TURUN YLIOPISTO

Polysemy in Translator's Footnotes in Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*

Susanna Stenfors
Bachelor's Thesis
Department of English
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Faculty of Humanities
University of Turku
February 2026

Bachelor's Thesis

Bachelor of Arts, Department of English
Susanna Stenfors
Polysemy in Translator's Footnotes in Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*
Number of pages: 19 pages, 3 appendices

This thesis examines how a translator can use footnotes to provide additional information to the reader in cases of polysemy. The aim of this research is to analyze how polysemy is mentioned, explained and discussed in translator's footnotes in Jonathan Clements' 2012 translation of Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*. To effectively analyze these footnotes, different categorizations are used to examine what kind of footnotes are used to discuss polysemy. This thesis also considers how *The Art of War* and classical Chinese exhibit special characteristics that warrant the use of footnotes, as well as how footnotes act as an important tool for the understanding of the underlying linguistic and cultural elements in the source text. Footnotes are also compared to other paratexts and their unique features are discussed. This study concludes that footnotes provide a useful way of adding information regarding cases of polysemy without having to take up a considerable amount of space in the main text body.

Key words: translator's footnotes, polysemy, *The Art of War*

Table of contents

1 Introduction

Translators use a variety of theories and methods when translating texts from one language to another. One especially useful tool for translators to use is often overlooked and left outside major research, this tool being paratexts. While authors get a lot of use out of paratexts and do so with purpose, it is rare to see translators use paratexts unless absolutely necessary. Paratext refers to all text, imagery and discourse surrounding the core text itself (Genette 1997). This includes the cover art of a book, bibliographies, introductions, and most importantly for this study, footnotes. Footnotes are texts that have typically been added to the bottom of pages, separated from the actual body of the text. They can be used, for example, to add information that would be too distracting for the reader in the middle of the main text body.

In this thesis I will be examining translator's footnotes. My focus is on the translations of polysemy and how this may affect the readers' understanding of the text. I will investigate how footnotes affect the reader's understanding of the source text in these cases. To analyze these footnotes, I am going to observe them in Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* translated by Jonathan Clements (2012). Clements uses footnotes on many pages of his translation, and considering the small amount of text the original book has, a considerable proportion of the work consists of additional information given by the translator.

I begin this thesis by introducing *The Art of War* as a whole in section 2 while also investigating the multiple challenges translators have faced when translating classical Chinese texts into modern Chinese and then into English. Clements' (2012) paratexts include mentions about his translation process and choices, and how his text differs from the previous translations, which will also be discussed in the following section 3. In the same section Clements' footnotes will be divided using Blight (2005) and Toledano-Buendía's (2013) categories, with a special focus on the ones concerning polysemy. I then proceed to section 4 and discuss some of the difficulties that arose during the research. This section will also cover how Clements approached polysemy, and why footnotes function as an efficient tool specifically to clarify cases of polysemy. Finally, in section 5, I conclude this thesis by summarizing the results and findings and discussing how the translators' usage of footnotes can be applied to aid readers. A table of all footnotes containing polysemy can be found at the end of this thesis.

2 Materials

In this thesis I will be discussing translator's footnotes and how they are used in Jonathan Clements' (2012) translation of *The Art of War* to explain polysemy. Polysemy means "instances of a single linguistic expression having multiple related senses" (Carston 2021, 108). In other words polysemy means words that have multiple different meanings that are related to one another in sense. Because of a variety of qualities which will be discussed later, *The Art of War* contains many instances where polysemy causes potential comprehension issues. There are three main reasons for why *The Art of War* is desirable as the main source. First, the book has extensive footnotes on almost every page of the main text, providing a great amount of material to analyze. Second. Clements uses footnotes for a variety of reasons, for example to explain the historical background of a word. This allows for the highlighting of the myriad purposes footnotes can be used. Lastly, although still relevant to this day, as a historical piece *The Art of War* is a highly complex work tied to its time by language and historical context. This warrants the use of footnotes to make the text understandable to modern readers.

2.1 Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*

The Art of War is a book in which Sun Tzu discusses such topics as military activity, business management, social administration, and operating decisions (Sha 2018, 195). To understand the difficulties of translating *The Art of War*, it is important to understand its long history. *The Art of War* consists of thirteen chapters, which were written during the fifth century BCE (Luo and Zhang 2017, 593). Sun Tzu or Sunzi, meaning Master Sun, was a military strategist, assumed to have come from a powerful North-Eastern state of Qi during the Spring and Autumn period from 771 to 403 BCE (Clements 2012, 25–38). By the time he was first mentioned in history, he was already a soldier, who had defected from Qi and later became a military general for the state of Wu under the service of king Helü (ibid.). Before this position, at some point he had already written the thirteen chapters and become famous for them (ibid.). Sun Tzu's knowledge on warfare is often assumed to have come from his experiences of living during the Spring and Autumn period, and the partially overlapping Warring States period (c. 475-221 BCE), which were times of great disunity and constant warfare (Fang et al. 2008, 287). Yet, in his chapters Sun Tzu extensively and constantly reminds the reader that war and fighting are only the last resort in all cases, and that actual war is high-cost and often low-reward. These thirteen chapters have been studied throughout

history and to this day leaders, generals and people in business use them to learn Sun Tzu's wisdom (Sha 2018, 197).

2.1.1 Language in *The Art of War*

Since *The Art of War* is an old text, its historical context is paramount to understanding the linguistic choices made by both Sun Tzu and his translators. Clements (2012, 21) considers "the written *The Art of War* less as Sun Tzu's book than his notes for a speech or for further discussion." According to Clements (ibid.), it is very likely that the thirteen chapters were used as 'key points', to which the speaker could refer when lecturing. This means that the chapters tend to be concise and brief, with the intention that the speaker should then provide more details in their speech.

Another central issue lies within classical Chinese. China prides itself with its long history and the Chinese language is an important part of it. Although classical and modern Chinese have a lot in common, the language has changed in critical ways over the last 3,000 years (Clements 2012, 21). Classical Chinese uses characters that may be familiar to modern readers, but that have either a completely different meaning or that could mean many other things as well. The latter is a case of polysemy.

2.1.2 Polysemy in *The Art of War*

According to Jiang et al. (2023, 77), "polysemy refers to multiple meanings of a word in different contexts in classical Chinese poetry", and although talking about poetry, the same can be applied to classical Chinese in general. Clements (2012, 14) also writes about this phenomenon, using *The Art of War*'s Chinese name as an example. The name of the book and all Chinese non-translated words are written in pinyin, which is the official format of writing Mandarin Chinese with the Roman alphabet (The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics, s.v. "pinyin", n.). Following the style that Clements (2012) uses in his translation, the tone indicators (such as á or à) will not be used in this thesis. The book is referred to as *Bingfa*, which has two constituents *bing* and *fa*, both of which have multiple meanings: *bing* can mean weapons, army, arms, troops, military etc. and *fa* can mean law, method, standard, model after etc. Military terms are especially difficult to understand due to classical Chinese own distinctive style (Sha 2018, 195). As even the title presents multiple different ways it can be translated, it highlights just how big of a role polysemy plays in classical Chinese.

Another common feature of the Chinese language that is important to understand for this study is homonymy. Homonymy is closely related to polysemy, which can cause confusion if their differences are not made clear. Homonymy means a case in which a word has two different, unrelated meanings but has the same written form and phonological realization (Carston 2020, 110). An English example of this would be the "bat", which means both an animal and a hitting instrument (ibid.). The difference between homonymy and polysemy stems from semantics: homonymous words are not related to one another in sense, whereas polysemous words are. Carston (id. 108) uses the word "run" ("to run for president" and "to run a mile") as examples of polysemy, as the two words are closely related in sense. Even though Clements (2012) does not use the term polysemy, his discussion on the aforementioned *bing* and *fa* showcases the many different and related meanings both of these words have. If the reader is not knowledgeable of the source language, it may be unclear whether polysemy or homonymy is cause of the multiple translations of a word. Clements (ibid.) does not mention polysemy or homonymy in his translation as he only provides the reader with a small list of possible translations, leaving it for the reader to determine which phenomenon is present. For this study, this means that each footnote that contains pinyin and mentions alternative translations must be evaluated carefully in order to differentiate polysemy from homonymy, since homonymy is not of interest to this thesis.

The Art of War has many instances where Clements (2012) explains the meanings of a group of words. On the surface these cases seem to exhibit polysemy the same way as those footnotes discussing singular words. For example, in footnote 28 (id. 89) Clements explains that he translated *shi sheng* as 'facing south', while a literal translation would be 'seeing growth'. Two words and their two possible translations. This raises the question of whether or not to include these groups in my analysis. A noticeable difference between single words and groups of words is that Clements (ibid.) does not go into greater detail on the individual meanings of the words in a group and only discusses them as a whole. Another example of this would be in footnote 6, where Clements (id. 50) writes that the term *bai xing* can mean both 'a hundred surnames' or 'the common people'. Clements (ibid.) does not further explain the individual meanings of the words, but he does mention the latter translation to be a poetic expression. This is in contrast with footnote 30, in which Clements (id. 91) writes that "'hundred diseases' here is *bai* ji, 'the hundred sicknesses', with *bai* (100) here is intended in its ancient metaphorical sense of 'too many to count'". In this footnote the meaning of *bai* is

explicitly explained. In this thesis I have adopted the definition of polysemy which specifies it to be a phenomenon concerning a single word. Because of this, after much consideration, I have decided to analyze only those footnotes that go into detail on the meanings of individual words. This is done to keep the focus of this thesis on a clear and simple goal, which is to examine how polysemy is discussed, and thus making it easier to analyze polysemy effectively.

2.2 Categories of Footnotes

The Art of War has a long history of commentaries and interpretations coinciding with it. As Luo and Zhang (2018, 594) note, "paratexts play an essential role in interpreting the original text". Even Clements (2012, 23) mentions some of its various famous commentators in his paratexts, such as Cao Cao and Jia Lin. While Clements' (2012) edition is a translation, it also provides a lot of information through discussions, explanations, and interpretations.

In order to conduct my analysis on footnotes, I will be relying on the categorization of Blight (2005, 11–14) who names three main categories for footnotes: 1. background information, 2. linguistic information, and 3. interpretational information. All these categories can be further subdivided, and some subdivisions are also divided into narrower categories. In addition, I will draw on Toledano-Buendía's (2013) two main functional types translator's footnotes. This is because even though Blight's (2005) categories cover a wide range of topics, he does not address all existing types of footnotes. Clements (2012) uses footnotes to commentate beyond just giving additional information, and accessing his footnotes solely based on Blight's categorization leaves plenty of footnotes without a fitting category. In his second footnote, for example, Clements (id. 44) notes how modern leaders, not just military but any environment, can find the book useful.

According to Toledano-Buendía (2013, 157), there are two main functional types of translator's notes: explanatory and discursive. Explanatory notes "have an explicative and informative function", whereas discursive notes "have a discursive or performative function." (id. 157–158). This means that explanatory footnotes contain information such as background information or additional context, and discursive notes include, for example, the translator's opinions or interpretations of the source text. While Blight's (2005) categories summarize the functions of explanatory footnotes well, he does not discuss discursive notes. Examining Clements' footnotes using both Blight and Toledano-Buendía's categories together makes it possible to form a more precise and comprehensive analysis. These categories will be used to

analyze what information Clements (2012) provides when explaining polysemy, highlighting how much additional information can be given to the reader by simply discussing the possible translations of a word.

It needs to be mentioned that Blight (2005) bases his findings on the New Testament, and some of his category names are contextually tied to it. I have adapted some of these category names for the purpose of better linking them to my analysis. Blight (ibid.) identifies several types of background information, including unknown geographic locations, historical contexts, symbolic actions, and unfamiliar objects or occupations. Together they supply the reader with enough information to understand the context of the text, making it easier to understand. In addition, the category includes different beliefs and several types of references to information contained in another part of the same text. Blight (ibid.) also identifies two types of linguistic information, the meaning or sound of a particular word and explanations of figures of speech or symbols. Blight's (ibid.) final main category, interpretational information, includes textual variants, literal translations, alternative translations and puzzling statements. Based on Toledano-Buendía's (2013) article, Blight's (2005) categories are explanatory in function as they do not consider any discursive elements. It can be assumed that polysemy is only mentioned in within explanatory notes since they discuss linguistic elements. Discursive notes may also contain some relevant information to this study, but assumably this is not the case. This will be discussed further in section 4.

2.3 Translator's Footnotes

Translator's footnotes provide valuable information to the average reader. To a reader with no intimate knowledge of translating, footnotes can make a text seem more dependable. As Blight (2005, 7) mentions, a translation that instead of having footnotes has all the additional information added to the running text, is visibly different in comparison to the original text. According to him (ibid.), this can cause the reader to criticize the translation as being unfaithful to the original text. In regard to *The Art of War's* English translations, this may not always be the case. Since the original text was written with Chinese characters, plenty of the differences in text length can go undetected. There is, of course, a limit to this, as the original text is very short and readers are bound to notice if one phrase with six characters has been translated into two full pages of text.

When the translator uses footnotes, the reader also has the choice of just simply not reading them (Ukušová 2021, 68). Additional information can also be added to the running text, but it

can be disruptive to the reader having to skip parts of the text in order to avoid them. There is always the possibility of not adding any additional information, but this can be ineffective. In cases where the reader has no previous knowledge of the source culture, the text can become uncomprehensible. For example, in Chinese culture red is considered a 'happy color' and used in weddings (Suika 2021, 404). This cultural difference between the Chinese and Western cultures can be easily explained in footnotes, creating the text more coherent to Western readers. In the case of *The Art of War*, its sparseness leaves the translator with the task of explaining the contextual elements that make the reader understand Sun Tzu's meaning. Clements (2012) does this by using footnotes.

For other translators, footnotes can also be tremendously helpful. Clements (2012, 18) mentions how Roger Ames' 1994 translation of the same text, *Art of Warfare,* has many "useful footnotes for other translators". Clements (2012) continuously brings up other famous translators of *The Art of War*: Lionel Giles (1910), Samuel Griffith (1963), Thomas Cleary (1988), Ralph Sawyer (1993) and Andrew Zieger (2010). He introduces them by including an excerpt of the same section from each of their translations of *The Art of War* (id. 15–17). Each translation is noticeably different in terms of form and content. Clements (id. 17) explains that "[e]ach [translation] reflects its author's era and background, and their assumptions about their implied readers". Sometimes he uses other translators' translations as a basis for his own. For example, in footnote 32 (id. 94) Clements notes that he followed Griffith's and some other translators' decisions to move a phrase to another chapter to keep all political discussion in one place. In terms of his own translation, Clements (id. 20) describes his own version as "a gateway text for the contemporary reader". I will consider this claim based on my observations in section 4.

3 Analysis

Jonathan Clements' 2012 translation of *The Art of War* contains hundred and fifty-one pages, but the thirteen chapters only take up ninety pages. That leaves sixty-one pages for Clements' own introduction, mentions of the previous translations and background information on Sun Tzu and the book itself (pages 25–38). After the thirteen chapters are concluded, pages 133–151 continue on with Clements' (2012) own writing. The thirteen chapters contain altogether 48 footnotes, some of which are longer and have more words in them than there is in the body text on that page. For example, the first page (41) of the actual text body has 26 words that are a part of the body text, while the footnote has 102 words. This calculation does not include titles, page numbers and chapter names. Some footnotes even span more than one page. A table containing all footnotes discussing polysemy will be attached at the end of this thesis.

3.1 The Structure of the Analysis

While going through these footnotes, it became apparent that they contained much more information than I previously expected. Many shared characteristics of multiple categories simultaneously or contained several clearly distinct category features within one footnote, even within one sentence. For example, the second footnote contains characteristics of two categories: "[t]he chapter's final passage uses the character *suan* (calculate, plot, count)" (Clements 2012, 44) which is linguistic information, while the next phrase "[i]t refers literally to counting, as officers in a temple chamber would pile up tokens on the floor in reference to the advantages and disadvantages of particular plans" (Clements, 2012, 44) is background information on an unknown symbolic action, which are all explanatory notes. The same footnote continues by discussing how modern readers can use the chapter to their advantage, which is a discursive note. Because of this the footnotes need to be dissected into distinctive and separate constituents with their own assigned categories instead of placing the whole footnote into a single category.

Because of the assumption that polysemy is mainly discussed in explanatory notes, discursive notes will not be central to this thesis, unless proven otherwise. With these changes in mind, a constituent will be treated in the following manner in this thesis: a constituent means a phrase or phrases right before or after one another that are classified the same way within the footnote. It should be assumed that every time a classification of the elements of a footnote is made in this thesis, it is always the constituents that are being discussed, not full sentences or

entire footnotes. This method of division works the best for this study and produces the most conclusive answers, because it shows how often different categories are present and makes them easier to analyze.

3.2 Footnote Analysis

After assessing Clements' (2012, 42–131) footnotes, I found eleven that addressed polysemy following the definitions established above. In all cases there were many constituents belonging in different categories used to explain the instance of polysemy. The most common way of addressing polysemy in the footnotes was first presenting Clements' (2012) own translation in the text, which is alternative translation, and then showing the pinyin version of the word or words being discussed. Then Clements (ibid.) proceeds by providing an explanation for his translation. The most common means were using a literal or more literal translation or adding historical context. In some cases, there was no 'literal' translation or historical background to be given, in which case Clements (ibid.) names multiple alternative translations. As an example of this, in footnote 16 Clements (id. 66) notes he occasionally translated *shi* as 'permutation', while other possible translations include power, force, momentum and tendencies.

Some Chinese characters have their own meanings, and some only have meanings when combined with certain other characters. This causes polysemy, because some characters have varying meanings depending on textual positions. When these characters are translated into the best fitting English words, it causes even more polysemy. This is because the English language boasts a massive lexicon, and it is not a surprise that many classical Chinese words have multiple English equivalents. For example, in footnote 9 Clements (2012, 55) discusses the word *jun*, meaning prince or lord. However, the word has even more alternative translations, such as monarch, ruler and gentleman. It can be argued that most of these alternatives can be synonymously used in many cases and do not need to be clearly distinguished, but that does not mean that polysemy is not present. Because I cannot read classical Chinese and thus examine the same source language edition of *The Art of War* as Clements, it is impossible for me to evaluate polysemy in the original text. This in on itself is not of interest to this research, since this thesis concerns translator's footnotes. What is important, however, is to make the distinction between Clements' (ibid.) mentions of polysemy in Chinese and in English.

Because polysemy within English can mostly be understood as translator's decisions and preferences, polysemy in Chinese is more central to this thesis. Both scenarios warrant for further explanations in order to make the reader understand the full complexity of the original text, but the assumption is that the reader of Clements' (ibid.) text cannot read classical Chinese or is not intimately familiar with Chinese culture. For this reason, explaining polysemy in the original language is more vital to the reader's understanding.

There were two cases of footnotes that exhibited characteristics of polysemy in both Chinese and English. These were footnotes 9 and 29. Both footnotes discussed title names, and how these terms from Sun Tzu's time did not correspond to their modern definitions. The first, footnote 9 (Clements. 2012, 55), as discussed earlier, contains the word *jun* (prince, lord). The second, footnote 29 (id. 90), discusses *di* (sovereign). Both *jun* and *di* are title names for rulers, *di* specifically being used for emperors. Clements (ibid.) uses an unknown historical background constituent to explain, that because at the time of Sun Tzu's life, no ruler on Chinese land could meet the modern requirements to be an actual 'emperor'. This is why Clements (ibid.) opts for using 'sovereign' instead. *Jun*'s translation has similar reasonings. In both cases, the Chinese terms can be used to describe several different (modern) titles and have multiple English translations. Because of this, I consider them as belonging to both Chinese and English cases of polysemy.

Although according to my categorization there were only two cases belonging to both languages' polysemy, it needs to be mentioned that I have based these categories on what Clements (2012) has written on them. It is certain that there exists more polysemy than the reader is made aware of, and Clements (ibid.) cannot possibly name all alternatives to every word. This is to say that my categorization of these cases into the two languages is rough and most likely merely scratches the surface of the truth. More studies on the topic need to be conducted in order to discover the most definite answer. For the purpose of this study, however, a rough framework suffices, and a deeper dive on the subject would be way out of the scope of this thesis.

4 Discussing the Findings

In this section I will discuss some of the difficulties I encountered when analyzing Clements' (2012) footnotes. Then I proceed by evaluating how well Clements was able to use these footnotes to discuss polysemy and familiarize the reader with the source text. Polysemy, of course, does not disappear when it is addressed. What happens during this explanation is that the reader is made aware of the underlying complexities of language, culture, and habits, to name a few key points. If paratexts or footnotes are not used, the reader might still comprehend the text, but they would not be able to access the more intricate knowledge they can provide.

4.1 Detecting and Explaining Polysemy

Finding cases of polysemy proved difficult. There were many situations in which Clements (2012) discussed the different interpretations of the meaning of a word or phrase where the words themselves were not the problem. In these cases, the issue lay in the potential lack of context in the original text and warranted for either explanatory or discursive constituents to explain the translation choices. This, as expressed before, likely stems from the original text's lack of explicitness. Another similar problem appeared with explanations of figures of speech or symbols. As mentioned above, in footnote 6 Clements (2012, 50) writes that he translated *bai xing* as 'the common people', while the literal translation would be 'the hundred surnames'. He (ibid.) then explains by using a linguistic information constituent that 'the hundred surnames' is a common poetic term used for the general population. This is not a case of polysemy, but more like an example of a translation choice. The reason for this lies in the lack of explaining the individual words and their meanings, as discussed in section 2. As explained above, this study will only focus on individual words and their polysemy. Although similar to footnote 6, footnote 22 does contain polysemy. In footnote 22 (id. 81), Clements writes that *yang bei* literally means 'feign north', while he translates it as 'feign retreat'. He (ibid.) then explains that 'north' also means 'back'. I struggled with whether or not to include this footnote in the contains polysemy category because Clements does not explain which of the Chinese words means north. The reader can make assumptions based on the word order or look up the translations of the words (and find out that *bei* is the one meaning both 'north' and 'retreat'), but ultimately the reader assumably cannot for certain know which word means which. Yet, because the multiple meanings of one of the words is made clear, I decided to include it.

Clements often justifies his translation decisions. He (2012, 24) addresses this in his introduction by writing that he has added footnotes to where Sun Tzu's meaning is not apparent or where he has made translation choices that may raise questions. In footnote 12, for example, Clements (id. 60) writes that "[t]his chapter was oddly thick with poetic phrases, including the 'nine earths … and nine heavens (*jiu di jiu tian*)", and then he goes on to explain that he decided to simply translate it as 'depths and heights'. At the same time this is also another case where polysemy is not present, or at least not explicitly mentioned. The footnote simply discusses a figure of speech which can be understood in a number of ways, and why Clements decided to simplify it. As stated before, polysemy only concerns individual words, and not full phrases.

Situations like this made it sometimes difficult to determine whether polysemy was present, especially since Clements (2012) also justified his choices when polysemy actually was present. An example of such a case can be found in footnote 34, where he (id. 101) discusses the word(s) *jian* or *xian*, which mean a 'narrow point', 'mountain pass' or 'point of danger'. Here Clements (ibid.) explains that his translation follows the same assumption as Giles in 1910, which is that Sun Tzu was specifically talking about mountain ridges.

So how does Clements (2012) tackle the issue of polysemy in classical Chinese? As discussed above, he uses a variety of differently categorized constituents to clarify and justify his choices. His method of providing the Chinese term in pinyin, highlighting his own translation, and then explaining his reasoning seemingly succeeded at clarifying each case. After analyzing Clements' (ibid.) footnotes, his claim of his translation being a great introduction to new readers can be seen as true, because he does provide all key information where it is needed.

As discussed above, footnotes have a plethora of qualities that make them useful not only to the translator but also to the reader. In the case of Clements' (2012) translation, footnotes are an essential part of the whole. Although the translation is fully comprehensible without footnotes, there is so much information that would be lost if footnotes were not included in the book. From the examples provided above, it can be seen that Clements (ibid.) had much to add to the main text, especially to explain polysemy, and considering all other possible methods of providing additional information, footnotes are the most fitting way of doing so in the case of this book. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, footnotes can technically be as long and as packed with information as the translator wants. In Clements (ibid.) case,

footnotes varied in length and structure depending on individual cases, and they contained multiple different types of information. For example, when discussing polysemy, Clements (ibid.) added different kinds of information depending on what word he discussed at the time, how its polysemy could be explained, and why he ended up with the resulting translation. Secondly, they distract the reader much less than other methods, unlike in cases where the information is added to the main text body. Much like in the first case, because Clements (ibid.) had so much information to add, having it separated from the main text made it easier to detect that the footnotes were Clements' own additions and not a part of the source text. It also made the text easier to read. This is because instead of containing one long paragraph, all text was separated into sections that made it easier for the reader to take in, and it highlighted which word's polysemy he was discussing. In conclusion, Clements' (ibid.) footnotes are an important part of his translation, and he was able to utilize them effectively throughout his work to discuss polysemy.

4.2 Polysemy and Cultural Identity

Luo and Zhang (2018) investigate how cultural identity can be reconstructed using paratexts. They use the definition of cultural identity by Peoples and Bailey (2011, 23): "[the] cultural tradition a group of people recognize as their own; the shared customs and beliefs that define how a group sees itself as distinctive". Luo and Zhang (2018) use Lionel Giles' translation of *The Art of War* in their study, making it easier to link their findings to this research. Their (id. 608) study found that when translating culturally significant text, paratexts can effectively be used for reconstructing cultural identity. They (id. 595) also note that translation not only involves linguistic activity, but also "the reconstruction of cultural identity". Cases of polysemy in Chinese created opportunities for Clements (2012) to add information about culturally significant factors, such as history, language and customs that reconstruct the Chinese cultural identity. Many of these additions might have never occurred if not for polysemy accidentally revealing potential gaps in the reader's knowledge. Recognizing and diligently translating cases of polysemy are pivotal for the understanding of the text, because if the translator fails to create a functioning and comprehensible ensemble, the reader will not be able to grasp the source text and culture as closely as possible.

5 Conclusion

In this thesis I analyzed Jonathan Clements' 2012 translation of Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* through his footnotes and how they address polysemy. There were several moving parts that required more attention than originally planned, such as correctly identifying the footnotes where polysemy was present.

Clements' (2012) footnotes were numerous and consisted of many constituents belonging to multiple categories. Using Blight (2005) and Toledano-Buendía's (2013) categories, these constituents were analyzed and used for evaluating how cases of polysemy were addressed. Clements (2012) uses forty-eight footnotes altogether, and these footnotes comprised of many more constituents. There were eleven cases discussing polysemy, all of which Clements (id. 24) addresses as he outlines in his introduction: if Sun Tzu's meaning is not apparent, or a translating decision that requires clarification is needed, he explains it in the footnotes.

This study finds that translator's footnotes have much potential that may be underestimated, especially in terms of addressing polysemy in the source language. It is important to keep in mind that each translation is unique, and different source texts require different paratextual solutions. Translators should seriously put thought into how they express additional information and should not shy away from using footnotes if a situation calls for them.

References

Primary Material

Tzu, Sun. 2012. *The Art of War.* Translated and introduced by Jonathan Clements. Constable & Robinson Ltd.

Secondary Material

Blight, Richard. 2005. "Footnotes for Meaningful Translations of the New Testament". *Journal of Translation* 1, no. 1: 7–46. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://doi.org/10.54395/jot-drvp4

Carston, Robyn. 2021. "Polysemy: Pragmatics and sense conventions". *Mind & Language* 36, no. 1: 108–133. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12329

Fang, Jing, Zhongwei Song and Canzhong Wu. 2008. "What may be Hidden behind a Translator's Choices: A Comparative Analysis of two Translations of *The Art of War*". *Systematic Functional Linguistics in Use. Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication* 29: 283–306. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282068632_What_may_be_Hidden_behind_a_Translator's_Choices_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_two_Translations_of_The_Art_of_War#fullTextFileContent

Genette, Gérard. 2017. *Paratext: thresholds on interpretation*. Translated by Janet E. Lewin. Cambridge University Press.

Jiang, Yuan, Mansour Amini, Kam-Fong Lee, Narges Saffari and Latha Ravindran. 2023. "The Use of Polysemy and Footnote in Preserving the Artistic Conception in English Translation of Classical Chinese Poems". *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation* 6, no. 2: 75–101. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2023.6.2.079

Luo, Tian and Meifang Zhang. 2018. "Reconstructing cultural identity via paratexts_ A case study on Lionel Giles' translation of The Art of War". *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* 26, no. 4. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi:2443/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1401650

Matthews, P. H. 2014. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press. Accessed 15 February 2026. http://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199675128.001.0001

Pengie (ed). 2021. *Heaven Official's Blessing.* Volume 1: p. 404. Translated by Suika. Mo Xiang Tong Xiu. Seven Seas Entertainment, LLC.

Peoples, James and Garrick Bailey. 2011. *Humanity: An introduction to cultural anthropology*. 9th ed. Wadsworth Publishing.

Sha, Lei. 2018. "Translating of Military Terms in Sun Tzu's The Art of War". *International Journal of English Linguistics* 8, no. 1: 195–199. Accessed 15 February 2026. http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n1p195

Toledano-Buendía, Carmen. 2013. "Listening to the voice of the translator: A description of translator's notes as paratextual elements". *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 5, no. 2: 194–162. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.105202.2013.a09

Ukušová, Jana. 2021. "Translator's Footnotes as an (In)Effective Translation Strategy". *Translation in Time and Time in Translation* 2, no. Special issue (2021): 51–70. Accessed 15 February 2026. https://www.bridge.ff.ukf.sk/index.php/bridge/article/view/51/46

Appendices

Appendix 1 Footnotes Containing Polysemy

This table contains all footnotes from Clements' (2012) translation of *The Art of War* that contain polysemy. The number of the footnote is indicated on the left side, the entire footnote is in the middle, and the right side has the page number. The words that contain polysemy have been boldened to indicate them as the most relevant for this analysis. No other changes or additions have been made to the footnotes.

Number of Footnote	Footnote	Pp.
2	"The chapter's final passage uses the character ***suan*** (calculate, plot, count) on no more than seven occasions. It refers literally to counting, as officers in a temple chamber would pile up tokes on the floor in reference to the advantages and disadvantages of particular plans. The first chapter of Sun Tzu's book would be familiar to any modern leader, not only in the military arena, but beyond it in management and marketing - any environment where there is ground to be gained and resources to be won. It amounts to a call to assess strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats."	44
9	"Sun Tzu boldly lists the way that management, particularly in the form of a clueless ruler, can interfere with military operations. He uses the term 'prince/lord' (***jun***) because at the time he wrote, China still officially had a figurehead sovereign, and the various separate states were, at least officially, merely dukedoms or princedoms under his central authority. The ruler was known as the 'Son of Heaven', but had a temporal power more akin to that of the Secretary-General of the United Nations than an actual despot. During the Spring and Autumn Period, his power was gradually eroded, and he remained powerless as his dukes fought among themselves, and eventually proclaimed themselves as kings in their own right. One king, the ruler of the westernmost state of Qin, would eventually proclaim himself to be the conqueror of all these kingdoms, choosing for himself the title of First Emperor of China. It is	55–56

	for this reason that I have avoided using the term 'emperor' when referring to the topmost authority in Sun Tzu's time."	
16	"For 'momentum' (***shi***), I have sometimes used the alternative translation of 'permutation'. Other dictionary definitions include 'power, force or tendencies'.	66
18	"A thousand ***li*** may simply be a random superlative, or may relate directly to the same distance in the first chapter. A thousand *li*, we might remember, is 400 miles – Sun Tzu's estimate of the effective range of a normal military force in his era. Here, he reminds his audience that an army need not fight every step of the way, but that it is surely easier to save its strength for the battle that really matters. Far better to appear out of nowhere, perhaps even striking from an allied territory closer to target. It would be in such cases, in particular, that Sun Tzu's army would require its budget 'for the entertainment of consultants and visitors, as mentioned in Chapter Two."	70
22	"For 'feign retreat', the text has *yang* ***bei***, literally 'feign north'. The word in Chinese for 'north' also means 'back' – the back of a correctly positioned house faces north. In this case, troops show their backs, or retreat by running away instead of making a fighting withdrawal."	81
29	"I have translated ***di*** here as 'Sovereign', in the understanding that all rulers of China before the famous First Emperor, be they legendary or honorary, could not, by definition, have been 'emperors', at least as we understand the term in English. The Yellow Sovereign was a legendary ruler of China who taught prehistoric man how to tame animals and grow crops. He supposedly defeated four other demigods: the Red Sovereign of the South, the Blue Sovereign of the East, the Black Sovereign of the North, and the White Sovereign of the West. Although our extant text of Sun Tzu's thirteen chapters rarely gives specific examples, one of the Yinqueshan fragments describe a 'Master Sun' – Sun Tzu or Sun Bin – discussing the Yellow Sovereign's legendary battle with the Red Sovereign. This suggests that a larger text by a 'Master Sun' went into far greater depth about the tactics of the days of legend. (See Ames, 1993, pp. 182–4.)"	90

30	"'hundred diseases' here is *bai ji*, 'the hundred sicknesses', with ***bai*** (100) here intended in its ancient metaphorical sense of 'too many to count'. There is a vestige of this classical high number in the modern Chinese term for a department store: *baihuo dailou*, or 'great building of a hundred commodities'."	91
34	"For 'High' the original text has ***jian*** or ***xian***, meaning a narrow point, mountain pass or point of danger. Sun Tzu could mean an important strategic nexus: a bridging point, crossroads or other key area, but I have followed Giles (1910) in assuming that it refers specifically to mountain ridges."	101
42	"A 'passwords' in this case is actually ***fu***, a tally. In ancient China, emissaries and commanders would each carry half a charm or statuette, allowing for orders to be ratified by checking that the two halves matched."	118
43	"I have struggled with the expression 'coy like a woman'. Other translators have taken it even further, suggesting some sort of maidenly coquette, but the original text reads *ru chu nü* – ''like staying woman'. However, the word ***nü*** has the alternate meaning of 'weak and small' in Classical Chinese. So Sun Tzu either says 'be like a dithering woman', or 'be like a coy woman', or possibly simply 'appear indecisive, weak and small'. The question, then, is whether to translate the apparent sexism of Sun Tzu's phrasing, or to trust that it was the language itself that was sexist, not necessarily Sun Tzu's use of it – he did, after all, once legendarily command an all-girl platoon."	119
46	"Where I have 'common people', the original text has *bai xing*, the 'hundred surnames'. Where I have 'beggars', the original text has ***dai***, 'neglected'."	127