

# Translation, rewriting and formation of Singapore's bilingual education policy

A comparison of English and Chinese editions of *My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey* by Lee Kuan Yew

Toh Wenqi and Cui Feng

Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry | Nanyang Technological University

Individuals inevitably have their own perception of Singapore's bilingual education policy, especially those who experienced its formation and history from the pre-independence days of the 1950s to the 1980s. The book, *My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey* by Lee Kuan Yew, the founding Prime Minister of Singapore, provides much information and insights into this part of history. Through the comparison of the English and Chinese editions, this paper discusses the poetics, patronage and ideological differences related to the reasons for the translation and rewriting by Lee Kuan Yew of the Chinese edition. It suggests that Lee Kuan Yew had different intentions for the English and Chinese editions in relation to the respective readerships; as regards the English readership, the author intends the readers to gain knowledge of the historical background and to emphasize to them the importance of Mother Tongue; as regards the Chinese readership, he seeks to address any misunderstandings and misgivings towards the government that this group of readers may have and to gain their support for the bilingual policy.

**Keywords:** rewriting, poetics, patronage, ideology, bilingual education policy

## 1. Introduction

The bilingual policy in Singapore dictates that all Singaporeans take up English, the official working language of Singapore, as a first language and their mother tongue languages as a second language. While it is a very pragmatic policy, the

formulation of this policy and its continuous maintenance and adjustments over the years have been controversial though, especially among the ethnic Chinese Singaporeans. This was the result of the closure of Nanyang University (Nantah), the only Chinese-medium university outside of China that provided higher education to the Chinese community, in 1980. It was a particularly significant event stemming from the implementation of the bilingual education policy and it marked the complete transformation of the linguistic environment in Singapore where the English language became the only official teaching language from Primary to University education; the ethnic Chinese Singaporeans did not take kindly to this. In 2012, Singapore's founding Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew (hereafter, Lee), the man behind the bilingual education policy, shared his views on this in his book *My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey* (hereafter, *Challenge*). He also documented his hardships in learning the Chinese language, through which he was able to empathize with the difficulties faced as the English-speaking ethnic Chinese learnt their second language.

The book was written by Lee in both English and Chinese and discussed rather different themes to the readers of the two versions, that is, the Chinese edition of this book is not just a word-for-word translation of the English edition – this is of particular interest as it marks a significant relationship between poetics, patronage, ideological differences and translation. As the publisher of the Chinese edition mentioned, 'The readerships of the two editions, particularly those 45 years and above, are different. They attended schools of two different language streams and hold quite different perspectives of the bilingual policy.' Hence, they are 'two separate Chinese and English editions' (SPH 2011). As this book was written by Lee from a first-person perspective, through the analysis of the book, we are able to understand the author's views directly without having to go through a third party's interpretation of the content.

The comparison of the book's English and Chinese editions provides a new perspective illustrating the relationship between the original English text and its rewritten Chinese translation. The majority of the readers tend to only read one edition of a book, typically the edition written in their dominant language, so that they may read the book comfortably and have a relatively good understanding of the content as much as possible. This decision is made based on the assumption that the original text is entirely translated and there is little difference in the content of both the English and Chinese editions of the particular book. However, in the case of *Challenge*, only reading one edition of a book suggests that a reader obtains either the author or the translator's perspective of the book. Unless one reads both the original and translated editions, his understanding of the book will be built on either the author or the translator's perspective and understanding of the content.

## 2. About *Challenge*

*Challenge* was jointly launched on 28 November 2011 by Singapore's newspapers *The Straits Times* and *Liánhé Zǎobào*, which published the English and Chinese editions respectively. Both newspapers are Singapore's flagship daily, with *The Straits Times* being the most-read newspaper and *Liánhé Zǎobào* being the most-read Chinese newspaper. These newspapers are under the Media Group of SPH Ltd, which is one of the leading media organizations in Asia, while the publisher of the English edition of Lee's book, the Straits Times Press is a subsidiary of SPH.

The book is comprised of two parts. The first part, "My Biggest Challenge", is Lee's narrative of his 50-year experience in the bilingual journey from a former Prime Minister and a politician's point of view. At the same time, he also shares his views and thoughts about bilingualism as a parent and as a learner of the Chinese language. There are eight chapters in this part, which generally adopts a chronological approach in narrating the beginning of his bilingualism experience, the formulation of Singapore's bilingual education policy to the closure of Nanyang University. The second part of the book is a collection of essays by Singaporeans (22 essays in the English edition and 18 essays in the Chinese edition), in which the authors recount their experiences to further illustrate and help the readers gain a deeper understanding of the bilingualism situation in Singapore. As this paper focuses on the discussion of the author's writing, only the eight chapters in Part 1 of the book will be used.

Although Lee was a well-respected political figure to many Singaporeans, there are people especially in the Chinese-speaking community that do not see eye-to-eye with Lee and the then-government's point-of-view on the bilingual policy. The Chinese edition is, therefore, also a platform for Lee to justify his decisions. Moreover, the usage of "my" in the book title also implies that the author opens up about his own journey of learning the Chinese language for the readers' understanding, scrutiny and criticism. By naming Part 1 of the book "My Biggest Challenge", which goes beyond his personal story, it becomes a case study for the readers who may also see the learning of languages as a big challenge to relate to.

The author is his own narrator and is in full control of the choice of words, the phrasing of sentences, and the arrangement of content in terms of chapters and sections; these are determined by the intentions of the author and intended response from the readership of the two different editions. For instance, different writing techniques are used to present the facts and recount personal experiences to attempt to stir up positivity towards the government, as it would, in turn, create relatively stronger feelings of patriotism among the Singaporean readers and evoke a sense of respect for the author.

Previous research on the topic of Singapore's bilingual policy have mainly adopted the approach of analyzing the rationales and outcomes of the policy by interviewing different categories of respondents regarding their experiences of learning Chinese, though 'views [towards the bilingual policy] are often suppressed due to Singapore's political climate' (Ee 2010: 18). In contrast, there is no research that looks at the bilingual education policy by doing a comparison of the English and Chinese editions of the book(s) written by Lee, which this paper attempts to do. In doing so, this paper seeks to answer the following questions: What are the more significant additions and omissions demonstrated through rewriting in the Chinese edition of the book? How does the author justify himself through translation and rewriting? What kind of collective memory is being constructed with the writing and translation of this book?

### 3. The rewriting of *Challenge*

#### 3.1 The Chinese edition as a translation and rewriting of the English edition

First, there is a need to establish the relationship between the Chinese and English editions of *Challenge*. According to SPH (2011), "in order to speak to (the) two readerships, the author decided that although the content should be similar, the approach would be slightly different". Additionally, launching both editions of *Challenge* at the same time may be a move by Lee to portray to the readers that he places equal emphasis on both editions of the book, hence both editions are considered original. As such, it seems as though the Chinese and English editions are indeed two 'separate' editions. Yet, a comparison of the general framework in these editions suggests otherwise. As shown in Table 1, it is evident that the titles of the eight chapters of Part 1 in the two editions are equivalent.

While Lee does adopt a slightly different approach for the readers of the different editions, the equivalence between the chapter titles in English and Chinese suggests that the author follows a consistent thought process throughout; there is a main idea concerning the bilingual policy which he would like to bring across in both editions of *Challenge*. In light of this, it is then necessary to determine, through other means, which of these editions should be seen as an 'original'.

First, from a language policy standpoint, despite the fact that both English and Mandarin are official languages of Singapore, it has always been the practice that the official documents are first written in English then subsequently translated into Mandarin. Even as Lee and the government try to explain bilingual policy through both editions of *Challenge*, they are unable to go around this practice. Hence, while the author tries to not refer the Chinese edition as a translation

**Table 1.** Comparison of the titles of chapters in English and Chinese editions

	English	Chinese
Part 1	My Biggest Challenge	一波一波的挑战 Yībō yībō de tiǎozhàn [Challenges one after another]
Chapter 1	Language and my early years 1923–1959	历史洪流塑造我的语言观 1923–1959 Lìshǐ hóngliú sùzào wǒde yǔyánguān 1923–1959 [The tides of history that shaped my language view 1923–1959]
Chapter 2	Birthpangs of bilingualism 1959–1987	双语政策终于起步 1959–1979 Shuāngyǔ zhèngcè zhōngyú qǐbù 1959–1979 [The bilingual policy finally takes off 1959–1979]
Chapter 3	Nanyang University 1956–1980	南洋大学兴与败的启示 1956–1980 Nányáng dàxué xīngyǔbài de qǐshì 1956–1980 [Reflections on the rise and fall of Nanyang University 1956–1980]
Chapter 4	Special Assistance Plan Schools: Preserving the best of Chinese education	时势造就了特选学校 Shíshì zàojiù le tèxuǎn xuéxiào [Special Assistance Plan Schools: a product of the changing times]
Chapter 5	The Speak Mandarin campaign	华语运动32年细说从头 Huáyǔ yùndòng 32 nián xìshuō cóngtóu [From the beginning: 32 years of the Speak Mandarin Campaign]
Chapter 6	A dynamic balance	调整又调整 改革又改革 1980–2011 Tiáozhěng yòu tiáozhěng gǎigé yòu gǎigé 1980–2011 [Adjustment after adjustment, change after change 1980–2011]
Chapter 7	Bilingualism and the rise of China	中国崛起带来的大气候 Zhōngguó juéqǐ dàilái de dàqìhòu [The rise of China: the big trend]
Chapter 8	Eight principles of Singapore’s bilingualism policy	我的经验总结 Wǒ de jīngyàn zǒngjié [A conclusion of my past experiences]

of the English edition, it is inevitable for the readers to make such an association, given that most readers are aware that Lee was more comfortable using the English language. Furthermore, as Bassnett and Lefevere (2001: 25) point out, “what is termed ‘translation’ and what is termed ‘original’ [...] are, inevitably, also linked to questions of authority and power”. As such, from this perspective, in the case of *Challenge*, we can logically deduce the English edition should be the ‘original’ for two reasons: (a) the author of *Challenge* is among those with the highest authority in Singapore and had played an indispensable role in nation building, and (b) English is Singapore’s language of administration. The Chinese edition is then construed as a translation the English edition.

Yet, the issue is complicated by the fact that Lee was the author of both the editions. While the ‘editorial team at Singapore Press Holdings’ (Lee 2012: 21) contributed to both editions of *Challenge*, Lee stated clearly that they only ‘provided the research and editorial material’ (Lee 2012: 21). This same information is also stated in the Chinese edition of *Challenge* (Li 2011: 5). While Lee expressed his thanks to them, he defined neither their roles as “translator”. He as the author is still the person having absolute authority over the narration of both editions of the book, and we can, therefore, see the Chinese edition as both a translation and a re-writing of the English edition.

Bassnett and Lefevere (2004) refer to translation as “a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way” (Lefevere 2004: vii). In this case study, the ‘given society’ is Singapore. After independence in 1965, Singapore’s “Education Ministry made the study of a second language compulsory in all secondary schools from 1966. This meant that Chinese-stream students had to learn English, while those in the English stream had to study another language” (Lee 2012: 63). This marked the beginning and formulation of Singapore’s bilingual education policy. Lee’s ideology of the bilingual education policy from Singapore’s pre-independence days is the foundation of the current education policies. Being the first and longest-serving Prime Minister in the history of Singapore also meant that Lee’s ideology represented the then-government’s ideology and the mainstream ideology in Singapore society. Hence, it is evident that the author’s ideology is one of the important factors that affected the translation and rewriting from English to Chinese.

Besides ideology, patronage and poetics also play a part in the rewriting process; for instance, and patronage may set the boundaries for readers, authors and translators. It is interesting to note that the patron, the author and the translator of *Challenge* are on the same side and share common objectives. As the patrons in this case, the publishers’ ideology is aligned with that of the author’s and the objectives of the book are being kept consistent.

It may even seem that *Challenge* would definitely be on the charts as a national bestseller after it is launched. This may be largely due to the author's background, political influence and the controversy between the English-educated and Chinese-educated Chinese over the bilingual education policy. According to Lefevere (2004:16), patronage consists of "three elements [...] an ideological component [...] an economic component [...] also an element of status involved". As mentioned earlier, the author's ideology of the bilingual education policy carries with it the political connotations which largely determines the approach with which the book is written. This means that even if the content in the English and Chinese editions is similar, the way the content is written, the words used to express the author's point of view to the different readerships are different.

The economic component in the case of the translation and rewriting of this book seems to already be taken into consideration, as the publisher would have ensured the professionals involved in the publishing of this book (editors, designers, etc.) are duly paid for their work. As explained earlier, readers, in general, would be interested to get a copy of this book and read about Lee's point of view on the bilingual education policy. For the readers of the English edition, the book would serve to provide them with more information on the background and adjustments of the education policy, so that they may have a better understanding on Singapore's history, particularly for those who were English-educated. On the other hand, most of the readers of the Chinese edition tends to be Chinese-educated and generally have a different perspective of the bilingual education policy as they are likely to have experienced great difficulty when they had to pick up the English language from scratch. Hence, the author's intention of having the Chinese edition is more than just sharing information and history, but to also give them a bigger picture and a macro-perspective of the times in the 1950s and 1960s that led Lee and the government to eventually make the decision for the closure of Nanyang University in 1980.

As for the element of status involved, the publisher as the patron will have to integrate itself as part of a group or a community, thus adopting its way of life and the way it works. In this case of SPH, the publisher and the nation's mainstream media, there is no conflict of interest and status with the author. Hence, the concept of "undifferentiated patronage" (Lefevere 2004:17) is evident in the publishing of this book in the English and Chinese editions. The publishing, translation and rewriting of this book are therefore to indirectly spread the official ideology towards the bilingual education policy to the primarily Singaporean readers. Besides sharing his views on the bilingual policy and his experiences in learning the Chinese language while being from an English-speaking family, the

author may also be trying to explain to the Chinese community that he understands what they have been through when learning the English language.

Nida explains that the differences in translations can generally be accounted for by three basic factors in translating: (1) the nature of the message, (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and (3) the type of audience. Messages differ primarily in the degree to which content or form is the dominant consideration (Nida 2000). As compared to the usual non-fiction bestsellers, the books written by Lee or those that contain interviews with him are definitely of a different nature. The message is not just transmitted through the content; it can also stir up feelings in the readers of the translation by invoking similar feeling(s) when one reads the original text.

Since the author and the translator happen to be the same person, there is no conflict of interest. From the perspective of the English edition, the author's purpose here is rather clear, that is, to share and convey his thoughts to the readers so that they may understand things from his perspective. In his 'Chinese translation', Lee, as the translator, intends to clear up misunderstandings with readers that hold different and/or opposing views while concomitantly sharing and conveying his thoughts. With a common objective and interest in mind, the publishing of this book is a relatively smooth process. There is virtually no opposition faced from the publisher.

Although books written by Lee (*Challenge* included) are not school textbooks used compulsorily as teaching materials, the readerships are also categorized according to a 'median' age, besides simply being categorized into English and Chinese readerships. This means that the readers can generally be sorted into two groups, that is, people who personally experienced the implementation and adjustments of the bilingual education policy and people who did not experience this part of Singapore's history firsthand. For the first group of readers, most of them may have already formed their own understandings, perceptions and responses towards the policy. Those that are already veered towards the English language as the dominant language in their daily lives because of reasons such as family background, parents' decisions or personal preference etc. are more likely to read the English edition of the book, which not only helps them understand the big picture of the policy but also encourages them to brush up their Chinese language if necessary, even if it is only for the rise of China and the economic value that comes with the language.

For the readers that did not personally experience the several rounds of adjustments gradually made over the years, the content mentioned in the book indirectly constructs their perspectives, knowledge and memory of the bilingual education policy. The author, being someone of authority, is able to, directly and indirectly, influence the construction of a collective memory among the Singa-

porean readers, simply because those with authority typically get to decide on what becomes part of the collective memory and what does not. Therefore, for the Chinese community, which forms part of the readership of the Chinese edition, the additional factor of the author justifying his decisions in the early years makes this process of the construction of collective memory even more important. It is only natural that the author's narrative of his personal experiences will invoke different responses and form, in the minds of the readers, different perceptions of the author. For instance, Singaporeans hold differing views on bilingualism, with most agreeing that Singaporeans do have an edge especially working in China, being proficient in both English and Chinese languages. This will be further elaborated using examples from the English and Chinese editions of the book.

### 3.2 Poetics and rewriting

Lefevere (2004: 26) mentions that poetics consists of two components: 'one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be in the social system as a whole.' This section discusses how the different aspects of poetics are used in the process of translating and rewriting. Poetics takes into account factors such as the literary environment and the emphasis of the society in question, that is, what is being accepted in the literary environment of the particular society affects the writing and the rewriting of literature. In light of this, there is a need to ask what kind of poetics is being accepted in Singapore's culture and environment. How do the English and Chinese editions of this book fit in to this climate? How are the characters portrayed and what kind of values do they wish to spread to the readers?

#### (1)

English edition:

In 1955, I visited Nanyang Kindergarten. Hsien Loong, then three and a half years old, thought I was there to pick him up. He grabbed his bag to get ready to go home with me. Alas, I was not there to pick him up but to observe the functioning of the kindergarten. The Chinese press later carried a photograph of him in the kindergarten, making it widely known that he was being educated in Chinese. This gave me credibility when I spoke on Chinese language issues. (Lee 2012: 34)

Chinese edition:

他们很小就到南洋幼稚园浸濡在华文环境里，这所幼稚园全用华语教学。1955年有一天，我和各政党委员会的委员去参观学校。显龙看到我，以为我到学校接他，拿起书包准备跟我一同回家的举动，逗得在场每个人都笑起来。过后，

华文报刊登了一张显龙在南洋幼稚园上课的照片，这使华人普遍知道他受的是华文教育，这无形中给了我“重视华文”的凭证。

Tāmen hǎnxiǎo jiù dào nányángyòuzhìyuán jìnrú zài Huáwén huánjìngli, zhèsuǒ yòuzhìyuán quányòng Huáyǔ jiàoxué. 1955 nián yǒuyītiān, wǒ hé gèzhèngdǎng wèiyuánhùi de wèiyuán qù cānguān xuéxiào. Xiǎnlóng kàndào wǒ, yīwéi wǒ dào xuéxiào jiētā, nǎqǐ shūbāo zhǔnbèi gēnwǒ yītóng huíjiā de jǔdòng, dòude zàichǎng měigèrén dōu xiàoqílái. guòhòu, huáwén bàokān dēngle yīzhāng Xiǎnlóng zài nányángyòuzhìyuán shàngkè de zhàopiàn, zhè shǐhuárén pǔbiàn zhīdào tā shòudeshì huáwénjiàoyù, zhè wúxíngzhōng gěilewǒ “zhòngshì huáwén” de píngzhèng.

[They [Mr. Lee's children] have been immersed in the Chinese language environment since young when they studied in Nanyang Kindergarten. Mandarin was the only language of instruction used in this kindergarten. One day in 1955, the executive members of the different political parties and I visited the school. Hsien Loong saw me and thought I was there to pick him up. He took his bag and was ready to 'head home' with me; everyone was amused by his actions. After that, a photo of Hsien Loong attending classes at Nanyang Kindergarten was published in the Chinese newspapers. This caused the news of Hsien Loong receiving Chinese language education to be widespread among the Chinese community, and indirectly became evidence that I [Mr. Lee] place great emphasis on the Chinese language.] (translation ours) (Li 2011: 26)

In (1), the underlined sentences are parts that have been added into the Chinese edition during the translation and rewriting process. In the chapter that this extract was taken from, i.e., Chapter 1, the author talks about his own encounters with languages, his early years and his family in detail. He also recounts the days when his children were young; using an encounter with his eldest child, Lee Hsien Loong, he demonstrated that his family is relatively high in his priorities and that his family unit is a closely-knitted one. As the family is the most important unit in the Singaporean society, the author's mention of his family is definitely acceptable and even provides a relatable backdrop for the readers, such as in the decision of a family's language choice and what kind of kindergarten to enroll one's child, all of which will affect the child's learning of languages in his life later on. Mr. & Mrs. Lee decided to enroll all their children in Chinese schools. This decision reveals the fact that he thinks that learning the Chinese language from a young age is important.

The emphasis on the language medium of Nanyang Kindergarten in the Chinese edition suggests that the author is worried that readers may conceive of Nanyang Kindergarten not as a fully Chinese kindergarten. This emphasis helps to dispel doubts about the 'purity' of the Chinese education in the kinder-

garten. The second portion added into the Chinese edition of the book is about how everyone present was having a good laugh over young Hsien Loong's funny response. The addition of this sentence brings light-heartedness into the text. As a reader, it is inevitable to have a certain reverence while reading the book as it is written by the founding Prime Minister of Singapore. There is bound to be a distance between the author and us readers. Hence, if the author wishes to reduce this distance between him and the readers, especially the Chinese readership that are likely to read his book with a predetermined mindset and perception, it is beneficial to add in some light-hearted moments in the content. This helps the readers to get more comfortable reading the book, making them more receptive to the content coming up next in the book. At the same time, because of the description of such a light-hearted moment in the Chinese edition, the fact that the author's child was in a Chinese school would leave a deeper impression in the readers' minds.

The next portion that was added to the Chinese edition is the specific mention that it was widely known among the public that his son was Chinese-educated. This emphasis strengthens his identity as being part of the Chinese community by sending his children to Chinese schools and reinforces his stand that the Chinese language is an integral part of Singapore's society even in 1955 (pre-independence days). The addition of the fact that his son studying in a Chinese school has indirectly and unknowingly become proof that he places great emphasis on the Chinese language and implies that the author has been trying to gain greater trust from the Chinese community that he shares the same belief that the Chinese language is important. Through this, he seeks to garner more support from the Chinese community in supporting the decisions that he made as the then-Prime Minister.

### 3.3 Patronage and rewriting

In the case of *Challenge*, Lee is the patron himself. He has absolute authority over the editorial and publishing team, ensuring that the content he intends to present to the readers of the different editions are published accordingly. He worked closely with his own team as well as the editorial and publishing team to ensure that the objectives of the book were met, especially for the readers of the Chinese edition. For those readers that have been through this part of the history, they may be limited by their own experiences, thoughts and perspectives. They may feel that government's decision to introduce the bilingual policy in the education system is being unfair to them and indirectly "forcing" them to place their mother tongue as the second language is an act of disregarding their Chinese roots, culture and value system. Hence, there is a need to clarify these issues in

the Chinese edition of the book through translation and rewriting. Take (2) for example.

(2)

English edition:

In December 1983, we announced that in 1987, all schools would use English as the main language of instruction. Only 260 children had enrolled for primary one in Chinese-medium schools that year. Tamil-medium schools had already closed, and the last two Malay-medium schools closed by end of 1985. In 1986, the last remaining purely Chinese-language schools closed. It was the end of a turbulent era in which education was subordinated to leftist politics. (Lee 2012: 74)

Chinese edition:

随着1984年教育部宣布从1987年起，除了特选学校，全国学校以英文为第一语文，母语为第二语文，统一源流，最后一所以华语为第一语文的华校于1986年关闭。这昭示了自1911年以来，曾经兴旺一时的华校，无论政府兴办的或私人兴办的，终于在新加坡教育史上完成历史任务。

Suízhe 1984nián jiàoyùbù xuānbù cóng 1987niánqǐ, chúle tèxuǎn xuéxiào, quánguó xuéxiào yǐ yīngwén wéi dìyī yǔwén, mǔyǔ wéi dìèr yǔwén, tǒngyī yuánliú, zuìhòu yīsuǒ yǐ huáyǔ wéi dìyī yǔwén de huáxiào yú 1986nián guānbì. Zhè zhāoshìle zì 1911nián yǐlái, céngjīng xīngwàngyīshí de huáxiào, wúlùn zhèngfǔ xīngbànde huò sīrén xīngbànde, zhōngyú zài Xīnjiāpō jiàoyùshǐ shàng wánchéng lìshǐ rènwu.

[In 1984, the Ministry of Education (MOE) announced that from 1987 onwards, all schools (with the exception of Special Assistance Plan schools) would use English as the first language, and mother tongue as the second language. With the unification of the language streams, the last remaining Chinese-language medium school closed in 1986. The closure of Chinese-medium schools signified that such schools, be it government or privately funded, have finally completed their missions and fulfilled their roles in Singapore's education history.] (translation ours) (Li 2011: 64)

In Example (2), the sentence 'Only 260 ... year' is omitted in the rewritten Chinese edition. This sentence is in the English edition to provide statistical information to the readers that the primary one enrolment for Chinese schools has decreased to the extent that there were only 260 in 1983. This was proof that parents preferred to send their children to English-medium schools and revealed the greater fact that the schools that used mother tongue as the language of instruction were unable to escape the fate of being closed eventually. Rather than saying that the mother tongue-medium schools were closed eventually, it can also be said that such schools were phased out by the times as parents placed greater emphasis on their children's learning of the English language in hopes of brighter futures. The author wishes to reiterate through the statistics of 1983's Chinese-medium

schools' Primary One enrolment that even without the government's decision on the closure of the mother-tongue medium schools, these schools were already phased out by the people's preference and the changes in the times. This statistical detail is omitted in the Chinese edition of the book to reduce the 'negative' impact on the readers if they get to know that the enrolment was so low. Furthermore, since the readers of the Chinese editions would already have had a rough idea that the enrolment decreased over the years, it would not be necessary to include the exact figure in the Chinese edition.

The portion underlined in the Chinese edition of Example (2) was rewritten to give the sentence a relatively neutral connotation. In the English edition, the sentence "It was ... politics" is filled with a sense of helplessness and relief. The word "subordinated" has the connotation that an object or person was being made dependent on something else. The use of this word in the English edition implies that education in Singapore at that point in history went through difficulties and challenges. Even as the Government implemented adjustments to the bilingual policy, "the measures we (the Government) introduced – integrated schools, and increasing language time – failed to address the fundamental disconnect between the home language and the languages taught in school" (Lee 2012: 69). Besides this, there was "much criticism of our bilingual policy by the public in the 1970s" (Lee 2012: 69). The political climate at that time also contributed significantly in the reduced effectiveness of the bilingual policy. The author described the formulation and adjustments of the bilingual policy from 1959 when the People's Action Party formed the Government to 1986 when the "last remaining purely Chinese-language schools closed" as "a turbulent era", implying that there were other intangibles that affected the education system at that time that were beyond control. The end of that "turbulent era" brought great relief to the government and marked the beginning of greater stability and growth in Singapore's education system. This sentence is rewritten in the Chinese edition as "[the closure of Chinese-medium schools] ... in Singapore's education history". The connotations in the Chinese edition and in the English one are rather different; the author, as the patron and the rewriter, has decided to present the closure of Chinese schools to the readers of the Chinese edition as a milestone, the closing of the previous chapter and the beginning of a new and better chapter.

### 3.4 Ideology and rewriting

Ideology is "a system of ideas and ideals, especially one which forms the basis of economic or political theory and policy [...] the set of beliefs characteristic of a social group or individual" (Ideology n.d.). It is closely associated with the politics but yet not limited to just politics. The ideology present in a culture and society

determines how the society will be like and the kind of opinions are accepted and not accepted. For a society to be stable, the people's thinking has to be generally aligned with the government's political beliefs and directions in which policies are formulated, implemented and adjusted accordingly. The political ideology of Singapore, with regards to its language policies, is that the national language is Malay and the official languages are Malay, Tamil, Chinese and English. English is the language of administration, and it is required that "all students must learn their mother tongue as their second language" (Lee 2012:225). The formulation and implementation of the bilingual education policy that has helped Singapore become what it is today signify the strengthening of such ideology in the country and society. In this paper, 'ideology' is not limited to the political ideology; it can also be Lee's ideology on a personal level, especially from his own language learning experience. It should be noted that there are also instances where the author's personal ideology is restrained or limited by the government's political ideology.

### (3)

English edition:

Students were exhausted from the heavier workload and from attending immersion classes several times a week. But we pressed on because I believed immersion was crucial in the learning of a language. We tried all ways to help the nine SAP [Special Assistance Plan] schools raise their English standards, so that parents could be confident enough to send their children there. We were not sure if the schools could deal with the numerous changes and make the cut as bilingual institutions. Parents were worried that more time on Chinese-language lessons would mean less time for other subjects. (Lee 2012: 121)

Chinese edition:

我为什么会非常坚持 [把华校生派去英校上课] 呢? 我根据自己学语言的经验, 发现环境非常重要。我认为学习语言需要语言环境的配合 [.....] 我们用尽种种办法来协助 [九所在“特别辅助计划”下的优秀传统华校] 加强英文, 重新赢得家长对它们的信心。 [.....] 我设计了这项保留优秀华校并且大力提高他们英文水平的“特别辅助计划”, 老实说, 当时能不能被家长接受, 心里完全没有底。我不知道会有多少家长愿意把孩子送去特选学校。对家长来说, 作出这个选择是有风险的, 但他们是勇敢的。谁愿意把天资聪颖的孩子放在以第一语文水平学习两种语文的“特选中学”——加重孩子负担, 让孩子处于不利的位置, 真是何苦呢?

Wǒ wèishénme huì fēichángjiānchí [bǎ huáxiàoshēng pàiqù yīngxiào shàngkè] ne?  
Wǒ gēnjù zìjǐ xuéyǔyán de jīngyàn, fāxiàn huánjìng fēicháng zhòngyào. Wǒ rènwéi  
xuéxí yǔyán xūyào yǔyán huánjìng de pèihé [.....] Wǒmen yòngjìn zhǒngzhǒng  
bànfǎ lái xiézhù [jiùsuǒ zài “tèbié fǔzhù jìhuà” xià de yōuxiù chuántǒng huáxiào]

jiāqiáng yīngwén, chóngxīn yíngdé jiāzhǎng duì tāmen de xīnxīn. [.....] Wǒ shèjì le zhèxiàng bǎoliú yōuxiù huáxiào bìngqiě dàlì tígāo tāmen yīngwén shuǐpíng de “tèbié fǔzhù jìhuà”, làoshishuō, dāngshí néngbùnéng bèi jiāzhǎng jiēshòu, xīnlǐ wánquán méiyǒudǐ. Wǒ bùzhīdào huìyǒu duōshǎo jiāzhǎng yuànyì bǎ háizi sòngqù tèxuān xuéxiào. Duì jiāzhǎng láishuō, zuòchū zhègè xuǎnzé shìyǒu fēngxiǎn de, dàn tāmen shì yǒnggǎnde. Shuí yuànyì bǎ tiānzī cōngyǐng de háizi fàngzài yǐ dìyī yǔwén shuǐpíng xuéxí liǎngzhǒng yǔwén de “tèxuǎnzhōngxué” — jiāzhòng háizi fūdān, rang háizi chūyú bùlì de wèizhì, zhēnshì hékǔ ne?

[Why do I insist [in sending Chinese school students to English schools for classes]? From my personal experience in learning language, I realized that the environment does play an important role. I feel that the learning of language requires a corresponding conducive environment [...] We tried all ways to help these nine [SAP] schools raise their English proficiencies, so as to regain the parents' confidence towards these schools [...] Honestly, when I designed this “Special Assistance Plan” to help preserve the outstanding Chinese schools and improve their English proficiencies, I was not sure if it was going to work as I did not know how many parents would be willing to send their children to SAP schools. The parents had to be brave enough to make such a risky decision [to send their children to SAP schools]. After all, who would send the intelligent children to SAP schools where they have to learn both English and Chinese as first language? The children would be busier from the heavier workload and this may place them at a disadvantage.] (my translation)

(Li 2011: 104)

Example (3), taken from Chapter 4, which talks about Special Assistance Plan (SAP) schools as being a product of changing times, presents a scenario whereby the author's personal ideology is in line with the government's national interests and objectives. With the impending closure of Nantah, the implementation of the SAP in 1979 with nine Chinese schools was with the objective of preserving the Chinese schools and raising the English standards of such schools. Even though these Chinese schools would be preserved, they would not remain as purely Chinese-medium schools. Instead, they were set to become bilingual schools where both English and Chinese languages would be the first languages of the students. Preserving the Chinese traditional values and culture to the extent of establishing selected Chinese schools as SAP schools was necessary as Chinese formed majority of the population, and with the impending closure of Nantah, there had to be an alternative symbol of identity that the Chinese could turn to, a place where they could continue fostering a sense of Chinese identity.

The interesting thing about (3) is the way the content is rewritten in the Chinese edition of the book. In the English edition, the content was narrated as plain information. The word “I” referring to the author was used once and the word “we” referring to the Government at that time was used twice. However, in

the Chinese edition, the word “我” [wǒ – I] was used a total of five times and the phrase “我们” [wǒmén – we] was only used once. Since it has been concluded that in this example, the author’s beliefs on the importance of building up SAP schools and allocating sufficient resources such as qualified teachers are shared by the Government, “I” (Lee) and “we” (the Government) should carry equivalent weight. From the perspective of a reader of the English edition, the establishment of SAP schools and promoting of learning both Chinese and English as the first language may not be of much appeal to him, depending on the person’s viewpoint towards being proficient in both Chinese and English. On the contrary, the Chinese community can be seen as the target group for the SAP schools. ‘By and large, the Chinese community supported the creation of the SAP schools’ (Lee 2012: 121), with the majority of the qualified students who signed up as the first batch of SAP school students coming from Chinese-stream primary schools. At this point, the Chinese-stream schools were still in operation. Hence, the setting up of SAP schools acted as a measure for the Government to preserve as many Chinese schools as possible before the eventual closure of Chinese-language medium schools in 1986. To the readers of the Chinese edition, the author emphasized on the efforts initiated by him to build up SAP schools with good English standards, putting actions to his belief that one should learn English and his mother tongue well. This example portrays the author’s ideology on a personal level through rewriting to illustrate the pioneering initiatives of establishing SAP schools.

The two examples mentioned above bring out the possibility that the author’s ideology on a personal level can be in some degree of conflict with the government’s ideology i.e. national interests and political objectives. Through rewriting, the author is able to decide to what extent he shares his personal thinking with the readers of the Chinese edition. From (3), it is evident that the author decided to adopt a more personal approach in sharing his thinking, which led him to come up with the SAP for the students “to attain as high a standard of English as in English-medium schools, but in a Chinese school environment” (Lee 2012, 120) as these schools “would get the best teachers and government funding to beef up their facilities” (Lee 2012, 120). Even if this was the case, there is a limit to the number of schools selected for the SAP, as these schools would always be a minority in Singapore, even though the requirements for students to take up Higher Chinese in schools have been relaxed over the years. Regardless of the future scale of the “Special Assistance Plan”, the fact remains that English would always be the dominant working language of Singapore.

### 3.5 The overlapping of all three aspects

Although the focus was only on one of three aspects (poetics, patronage and ideology) in each of the examples discussed earlier, the fact is that all three aspects overlap and interact with each other in the rewriting of the book in the Chinese edition. It was merely the case that the dominant aspect (poetics, patronage or ideology) was analyzed in detail.

#### (4)

Chinese edition:

华语受“污染”

上世纪90年代，新加坡电视台有两部环境剧非常受欢迎，一是第5波道的英文剧《同在屋檐下》，另一部是第8波道的华语剧《敢敢做个开心人》。

这两部环境剧都以小市民为主线，故事围绕着他们的日常生活发展。剧集最大的卖点是运用本地色彩非常浓厚的生活语言。《同在屋檐下》说的是新加坡式英语，《敢敢做个开心人》说的是新加坡式华语，无论说的是华语还是英语，都混杂了马来语、方言、英语（或华语）。演员说这些“杂菜式”语言，起了搞笑作用，让普罗大众感到亲切。这也引起了当时“杂菜式华语”好和不好的两方论战。

支持“杂菜式华语”的人认为，反正生活在新加坡，说更贴近新加坡人生活的“杂菜式华语”已经是习惯，只要新加坡人听得懂就行。他们还认为新加坡的“杂菜式华语”是多元社会的“结晶”，是新加坡的特殊文化，只有在新加坡这样的社会才会出现。

反对者则担忧“杂菜式华语”会影响我们推行了多年的“讲华语运动”。他们认为必须尽快进行“净化语言”，说标准华语，否则新加坡年轻一代的华人将没有办法用纯正的华语表情达意，无法和其他地区的华族沟通，结果华语又变成取代其他方言的另一种低层次方言，最终在一个英语的海洋中，像一个孤岛般沉没。

这两部剧的混杂式语言，当时都引起身为总理的吴作栋关注。在他的建议下，《同在屋檐下》的主角“潘厝港”去上英文课，修补他的破烂英语。《敢敢做个开心人》则重新配音，把方言词删去。吴作栋同时也建议推广华语理事会考虑在今后的讲华语运动中，把重点放在鼓励华人讲标准的华语上。

我的意见是我们应该尽量提升华语水平，而不是停留在“新加坡式华语”的层面。这也是为什么我不赞成“新加坡式英语”的原因，它会使这个语言的错误使用方式持续下来。这对语言学者来说也许很有趣，但对社会发展没有丝毫价值。我们学习英语是为了沟通，为了让世界了解我们，也为了让我们了解世界，为什么我们需要一个属于自己的特别语言？华语也一样。我们应该尽量达到标准的水平，让所有的人，不管在香港、台湾、中国还是美国的华人都听得懂，而不是保留一个只有新加坡人才听得懂的语言。

我不明白我们的华语为什么要标新立异？除非我们像美国，人口远远超过英国，才有说美式英语的条件。我们人口只有300万，没有必要编自己的华文词典。我们如果说除了新加坡人以外没有人能听得懂的新加坡式华语，好像说“暗语”那样，有什么意思？有什么价值？就像说新加坡式英语那样，那是极端愚蠢的，也是自我降低水平的做法。就像我说的英语是标准的，是全世界人都听得懂的，任何人跟我说只有他自己才听得懂的英语，我是不回答的。

所以，我们当然要净化华语，要学一种能让13亿中国人以及全世界华人都听得懂和华语。现在全世界对中国有兴趣的人，并没有去台湾学闽南语、去香港学广东话、或到马来西亚、新加坡来学我们这里的华语，他们都到中国去学标准的普通话，以便跟全世界的华人联系，就是这个道理。

Huáyǔshòu “wūrǎn”

Shàngshìjì 90niándài, Xīnjiāpō diànshìtái yǒu liǎngbù huánjìngjù fēicháng shòuhuānyíng, yīshì dì5 bōdào de yīngwénjù 《Tóngzài wūyánxià》, língyǐbù shì dì8 bōdào de huáyǔjù 《Gǎngǎn zuògè kāixīnrén》.

Zhè liǎngbù huánjìngjù dōuyǐ xiǎoshìmín wéizhǔxiàn, gùshì wéirào tāmen de rìcháng shēnghuó fāzhǎn. Jùjī zuìdàde mǎidiǎn shì yùnyòng běndì sècǎi fēicháng nóng hòu de shēnghuó yǔyán. 《Tóngzài wūyánxià》 shuōdeshì Xīnjiāpōshì yīngyǔ, 《Gǎngǎn zuògè kāixīnrén》 shuōdeshì Xīnjiāpōshì huáyǔ. Wúlùn shuōdeshì huáyǔ hāishì yīngyǔ, dōu hùnzǎle mǎláyǔ, fāngyán, yīngyǔ (huò huáyǔ). Yǎnyuán shuōzhèxiē “zácàshì” yǔyán, qǐle gǎoxiào zuòyòng, rang pǔlúodàzhòng gǎndào qīnqiè. Zhè yě yīnqǐle dāngshí “zácàshì huáyǔ” hǎo hé bùhǎo de liǎngfāng lúnzhàn.

Zhíchí “zácàshì huáyǔ” de rén rènwéi, fǎnzhèng shēnghuó zài Xīnjiāpō, suǒ gèngtiējìn Xīnjiāpōrén shēnghuó de “zácàshì huáyǔ” yǐjīng shì xíguàn, zhǐyào Xīnjiāpōrén tīngdédòng jiùxíng. Tāmen háirènwéi “zácàshì huáyǔ” shì duōyuán-shèhuì de “jiéjīng”, shì Xīnjiāpō de tèshū wénhuà, zhǐyǒu zài Xīnjiāpō zhèyàngde shèhuì cáihuì chūxiàn.

Fǎnduìzhè zédányōu “zácàshì huáyǔ” huìyǐngxiǎng wōmen tuīxíngde duōniánde “jiǎnghuáyǔ yùndòng”. Tāmen rènwéi bìxū jìnkuài jinxing “jīnghuáyǔyán”, suǒ biāozhǔn huáyǔ, fǒuzé Xīnjiāpō niánqīng yīdàide huárén jiāng méiyǒu bànfǎ yòng chúnzhèngde huáyǔ biǎoqíngdàyì, wúfǎ héqítā dìqūde huázú gōutōng, jiéguǒ huáyǔ yòubiànchéng qǔdài qítā fāngyán de língyǐzhōng dīcéngcǐ fāngyán, zuìzhōng zài yīgè yīngyǔ de hǎiyángzhōng, xiàngyīgè gūdǎobān chénmò.

Zhèliǎngbùjù de hùnzǎshì yǔyán, dāngshí yīnqǐshēnwéi zǒnglǐ de Wúzuòdòng guānzhù. Zài tāde jiànyìxià 《Tóngzài wūyánxià》 de zhǔjué “pāncuògǎng” qùshàng yīngwénkè, xiūbù tāde pòlàn yīngyǔ. 《Gǎngǎn zuògè kāixīnrén》 zéchéngxīn pèiyīn, bǎ fāngyáncǐ shānqù. Wúzuòdòng tóngshí yějiànyì Tuiguāng Huáyǔ Lǐshìhuì kǎolù zài jīnhòu de jiǎnghuáyǔ yùndòng zhōng, bǎ zhòngdiǎn fāngzài gǔlǐ huárén jiǎng biāozhǔn de huáyǔshàng.

Wǒ de yìjiànshì wǒmen yīnggāi jìnliàng tíshēng huáyǔ shuǐpíng, érbùshì tíngliúzài “Xīnjiāpōshì huáyǔ” de céngmiàn. Zhèyěshì wèishénme wǒ bùzànchéng “Xīnjiāpōshì huáyǔ” de yuányīn, tā huìshǐ zhègè yǔyán de cuòwù shíyòng fāngshì chíchù xiàlái. Zhèduì yǔyán xuézhě láishuō yěxǔ hěnyǒuqù, dānduì shèhuì fāzhǎn méiyǒu sīháo jiàzhí. Wǒmen xuéxí yīngyǔ shìwèile gōutōng, wèile ràngshìjiè liǎojiě wǒmen, yěwèile ràngwǒmen liǎojiě shìjiè, wèishénme wǒmen xūyào yīgè shǔyǔ zìjǐ de tèbié yǔyán? Huáyǔyěyīyàng. Wǒmen yīnggāi jìnliàng dádào biāozhǔnde shuǐpíng, rang suǒyǒuderén, bùguǎn zài Xiānggǎng, Táiwān, Zhōngguó, háishì Měiguó de huárén dōutīngdédòng, érbùshì bàoliú yīgè zhǐyǒu Xīnjiāpōrén cáitīngdédòng de yǔyán.

Wǒ bùmíngbai wǒmende huáyǔ wèishénme yào biāoxīnlìyì? Chūfēi wǒmen xiàng Měiguó, rénkǒu yuǎnyuǎn chāoguò Yīngguó, cáiyǒu shuōměishìyīngyǔ de tiáojiàn. Wǒmen rénkǒu zhǐyǒu 300wàn, méiyǒu biyào biān zìjǐde huáwén cídiǎn. Wǒmen rúguǒ shuō chúlè Xīnjiāpōrén yǐwài méiyǒurén néng tīngdédòngde Xīnjiāpōshì huáyǔ, hǎoxiàngshuō “ànyǔ” nàyàng, yǒushénme yìsi? Yǒushénme jiàzhí? Jiùxiàngshuō Xīnjiāpōshì yīngyǔ nàyàng, nàshì jíduān yúchǔnde, yěshì zìwǒ jiàngdī shuǐpíng de zuòfǎ. Jiùxiàng wǒshuōde yīngyǔ shì biāozhǔnde, shì quánshìjièrén dōu tīngdédòngde, rènherén gēnwǒshuō zhǐyǒutā zìjǐ cáitīngdédòngde yīngyǔ, wǒshì bù huídáde.

Suǒyǐ, wǒmen dāngrán yào jìngguà huáyǔ, yàoxué yīzhǒng néngràng 13yì Zhōngguórényǐ jí quánshìjiè huárén dōu tīngdédòngde huáyǔ. Xiànzài quánshìjiè duì Zhōngguó yǒuxìngqǔ de rén, bìngméiyǒu qù Táiwān xué mǐnnányǔ, qù Xiānggǎng xué guǎngdōnghuà, huòdào Mǎláixīyà, Xīnjiāpō xué wǒmen zhèlǐde huáyǔ, tāmen dōudào Zhōngguó qùxué biāozhǔnde pǔtōnghuà, yǐbiàn gēn quánshìjiè de huárén liánxi, jiùshì zhègè dàoǐ.

Our translation into English:

[The “pollution” of Chinese language

In the 90s, the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation (today’s MediaCorp) produced two very popular local sitcoms: Channel 5’s “Under One Roof” and Channel 8’s “Don’t Worry, Be Happy”.

The plots of the two local sitcoms were developed from the daily lives of Singaporeans, with the biggest selling point being the use of “day-by-day” language. Singlish was used in “Under One Roof” and Singaporean Mandarin was used in “Don’t Worry, Be Happy”. Malay, dialects, and English (or Mandarin) were mixed together like “rojak” (a dish made by tossing various fruits and vegetables in Singapore). These “rojak” languages enhanced the comedy effects of the sitcoms, and viewers could relate to them easily. This sparked off a debate between the pros and cons of using “rojak Mandarin” at that time.

Those who were in support of “rojak Mandarin” felt that as everyone was already living in Singapore, people were already used to “rojak Mandarin” which was closer to their daily lives. As long as Singaporeans understood this language, there was no issue. People who were for the idea of “rojak Mandarin” also felt that multicultural society in Singapore gave rise to “rojak Mandarin”. This can be seen as a unique culture in the Singapore society.

Those who were against the idea of “rojak Mandarin” were concerned that this “language” would reduce the effectiveness of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. They felt that there was an urgency for “language purification” and advocate speaking good Mandarin, otherwise, the younger generations of Chinese Singaporeans would not be able to express their thoughts using pure Chinese language. They would also not be able to communicate effectively with the Chinese from other parts of the world. In the end, the Chinese language would become another low-level dialect that is used to replace other dialects, and lose its standing in a English-majority environment.

Mr. Goh Chok Tong, then Prime Minister, was concerned with the use of “rojak” language in these two local sitcoms. With his advice, the lead character “Phua Chu Kang” in “Under One Roof” attended English lessons to brush up his English. The dubbing for “Don’t Worry, Be Happy” was done all over again, with all the dialect removed. Mr. Goh Chok Tong also suggested that the Promote Mandarin Council could focus more on encouraging Chinese Singaporeans to speak ‘good Mandarin’ in the subsequent years of Speak Mandarin Campaign.

My advice was that we should raise the Mandarin standards as much as possible, and should not stop at the level of Singaporean Mandarin. This is the reason why I disapprove of Singlish because it would cause the continuation of wrong language usage. This may be interesting to linguists, but yet it does not contribute towards the development of society at all. We learn English for communication with the world and let the world understand us better and vice versa; why do we need to have our own special language? This same goes for Mandarin. We should try our best to attain a good standard, so that the Chinese people from Hong Kong, Taiwan, China or even the US can understand us; we ought not to preserve a language only understood by Singaporeans.

I don’t understand why we have to be innovative in the Mandarin we use? Unless we are like America, whose population far exceeds that of England, thereby promoting the need for American English, there is no need to create our own Chinese dictionary when our population hovers around only 3 million. If we use Singaporean Mandarin that is only understood by fellow Singaporeans, it is like speaking in codes; does it have any value at all? This is absolutely foolish, just like speaking Singlish, and is a form of devaluing ourselves. I speak good English that is under-

stood by people all over the world. If anyone speaks to me in a form of English that only he understands, I will not respond to him.

Therefore, we must purify Mandarin, and learn Mandarin that is understood by the 13 billion people in China and all the Chinese around the world. Everyone that is interested in China did not go to Taiwan to learn Hokkien, Hong Kong to learn Cantonese, or Malaysia and Singapore to learn the Mandarin here; all of them go to China to learn standard Mandarin, so that they may connect with Chinese all over the world. This is a truth that we need to understand.] (repeated: translation is ours)  
(Li 2011: 168–169)

Example (4) is taken from the fifth chapter of the book, which speaks about the Speak Mandarin Campaign. This is a section on its own in the Chinese edition of the book, one that is not in the English edition at all. The author used two locally-produced sitcoms that were very popular in the 90s, namely “*Under One Roof*” and “*Don’t Worry, Be Happy*” as case studies to illustrate his point that it is of utmost importance to ensure Singaporeans learn and speak good English and Mandarin in their daily lives. Besides the use of ‘rojak language’ (i.e. a mix of English, Malay, Mandarin and Chinese dialects) in the dialogue, another similarity between the two local sitcoms is in terms of the plot and characters. The main characters are usually from the same family and share a close relationship with each other. They also have good relationships with their neighbors. Through the plot and the main characters, the idea of a family-oriented value system with an emphasis on social cohesion between different ethnic groups is transmitted to the viewers. The author’s decision to include these local sitcoms at the beginning of the section, besides being in line with the poetics of Singapore’s society, also draws the Chinese readers’ attention to the subsequent content. This was based on the assumption that because the local sitcoms were very popular in the 90s, most of the Chinese readers would have watched these shows and hence could relate to them easily. Adopting this way of narration also makes the readers relatively comfortable to continue reading the subsequent paragraphs leading to the main ideas of this section in the book.

The author explicitly stated his disapproval towards Singlish and Singaporean Mandarin, indirectly expressing his view that while viewers enjoy watching the two local sitcoms, he does not encourage them to watch these television shows on a regular basis as they would adversely affect the use of good English and Mandarin in their daily lives. Although the author was no longer the Prime Minister of Singapore at the time when the two sitcoms were aired on television, he, as the Senior Minister, meant that there was still authority in his words. Furthermore, his views on speaking good English and Mandarin were shared by then-Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong. This consistency in ideology on the

personal and national level further reinforced the subsequent actions such as adjustments in the plot and in the dubbing to remove dialect in the dialogue were taken to ensure that the local sitcoms adhere to the government's focus in the bilingual policy as part of the efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. Through rewriting, content that were not mentioned in the original English edition are presented in the Chinese edition, sending a clear message to the readers that Singaporean Mandarin is not an acceptable standard of Mandarin and that the hard truth is that the only way to connect with China and the Chinese people across the globe is to speak good Mandarin. Watching sitcoms that mostly contain dialogue with Singaporean Mandarin is not helpful towards speaking good Mandarin and would not contribute towards meeting national interests and objectives.

Besides seeing how poetics and ideology play their roles in the rewriting of including (4) only in the Chinese edition, patronage is also at play in terms of the way narration used in this example. Consisting of eight paragraphs, the first four paragraphs talk about how the airing of local sitcoms gave rise to "impure Mandarin" (i.e. Singaporean Mandarin) and the differing views on this trend. The fifth paragraph talks about how the then-Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong was concerned with the rise of such "impure" languages and action was taken to ensure this trend was kept under control. The author used the first five paragraphs that narrated from a third person's point of view as a setup for his narration of the main points in the last three paragraphs. The author's tone changed in the last three paragraphs as he shared the hard truth, using the word "我" [wǒ - I] a total of six times and the phrase "我们" [wǒ mén - 'we' or 'our'] a total of twelve times to raise questions that set the readers thinking rationally about the objectives of the bilingual policy and guiding them towards the direction of agreeing with his viewpoint and sharing his disapproval towards Singlish and "Singapore Mandarin", as well as the need to "purify" Mandarin and learn that proper Mandarin enables Singaporeans to connect with the world. The author, being his own patron in the translating and rewriting, did not have to worry about the issue of censorship in the publishing. The publisher usually has the right to omit certain content if it potentially offensive, such as the use of overly explicit and vulgar words. In this case, although there were no offensive words used, explicitly stated disapproval towards popular local sitcoms may be omitted as they may stir up feelings of negativity and displeasure amongst the readers. However, as the author is of a greater influence than the publisher, he is able to exert his patronage in the rewriting, stating his viewpoints clearly without any omissions.

#### 4. Conclusion

This paper has illustrated with examples how poetics, patronage and ideology interplay and contribute to the translation and rewriting of *Challenge*. It is evident that the presence of these resulted in the different responses of the two readerships. The possible reasons for understanding the Chinese edition as a rewriting of the English one can be summarized as: (1) the author was aware that the different readerships have varied understanding and viewpoints toward the bilingual education policy and him as the person that engineered, implemented and adjusted this policy for the last 50 years; (2) in terms of national interests and objectives, the author wanted to take this book as a platform to share and clarify the thought processes he went through which led to the decisions made; (3) from the several examples listed in the chapters earlier, it can be concluded that most of the rewriting done and shown in the Chinese edition are additions. The author wanted to address, as a whole, the misunderstandings that the Chinese community may have towards him. In order to form a rapport with the readers of the Chinese edition, he adopted a relatively personal approach of narration by writing from the first-person perspective.

Although in the case of Lee, it is rather straightforward to establish that he is the author, his own patron and rewriter, there are still limitations to Lefevere's theories. Hermans (1999) commented that there is "an inconsistency in his [Lefevere's] own theory [...] he puts rewriters, including translators, with the 'experts' who form part of the control mechanism of the literary system" (Hermans 1999: 129). In the case of Lee, however, he, as the rewriter, is indeed the 'expert' that is in control of the 'system' in which his book is released into. There is no conflict between the author, rewriter, publisher and the government for the publishing of this book. Because of the power and authority that comes with his status of Singapore's founding Prime Minister and a person of immense political and global influence, there is virtually no objection in the content, what could be mentioned, what could not be mentioned, how things should be mentioned etc.

However, it is notable that such a scenario can be rather rare. Under the usual circumstances, the translator or rewriter is engaged by the publisher for his services. The author, depending on how highly he is sought after and even his relationship with the publisher, may not even have the right to choose the translator. The publisher with its own objectives, such as profits and cost-benefit analysis, is likely to engage translators who ask for relatively lower remuneration, which may imply a compromise in the standards of the translation, where the translator's understanding of the author's work may not necessarily be consistent with the meanings and intentions of the author himself. If this is the case, for readers that only understand the target language, they would only be able to

understand the translated version of the author's work and thereby get their perceptions of the author and his work by reading the rewritten translation. If the translation does not express the intention of the author and his work consistently and accurately, it would not be beneficial to the author in the long term. This system consisting of the authors, publishers and the translators in most real-life situations seems to be more complex than what Lefevere thought, the relationships between them are not also not as easily and clearly defined. Even in the context of Singapore's literature environment as a whole, the case study of *Challenge* is a very rare one. With the publishers facing tough competition to keep up with the market and cater to the readers' preferences, the role of translation and rewriting is getting more and more important.

## References

### 1. Books

- Bassnett, Susan; and André Lefevere. 2001. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester (UK): St. Jerome Publishing.
- Lee, Kuan Yew. 2012. *My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey*. Singapore: Straits Times Press.
- Lefevere, André. 2004. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Li, Guang Yao. 2011. *Wo yisheng de tiaozhan – Xinjiapo shuangyuzhilu [My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey]*. Singapore: Liánhé Zǎobào
- Nida, Eugene. 2000. "Principles of Correspondence". In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 126–140. London: Routledge.

### 2. E-resources

- Ee, Yan Li. 2010. *Bilingualism and Hegemony: Public Discourse on the Chinese language teaching in Singapore* (Bachelor's Thesis). Singapore: DR-NTU Institutional Repository. [https://repository.ntu.edu.sg/bitstream/handle/10356/25666/hHSA09\\_10.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y](https://repository.ntu.edu.sg/bitstream/handle/10356/25666/hHSA09_10.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y)
- Oxford dictionaries*, sub voce "ideology". <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ideology>
- Singapore Press Holdings. 2011. *Launch of "My Lifelong Challenge: Singapore's Bilingual Journey" by Lee Kuan Yew*. Singapore Press Holding's Media Releases 2011. [http://www.sph.com.sg/media\\_releases/1351](http://www.sph.com.sg/media_releases/1351)

## Résumé

Les individus ont inévitablement leur propre perception de la politique d'éducation bilingue de Singapour, en particulier s'ils ont vécu sa formation et son histoire depuis la période antérieure à l'indépendance dans les années 1950 jusqu'aux années 1980. Le livre *My Lifelong Challenge : Singapore's Bilingual Journey* de Lee Kuan Yew, le Premier ministre fondateur de Singapour, fournit un grand nombre d'informations et de points de vue sur cette période de l'histoire. En comparant les éditions anglaise et chinoise, cet article examine les différences en matière de poésie, de paternalisme et d'idéologie liées aux motifs de la traduction et de la réécriture de Lee Kuan Yew dans l'édition chinoise. Il suggère que les intentions de Lee Kuan Yew à l'égard des lecteurs respectifs des éditions anglaise et chinoise étaient différentes. En ce qui concerne le lectorat anglais, l'auteur souhaite que les lecteurs acquièrent des connaissances sur le contexte historique et insiste sur l'importance de la langue maternelle; concernant le lectorat chinois, il cherche à dissiper les malentendus et les réserves que ce groupe de lecteurs pourrait avoir à l'égard du gouvernement et à obtenir son soutien à la politique bilingue.

**Mots-clés:** réécriture, poésie, paternalisme, idéologie, politique d'éducation bilingue

## Address for correspondence

Toh Wenqi  
Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
Trade Association Hub  
9 Jurong Town Hall Road #04-01  
Jurong Town Hall  
609431  
Singapore  
toh.wenqi@gmail.com

## Co-author information

Cui Feng  
Nanyang Technological University  
cuifeng@ntu.edu.sg