

Translation Quarterly No. 35

目錄 CONTENTS

vi Founding Chief Editor's Note

論文 Articles

1 From Transcription to Innovation: Literary Translation and Language Scepticism in a Century of Cultural Interchange between China and the West *Nigel B. R. Reeves*

25 Reflections on New Dimensions in Translation Studies *Liu Ching-chih*

40 從“傳譯”到“譯傳”
——兼談文學翻譯中的“探驪”與“得珠” 金聖華

69 語言學途徑的語篇轉向和發展 李運興

書評 Book Review

94 Classical Chinese Literature in Translation: New Perspectives on Old Traditions *Wang Mingyue*

100 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors

ISSN 1027855935



9 771027 855003

Translation Quarterly

No. 35 2005

Special Issue I

Selected papers presented at the Second
Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇五年
第三十五期
第二屆清華—
嶺南國際翻譯學
術研討會專號(一)

Translation Quarterly

No. 35 2005

Special Issue I

Selected papers presented at the Second
Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by

The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇五年
第三十五期
第二屆清華—嶺南國際
翻譯學術研討會專號(一)

《翻譯季刊》

二〇〇五年三月 第三十五期

版權所有，未經許可，不得轉載。

Translation Quarterly

No. 35, March 2005

All Rights Reserved

Copyright © 2005 THE HONG KONG TRANSLATION SOCIETY

ISSN 1027-8559-35

Printed by C & C OFFSET PRINTING CO., LTD. 中華商務彩色印刷有限公司承印

翻譯季刊
Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會

The Hong Kong Translation Society

創刊主編 **Founding Chief Editor**

劉靖之 Liu Ching-chih

主編 **Chief Editor**

陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan

本期執行編輯 **Executive Editors of this issue**

朱志瑜 Chu Chi-yu 倪若誠 Robert Neather

潘漢光 Joseph Poon

書評及書話編輯 **Book Reviews and Book News Editors**

倪若誠 Robert Neather 潘漢光 Joseph Poon

編輯委員會 **Editorial Board**

劉靖之 (主席) Liu Ching-chih (Chairman)

黎翠珍 Jane Lai 黃國彬 Laurence Wong

金聖華 Serena Jin 羅志雄 Lo Chi-hong

顧問委員會 **Advisory Board**

鄭仰平 Cheng Yang-ping Mona Baker

高克毅 George Kao Cay Dollerup

賴恬昌 Lai Tim-cheong 葛浩文 Howard Goldblatt

林文月 Lin Wen-yueh Wolfgang Lörcher

羅新璋 Lo Xinzhang 馬悅然 Göran Malmqvist

楊憲益 Yang Xianyi 紐馬克 Peter Newmark

余國藩 Anthony Yu 奈達 Eugene Nida

余光中 Yu Kwang-chung Gideon Toury

編務經理 **Editorial Manager**

李燕美 Samantha Li

Translation Quarterly No. 35, March 2005

Special Issue I: Selected papers presented at the
Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium,

5 - 6 June 2004

目錄 CONTENTS

vi Founding Chief Editor's Note

論文 Articles

- 1 From Transcription to Innovation: Literary Translation and Language Scepticism in a Century of Cultural Interchange between China and the West *Nigel B. R. Reeves*
- 25 Reflections on New Dimensions in Translation Studies *Liu Ching-chih*
- 40 從“傳譯”到“譯傳”
——兼談文學翻譯中的“探驪”與“得珠” 金聖華
- 69 語言學途徑的語篇轉向和發展 李運興

書評 Book Review

- 94 Classical Chinese Literature in Translation: New Perspectives on Old Traditions *Wang Mingyue*
- 100 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors

Founding Chief Editor's Note

2005 marks the 10th anniversary of the *Translation Quarterly*, a journal published by the Hong Kong Translation Society.

The *Translation Quarterly* has encountered numerous challenges and difficulties over the past 10 years. The major one has been the shortage of quality articles, both English and Chinese, which has probably been due to the fact that the distribution of the journal has not been effectively handled. As a result, there has not been a sufficient number of contributions submitted for publication. Another problem is funding: the society has not been able to employ paid staff to discharge the heavy duties of scrutinizing, editing, proofreading and so on; this has inevitably affected the overall quality of the journal and its timely publication.

The Society firmly believes that Hong Kong should be developed into one of the key centres of C-E and E-C translation and translation research. It is equally confident that we have the potential to become one. Being the only professional body of translators and translation scholars in Hong Kong, the Society should take the lead in achieving such a goal.

It is also time for me to hand over my job, as Chief Editor, to a younger, more energetic and more capable person. A decade is considered an insignificant period of time for a journal like the *Translation Quarterly*, but it is a relatively long time-span for a Chief Editor. I am pleased to announce that with effect from issue

no. 35 (2005), Dr. Leo Chan Tak-hung, Vice-President of the Society and Head of the Department of Translation, Lingnan University, will take over as Chief Editor. I will remain on the editorial staff as Founding Chief Editor, ready to render my assistance whenever necessary. The Executive Editors and Book Review/Book News Editors remain unchanged.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who supported and made contributions to the *Translation Quarterly* during the past 10 years, especially my friends abroad, including Peter Newmark, David Hawkes, Lin Wen-yueh, Göran Malmqvist, Nigel Reeves, Gideon Toury, Eugene Nida, George Kao and colleagues at Lingnan University, the University of Hong Kong, the City University of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, and the Baptist University of Hong Kong.

As one of the activities in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the *Translation Quarterly*, I have invited three distinguished translators/translation scholars to write reviews of all the issues of the *Translation Quarterly* published during the past decade. They are Professor Nigel Reeves, a German-English translator and Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Aston University, United Kingdom; Professor Laurence Wong Kwok-pun, Department of Translation, Lingnan University; and Professor John Minford, Acting Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, Open University of Hong Kong. We look forward to receiving their reviews.

I sincerely hope that the *Translation Quarterly* will continue

to make improvements during its second decade.

In this special issue, except for Li Yunxing's article entitled "The Textual Turn and the Future of the Linguistic Approach", the other papers have all been presented at the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium ("New Dimensions in Translation Studies") held in June 2004 at Lingnan University. Similarly, in the other Symposium Issues to be published, at least one non-Symposium article will be included, just to enable the Editors to deal with the backlog of submissions already accepted for publication.

Liu Ching-chih
Founding Chief Editor

February 2005

From Transcription to Innovation: Literary Translation and Language Scepticism in a Century of Cultural Interchange between China and the West *

Nigel B. R. Reeves

Abstract

Translation is an essential support service in international trade, never more so as globalisation gathers pace. Export documentation, contracts, instructions for use, sales and marketing materials are just a few examples. Translations of literary and other cultural products such as film subtitles or dubbing texts occupy a special and complex place in the broader spectrum of international trade. Both literary translations and subtitled or dubbed films are themselves tradeable commodities. But trade in cultural commodities cannot be considered in isolation from their influence on cultural exchange and intercultural stimulus. How do literary translations differ from other export-import goods in their nature and their effect? What is the nature of their new functions in the recipient culture? Reflecting on some case studies in the history of modern translational interchange between China and the West, Waley, Pound and Brecht's reception of Li Bai, Bai Juyi and of other classical Chinese poets, Gao Xingjian's reception of Beckett

and Brecht (and the English translation of his work by Gilbert Fong and Mabel Lee), the paper considers how literary translations can stimulate productive responses in their new cultural homes. Indeed in some cases it asks, where can we draw the line between a translation and a new creation? How have these historical examples promoted diversity and renewal? Looking to the future, can they act as a counter to the standardisation of globalised consumerism? Or, as tradeable commodities, are literary translations contributing to standardisation as some fear?

May I begin by thanking the organisers of this important conference for asking me to address you today. I was privileged to open a previous translators conference here in Hong Kong just two and a half years ago—The FIT Third Asian Translators' Forum of December 2001.

In my paper on that occasion I looked at the effect of globalisation on the translation profession, its impact on trade and the accompanying need for the translation of a range of texts from instruction manuals to legal documents. I argued that the continuing growth in business would lead to a major opportunity for translators and that the entry of China to the WTO together with the rarity in the West of competent translators from Chinese to English would provide East Asian experts in the field with a unique opening. At the same time, however, the revolution in telecommunications that has facilitated globalisation might be a threat in that translation expertise could be sourced anywhere in the world and that texts, once translated, could be dispatched instantaneously.

At the centre of my concern was, then, what we might call the staple diet, the rice bowl, of the commercial translator: international

business documentation.

However, translation is required for more than commerce if peoples and language communities are to interact at deeper levels, the level of cultural exchange or cultural transmission. Culture is, of course, a very broad term and it can apply to almost all the aspects of our social and reflective lives: the outward manifestations—the way we dress, what we eat, how we interact with others in our cultural community from family and colleagues to the leaders at the top of our political and economic structures.

It refers also to our deepest values, the values we acquire as children, of which we become more aware as we mature, values which shape what we think and how we behave. One sphere in which these values are articulated, considered and laid bare for our reflection, is literature. It is not, therefore, chance or purely tradition that literature has occupied such a central position in the academic study practised in schools and at universities of our own native culture and those of foreign peoples and their languages.

Literature in translation has one feature in common with commercial translations—both constitute a part of trade. In the case of literary translations *they are themselves the commodity* in the form of books, whilst the translations to which I drew our attention at the Third Asian Translators' Forum accompany tradeable commodities as *part of the commercial process*.

Commercial document translation differs from literary translation in a key aspect, however. The commercial or legal text to be translated is—or should be—unambiguous. Clarity of meaning and reference are essential. There cannot be different ways of interpreting the description of how the braking system on a car functions or how an appliance should be connected safely to the electric power supply! Ambiguity in a contract may not kill the user but it could result in bankruptcy. But ambiguity

may be the very stuff of literature!

Literature, of whatever genre, whether narrative, drama, or poetry, offers interpretations of outer and inner reality as grasped by the author. The objective world is presented through the subjective filter of the author's understanding, while the subjective reality of the author may be presented to the reader as if objective. Moreover, the author's feelings (the affective filter if you like) and the author's analysis (the logical filter) can only be expressed in *language*. Furthermore, the shaping and structuring of the text is central to any aesthetic creation, so authors work within (or in some cases try to react against) the traditional or current aesthetic or genre conventions of their culture and of their time. The reader then responds to that linguistic and textual structure, the literary work, in the light of their own culturally and personally coloured judgements. Indeed there are those in the post-modernist school who appear to deny an objective reality to a literary work, arguing that it only exists in so far as it is perceived and understood by another, the reader. Let it suffice to say that the *translation* of literary texts is, therefore, a very different task from translating instructions for the use of a mobile telephone. For the translator not only comes to the foreign literary text from the perspective of a different linguistic and literary tradition but has necessarily to interpret the text both as a member of a different culture and in accordance with their linguistic and personal understanding, before re-creating it in the new language. The final stage of interpretation is, of course, reached when the re-creation is read and received by the new readership.

It has been observed by Venuti, for example, that to be accepted in their new cultural homes, literary translations regularly have, almost like wild animals, to be "domesticated", transmitted in such a way that they are acceptable linguistically and also acceptable in the way their message or sense is conveyed (a standpoint from which he distances himself).^[1]

Notwithstanding this complex and challenging process, literature

is and has been a major source of the most profound cultural interchange. Translations from foreign literatures can stimulate and revive their new home cultures.

I would now like to take some examples of literary interchange between China and the Western world in the last century to illustrate these very general and, I apologise, rather abstract opening remarks. In so doing I wish to place literary translation within a suggested spectrum of cultural transmission from transcription of a work by a scholarly informant, through translation as a literary re-creation in the target language, translation that has become through re-versioning or adaptation of the original a new creation and finally moving beyond translation to a new, innovative work that has been inspired by the author's knowledge and response to a source language text or texts.

My first example considers the impact of classical Chinese poetry in translation on some major poets of the English-speaking world in the early decades of the twentieth century.

An initial impetus to this influence was given by H. A. Giles' influential publication, *A History of Chinese Literature*, published in 1901. A little poem which he translated by way of illustration was the lament of the Han Emperor Wu-Ti for his dead concubine.

Giles' translation reads:

Gone

The sound of rustling silk is stilled,
With dust the marble courtyard filled,
No footfalls echo on the floor,
Fallen leaves in heaps block up the door ...
For she, my pride, my lovely one is lost,
And I am left, in hopeless anguish tossed.

(quoted Graham^[2], p. 34)

A translation of this brief lament was later also included in the other major source of mediation between Chinese classical poetry and English-speaking (and European) poets early in the twentieth century, Arthur Waley's anthology, *One Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems*. First published in 1918 by Constable and Co it was reprinted no fewer than ten times between 1919 and 1947, followed by two reprints since then.^[3] Waley, who also translated the great Japanese narrative, *The Tale of Genji*, was self-taught, having scrambled into a post in the Oriental Section of the British Museum, where he was charged with cataloguing books in the Chinese and Japanese languages (Waley, pp. 4f). Waley's translation of Emperor Wu-Ti's poem is entitled Li Fu-Jen:

Li Fu-Jen

The sound of her silk skirt has stopped
On the marble pavement dust grows.
Her empty room is cold and still.
Fallen leaves are piled against the doors.
Longing for that lovely lady
How can I bring my aching heart to rest?

(Arthur Waley, p. 31)

Perhaps the most celebrated *poet* to be fascinated by the Emperor's poem was the American, Ezra Pound. Pound, like Waley, in all probability, had found the poem in Giles' translation in his *History of Chinese Literature*. Pound's version of the poem from his collection *Lustra* of 1916 reads:

Liu Ch'e

The rustling of the silk is discontinued,
Dust drifts over the courtyard,
There's no sound of foot falls, and the leaves

Scurry into heaps and lie still,
And she the rejoicer of the heart is beneath them:
A wet leaf that clings to the threshold.^[4]

What is it that attracted Waley, the Bloomsbury Circle translator, and the American poet, Ezra Pound to the poem? Common to both for the English ear is the understatement, the unadorned juxtaposition of visual and sound images, the sequence of moments without commentary, concluded by the mournful reflection that is the stimulus for the poem. Waley's rendering is more static: the verbs "topped", "are piled" and the phrase "is cold and still" are less evocative and do not possess the dynamism of Pound's "drifts", "scurry into". "Rustling of silk" contrasts with the rather empty "sound of her silk skirt". Pound has stripped Giles' text of rhyme and the plainly Victorian, even Byronic, sentimentality of the last two lines. Pound's most obvious creative addition is his last line "A wet leaf that clings to the threshold", a new image of motion—the leaf being blown in the wind—but held in stasis by its wetness, retaining indirectly Wu Ti's—and Giles'—reference to the door where the autumn leaves have gathered.

In Pound's poem we move along the spectrum from "close" or "semantic" translation, to use Peter Newmark's term,^[5] beyond re-creation in the new language towards a new creation through re-versioning.

The common interest of both Waley and Pound lay in the spare, unembroidered text, the concentration on image and the expression of emotion without sentimentality, reactions against the excesses of some over-blown nineteenth century poetry, including Byron and his Victorian inheritance. And indeed the literary movement to which we can assign Waley and Pound directly at this time was "Imagism", the movement's first anthology *Des Imagistes* already appearing in 1914, edited by Pound.

It was Waley who expounded most clearly why he and after him so

many readers were drawn to classical Chinese poetry, transmitted by his own anthology: The Bloomsbury Circle arts workshops ("The Omega Workshops")^[6] of which Waley was member alongside the novelist Virginia Woolf, her husband Leonard, her sister, the painter, Vanessa Bell, the art critic and curator Roger Fry, and the painter Duncan Grant, among others.

I think one of the reasons that it remained in fairly heavy demand for forty years is that it appeals to people who do not ordinarily read poetry. When in 1940 I was working in a Government Office a number of young girl typists and clerks brought me copies of the *Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems* to sign. Several of them said they did not ordinarily read poetry and had, before coming across my book, always supposed that it was something "special and difficult". The reason they got on all right with Chinese poetry was, I think, that it mainly deals with the concrete and particular, with things one can touch and see—a beautiful tree or a lovely person—and not with abstract conceptions such as Beauty and Love. The English upper class, on the other hand, brought up at the universities in a tradition inspired largely by Plato, has reconciled itself to abstractions and even to the belief that the general is, in some mysterious way, truer and nobler than the particular. But ordinary people in England have very little use for abstractions and when poetry, under the influence of higher education, becomes abstract it bores them.

(Waley, p. 7)

It is perhaps, therefore, not so surprising to find that Amy Lowell, a contemporaneous poet and contributor to *Des Imagistes* and one of the most active proponents of the movement, also wrote a version of Han Wu-Ti's poem, for which she relied on a character-by-character explication of the Chinese by Florence Ayscough in a process not unlike that followed

by the first generation of Chinese translators of Buddhist scriptures centuries before,^[7] examples of how the very first stage in cross-language literary exchange, transcription, can lead beyond a translation as re-creation of the work in the new language into what is a new version, bordering on a new creation:

To the air: "The Fallen Leaves and the Plaintive Cicada"

There is no rustle of silken sleeves,
Dust gathers in the Jade Courtyard.
The empty houses are cold, still, without sound.
The leaves fall and lie upon the bars of doorway after doorway.
I long for the Most Beautiful One; how can I attain my desire?
Pain bursts my heart. There is no peace.

(Amy Lowell, quoted Graham, p. 35)

Significantly, it was probably the very nature of Chinese syntax as represented in Chinese classical poetry with its use of juxtaposition in contrast to the Indo-European clausal articulation of English and, arguably, the consequent emphasis in the Chinese on image that attracted Waley, Pound and Lowell: therefore this could only be transmitted through retaining visual and auditory simplicity in the translations.

However, it was at precisely this time, the turn of the century, that a much wider concern was being expressed as to the very capacity of language to represent reality, to capture its sheer complexity, perceived both as externality and experienced inwardly through memory, imagination and reflection. In Germany and Austria this crisis came early: Hugo von Hofmannsthal's seminal "Chandos Letter" ("Ein Brief"—1902) encapsulates in a fictional framework scepticism that language is an adequate instrument to grasp reality or express feeling, "crumbling" as the notional author of the letter, based on Lord Chandos, tries to use

it.^[8] This scepticism may be traced through to Wittgenstein, the Austrian philosopher whose major works were written in the inter-war years in Cambridge and who worked in close association with Bertrand Russell.^[9] But while the Imagists sought reassurance in concrete images, as opposed to abstractions, and the reduction of linguistic expressiveness to a concentration on the unsaid contained within the image, and Wittgenstein sought philosophical clarity in the minimalist language of logical proposition, thus accepting the *limitations* of language, others were to try and push the expressiveness of language beyond its traditional boundaries.

One remarkable example of this attempt was a novel by one of the members of the Bloomsbury Circle with which Waley was associated.

Published in 1931 Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*^[10] traces (with the emphasis on "traces" rather than "records" or "documents") the interweaving lives of six people, who first meet as children, as they move through life to their ends. The theme underlying the novel is *time*, transitoriness as opposed to an unobtainable permanence, and the reflections of the six as they speak to one another at intervals over years are a philosophical patchwork, interspersed by passages of highly evocative lyrical prose picturing a seascape, the waves of the ocean from dawn to night, surging, receding, reflecting the changing light of day, never fixed, and concomitantly the passage of the protagonists from the dawn of their day as childhood friends through to its night, death.

One of the six, Bernard, who seeks himself to be an author, says of the group:

And we ourselves, walking six abreast, what do we oppose, with this random flicker of light in us that we call brain and feeling, how can we do battle against this flood; what has permanence? Our lives too stream away, down the unlighted avenues, past the strip of time; unidentified.

(*The Waves*, p. 198)

Towards the close Bernard has a vision of his self, detached from him, so that he becomes invisible. But the person with no self has no language:

But how to describe the world without a self? There are no words. Blue, red—even they distract, even they distract, even they hide (with thickness instead of letting the light through). How to describe or say anything in articulate words again? ...

(*The Waves*, p. 247)

At the close, the book in which Bernard had futilely attempted to record all these memories and thoughts drops and disappears, like a discarded train ticket, beneath a restaurant table at which he is sitting.

Death seems to be coming. He challenges Death in the last lines of the novel. "Death to the enemy. It is death against whom I ride with my spear couched and my hair flying ..."

(*The Waves*, p. 256)

The very last line returns to the ocean: "*The waves broke on the shore.*"

I shall have reason to come back to three areas mentioned here: they are firstly the adequacy of language to capture ever changing reality: "Words and words and words, how they gallop—how they lash their long manes and tails, but for some fault in me I cannot give myself to their backs."

(*The Waves*, said by Neville, one of Bernard's friends, p. 70)

Secondly: an individual or narrator's sense of being detached from him/herself, separated within.

Thirdly: a fragmented narrative structure, here given direction by

the inexorable march of time reflected in Nature a seascape, and culminating in the death or prospect of death of the central figure.

In 1938 there appeared in France another novel that was to shape the feelings of a generation or more, Jean-Paul Sartre's story also of a would-be writer, Roquentin, who wishes to write a biography of the fugitive assassin and nobleman Rollebon, who survived the French Revolution. [11]

Rollebon travels the world, returns to marry an 18-year old at the age of seventy and is finally accused of treason and imprisoned where he dies. But Roquentin fails, like Bernard, to complete the work, leaving behind his own diaries instead. In these diary entries he records his sense of detachment from reality, from the world of objects around him, becoming, in its Otherness, literally sickening, as the title of the novel implies: *Nausea*, *La Nausée*. The single word that Roquentin finds to describe this overwhelming external world is "Absurdity" (*La Nausée*, p. 182):

Absurdity: yet another word; I struggle against words; over there I touched a thing.

The thing, the things he touched, were physical reality. Looking at a tree's roots he says: "The root ... existed only in so far as I could not explain it. Knotty, inert, without a name, it fascinated me, filled my eyes, brought me back over and over again to its own existence." (*La Nausée*, p. 183. Translation mine)

In this work we have moved a stage further towards scepticism, non-belief not only in the adequacy of language to connect and provide understanding of reality, but scepticism towards reality itself, for the world of things is without any meaning, hence absurd. Thus images and the feelings images may represent, which had provided the Imagists with

an anchor, a world that words could capture through discursive reduction, have now assumed a quality of impenetrability, irrationality or non-rationality that defies language. Roquentin fails to write his book. We are left with his fictive reflections in the diaries.

The scepticism that seized these two key European writers, Woolf and Sartre, in the first part of the last century is paradoxical because both *use* language to display doubts about the adequacy of language. These observations lead us to the characteristic features of a philosophical movement that dominated Europe in the years leading up to and following the Second World War, Existentialism, of which Sartre was a central proponent. The first is, then, the use of language, not only in philosophical texts, but more influentially in literature, to throw doubt on the power of language to enable human beings to understand, rationalise or even cope with an ominous, often threatening reality. A consequent second feature is the Existentialists' doubts as to the existence of any Higher Being, any Divinity or Supreme Meaning to which we, trapped in Time and armed only with feeble words, could gain access—even if the Higher Being did exist. This is the situation that Sartre termed "Absurdity". What is absurd has no logical sense, is contradictory, contrary to what we call sense. The Absurd is also laughable or even funny in its flaunting of logic. So it is perhaps not surprising that alongside the novels of Sartre and of Camus (for France was the heartland of the movement) we find comedy, or at least drama that does not follow any previously established genre, not tragedy, nor comedy in the sense that we can laugh at the rather sad characters depicted on the stage but plays presenting on the stage people who are absurd in the futility of what they do. I am thinking of the drama of Samuel Beckett, an Irish Professor of French who wrote in both English and French, of Ionesco in France, of Harold Pinter in England. Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* of 1955 shook us and shocked us when first played in England. (I saw it in London when I was

sixteen.) *Endgame* (1957) seemed still more pessimistic. Pinter could be funnier—*The Dumb Waiter* (1960) for example. But there always lurked menace, the threat of violence behind the everyday banality of dialogue that dislocated communication rather than connected, as in Pinter's *The Caretaker* (1960).

It was with this literary world and sceptical tradition that the recent Nobel Prize winner Gao Xingjian became familiar as a student in the Beijing Foreign Studies University. To conclude my consideration of Chinese Western literary interchange I turn to a consideration of the novel that was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature, *Lingshan*, or in the English of Mabel Lee's translation, *Soul Mountain*.^[12] In a longer exposition one could consider others of his narratives and naturally, his plays. But here I shall concentrate on this complex novel that was first published in Chinese in 1990 and appeared in English in 2000. In this work we move to a final stage in the spectrum of Chinese-Western literary interchange, beyond transcription, beyond translation as re-creation and translation as adaptation and effective new creation, to the point where foreign literary works read by the author in the original language act as inspiration for a new work.

Lingshan is the story of a journey, a journey up the Yangtze River into the mountains of South-West China close to Tibet and back to Shanghai, yet ending with a seeming return to the snow wastes of a mountain. The narrator, an author, had been diagnosed with cancer and it is from under the threat of this, as it happens, false diagnosis, that he decides to re-join life, fleeing less from death, now that its imminence seemed lifted, than from the separation from life that writing had drawn him into.

I had gone against real life because I was simply stringing together life's manifestations, so of course I wasn't able to accurately portray life and

in the end only succeeded in distorting reality.

(*Soul Mountain*, p. 12)

But his purpose is not simply to experience "life", to encounter people as he finds them, to wander in ever more remote parts of China. He is on a conscious search for the origins of his culture, earlier forms recorded in what folk-songs are still extant and sung, peoples and individuals who still adhere to earlier customs—religious figures and religious orders that still practise Daoism and Buddhism and remember the ancient narratives explaining the principles on which human existence was founded. Yet even as he searches for the Soul of his country in this sense of its earlier and most ancient beliefs and insights he is in search of his own soul. But it is not only his soul that he seeks. He tries to confirm his continuing earthly existence (if not to fulfil it) in a series of curiously disembodied yet passionate sexual encounters and dialogues with women—in their number almost a sequential and at times supernatural encounter with the Feminine, the Female Principle, he and they together manifesting the eternal Yin and Yang of human existence.

Setting out from under the threat of personal Death through lung cancer, he repeatedly encounters death and suicide, suicide particularly of young women who have been persecuted by society or mishandled by men. These are examples of brutality, an aspect of human behaviour that runs through the novel as a *leitmotif*. Moreover, the narrator keeps moving on his journey to the very edge of existence—in the mountains, in primeval forest, in severe weather, in what he calls towards the end of the novel "deathly loneliness". Experiencing people like forest rangers charged with guarding the Giant Panda from extinction, recluses remaining from vanished monasteries who can still sing their incantations, encountering women who are wanderers and social outsiders, hearing tales of bandits, pitiless and beyond the rule of law, he is exposed directly

and indirectly to death at every turn.

In its first-person reflections and description the novel might be described as a vast monologue but the narrator, the "I" also creates other selves, a "you":

You know that I am just talking to myself to alleviate my loneliness.
You know that this loneliness is incurable, that no one can save me and
that I can only talk with myself as the partner of my conversation.

(*Soul Mountain*, p. 312)

Yet we also learn that "you" may have created "she" of whom there appear to be several. Indeed in his description of the emergence of self from the primeval collective consciousness of the first woman, Nüwa, who bestowed the first man, Fuxi, with his life and his intelligence (p. 307), we learn:

At that time the individual did not exist. There was not an awareness of
fearing oneself, knowledge of the self came from another, was affirmed
by possessing and being possessed, and by conquering and being
conquered.

If an absence of self-awareness characterised the early stages of human experience as reflected in this Chinese myth, the novel appears to be expressing an advanced stage in civilisation where the narrator himself has lost a sense of single individuality and through reflection and writing on that reflection is creating further selves. This self-reflection reaches a climax in one of the final chapters (chapter 72, pp. 452-455) when the narrator encounters a hostile critic who accuses him of nihilism, of believing in nothing. The narrator, now "he", replies:

He says he actually has no ideology but does have a small amount of nihilism in him, however, nihilism isn't the equivalent of absolute nothingness. It's just like in the book where you is the reflection of I and he is the back of you, the shadow of a shadow. Although there's no face it still counts as a pronoun. (p. 454)

It is as if language, through its availability of pronouns signifying different persons and perspectives, is able to go beyond the limitations of reality. Roquentin, Sartre's fictive author in *La Nausée*, is overwhelmed and sickened by the Otherness and the material substantiality of the physical world outside the self. The famous passage when Roquentin stares at the root of a tree in its alien Otherness seems almost to be echoed in the passage in *Soul Mountain* (chapter 65) where the narrator photographs the skeleton of an ancient tree that seems to menace him like a "malevolent demon". It is less its Otherness that threatens than its frightening affinity to "the dark aspect in the depths of my soul" (p. 413).

While Roquentin's biography of Rollebon is never completed, Sartre is able, through the fiction of the diaries, to use language to depict, if not explain, the predicament of the individual who finds himself mentally blocked by the disparity between self and world. Gao tries to overcome the dissolution of self *through* language, conducting an inner dialogue and reflecting upon himself through the distancing effect of addressing a second person and looking at himself as a third person. His conversations with a woman—or women—sometimes take the form of a conventional dialogue or, perhaps better, a dialectic alternating between words spoken by the narrator (or "I") and words spoken by her (= "she"!). Perhaps, unsurprisingly, what the women he encounters seem to have in common—and in common with himself—is their loneliness.

So while Gao as narrator succeeds in exploiting the possibilities of

language to capture the dissolution, or perhaps better, the duplication of self as interlocutor and as the self observed, he also longs for a language that could reach deeper into the human soul. This is how I understand the ostensible purpose of the journey, the search for ancient folk songs which he hears and records in a scene of encounters: with the Yi singer and Yi priest who still use their ancient language (pp. 117-119), with the aged former Daoist priest (pp. 290-299), and in the songs of the old Master of Sacrifice (pp. 237-242).

It is as if these ancient songs are a constituent part of the Soul that he seeks in his journey to the Soul Mountain, a constituent part expressed in language.

Closely related to this element of his search is the search for his own past, fed by his memories—memories of the house of his childhood (pp. 210ff, p. 325), which he tries to revive by the visit to the old people's home where he believes, and indeed he finds confirmed, that his aunt died (pp. 322-324). But memories bring with them difficulties of the same kind encountered by Virginia Woolf's Bernard in *The Waves*: Language seems inadequate to contain these memories, yet it is only in memories that you find self-identity in the vastness of humanity:

Although you were born in the city, grew up in cities and spent the larger part of your life in some huge urban metropolis, you can't make that huge urban metropolis the home town of your heart. Perhaps because it is so huge that within it at most you can only find in a particular corner, in a particular room, in a particular instant, some memories which belong purely to yourself, and it is only in such memories that you can preserve yourself fully. In the end in this vast ocean of humanity you are at most only a spoonful of green sea water, insignificant and fragile.

You should know that there is little you can seek in this world, that there

is no need for you to be so greedy, in the end all you can achieve are memories, hazy, intangible, dreamlike memories, which are impossible to articulate. When you try to relate them, there are only sentences, the dregs left from the filter of linguistic structures. (p. 329)

But sentences are all there are:

You create out of nothingness, playing with words like a child playing with blocks. But blocks can only construct fixed patterns, the possibilities of structures are inherent in the blocks and no matter how they are moved you will not be able to make anything new. (p. 351)

And he reflects on how he might find a language that can transcend the limits of its own syntax and grammar and give expression to what then becomes a list of almost the whole gamut of human emotions (pp. 351f). Interestingly he says that this language should not "distinguish between subject and object" and should "transcend pronouns", the very part of speech he uses in such a masterly fashion to reflect the fluid line between subject and object. And it is in this concern with overcoming the gap between subject and object that we find the affinity between the narrator's thinking, the curious dissolution yet duplication of self and the Daoist and Buddhist philosophies that he encounters as a *leitmotif* in the novels. Staying at the Daoist Palace of Supreme Purity he learns of the Daoist doctrine of mutual respect for subject and object which achieves oneness. The old Head Daoist states:

For Daoists, purity is the principle, non-action the essence and spontaneity the application; it is a life of truth and a life requiring absence of self. (p. 403)

Daoist mysticism as depicted here bears some resemblance to the Buddhist ideal of achieving an absence of emotions, evoked by the steady beat of drums, bells and chanting (pp. 439-443), which the narrator also encounters.

Thus there is a counterpoint between the disappearance or conquest of self that characterises two of the ancient religions of China that the narrator encounters in his exploration of and search for "Soul", and his own personal experience of a duplication of self—or even a multiplicity of selves that regressive reflection induces in him at one point (p. 151). The Daoist has overcome the quest for goals. He learns from one Master whom he encounters (p. 277): "it is the absence of goals which creates the ultimate traveller", and indeed the narrator confirms this from a more practical point of view as he travels along: "life itself is without goals, and is simply travelling along like this" (p. 342).

This is the meeting-point, then, between the narrator's own quest for Soul as self-discovery and discovery of Soul in the ancient philosophies of China, the Han myths of human origins, and the mysticism and dissolution of self in Daoism and Buddhism. It is also the meeting-point between ancient Eastern mysticism and twentieth-century Western scepticism that Gao must have first encountered in his university studies, a scepticism with regard to human access to any Higher or Ultimate Meaning in the writings of Existentialism, which I have encapsulated in reference to Sartre's *La Nausée*, scepticism towards the capacity of language to seize the complexity of a reality that defies the necessary structures on which language depends to create meaning, seminally expressed in Woolf's masterpiece, *The Waves*. In Western thinking profound doubts about the meaning of life, which accompanied and followed the two devastating World Wars that ravaged Europe in the first half of the century, led to a deep pessimism mitigated, however, by the ability of writers to formulate that pessimism in fictional narrative—

and in the case of Beckett, like Gao a student of French philosophy and literature, to give visual reality in drama. This ability flies in the face of a scepticism towards the inherent capacity of language to penetrate or to represent reality, a scepticism foreshadowed prior to the First World War by Hofmannsthal and which, in my opening example, the Imagists, inspired by their encounter through translation with classical Chinese poets of a thousand years before, sought to avoid by a concentration on simple language focussed on the singular manifestations of life in images.

Gao's familiarity with the debates that exercised Virginia Woolf (who, incidentally, like some of the female characters in *Soul Mountain* committed suicide by drowning), the French Existentialists and the dramatists of the Absurd who followed them in the late 1950s and 1960s, seems to have been a source of inspiration for this novel. In the self-reflective chapter devoted to the confrontation with a critic, the narrator is accused of a defective imitation of Western Modernism:

You've slapped together travel notes, moralistic ramblings feeling, notes, jottings, untheoretical discussions, unfable-like fables, copied out some folk-songs, added some legend-like nonsense of your own invention, and are calling it fiction. (p. 453)

Defiantly—and almost jokingly—the narrator retorts that if it's not a successful imitation of Western Modernism it must be Eastern.

I have attempted to indicate how the quest in the Eastern mystical religions that are presented in this novel, Daoism and Buddhism, for an overcoming of the distinction between self and others, between self and the world, can be related to the anxieties of sceptical Western philosophies of the early and mid-twentieth century concerning the divorce between self and reality and the capacity of language to penetrate and hold fast that reality in its fluidity. These are two central, organic

links with Gao's search for Soul, the meeting of East and West. The last link is also my third theme; the experimental use of language and textual structure. In the novel's apparent structurelessness, held together only by the narrator's journey, and in the accompanying self-conscious reflections, syntax and textual coherence are pushed to their limits. Gao has absorbed the European modernist tradition and gone beyond it. It is for this reason that I chose *Soul Mountain* as my final example of the spectrum of literary and cultural interchange through translation, a spectrum that begins with the transcription of a work, and moves on through translation as re-creation in a new language to translations that have become new creations. At the end of the spectrum we have an example of how one author's intimate knowledge of a foreign culture's writings can inspire, beyond translation, an innovative work within a second, receiving culture.

Let me close by asking a question that follows logically from my own argument. Where does Mabel Lee's masterly translation itself belong in this spectrum of literary interchange between China and the West? It is a question that is particularly pertinent to ask here in Hong Kong, the commercial meeting-point between East and West, and increasingly, as this Conference demonstrates, a cultural meeting-point. Certainly her translation is a re-creation of *Lingshan* in English. But could this translation of Gao Xingjian's Nobel Prize-Winning novel in turn spur new creations in Western literature? I leave that as an open question.

* A keynote speech delivered at the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium at Lingnan University on 5 June 2004.

Notes

[1] See Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*

(London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

[2] *Poems of the Late T'ang*, translated and introduced by A. C. Graham (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965/1977).

[3] *One Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems*, translated by Arthur Waley (London: Constable, 1918). Page references in the text are for third edition, 1986.

[4] Ezra Pound, *Selected Poems* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), p. 112.

[5] See Peter Newmark, *Approaches to Translation* (Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, 1988), pp. 22-23, 38-69.

[6] See Richard Shone, *The Art of Bloomsbury: Roger Fry, Vanessa Bell and Duncan Grant* (London: Tate Gallery, 1999), pp. 14-16.

[7] André Lefevere, "Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation", in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, *Constructing Culture: Essays on Literary Translation* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998), p. 21.

[8] "The abstract works which the tongue naturally has to use to express any judgement, crumbled in my mouth like rotten mushrooms." *Hofmansthal, Selected Essays*, edited by Mary E. Gilbert (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), p. 109. (Translation mine)

[9] Ludwig Wittgenstein's seminal work *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* was published in 1921, the English edition with a foreword by Bertrand Russell, his mentor in Cambridge, in 1922.

[10] Virginia Woolf, *The Waves*, edition used here, Harmondsworth: Penguin new edition 1964.

[11] Jean-Paul Sartre, *La Nausée*, edition used here, Paris: Gallimard (1938) 1959.

[12] Gao Xingjian, *Soul Mountain*, translated from the Chinese by Mabel Lee (London: Flamingo, 2001). All further references in the text are to this edition.

About the Author

Professor Nigel B. R. Reeves, OBE, is Pro-Vice-Chancellor for External Relations at Aston University, where he has been Professor of German since 1990, having previously held the Chair of German at Surrey University since 1975. A former Chairman of Council and Vice-President of the Institute of Linguists, he has published extensively on German literature, on foreign language education and the role of languages in overseas trade, and on translating—ranging from terminology work to translation of literature. His own best known translation was with Dr. David Luke and is the Penguin Classics edition of Heinrich von Kleist's *The Marquise of O and Other Stories*, which has been in continuous print since 1978. He is currently working on a comparative study of Brecht's and Waley's translations of poems by Bai Juyi and some other poets in Waley's anthology *One Hundred and Seventy Poems*.

Reflections on New Dimensions in Translation Studies *

Liu Ching-chih

Abstract

Many of the papers presented at this Symposium deal with English-Chinese translation, focusing on specific micro-technical issues. At the present stage of development, translation scholars are only beginning to experiment with a micro-philosophical approach with regard to English-Chinese translation, trying to work out a theoretical framework for academic discourse on the subject.

The theme of this symposium – “New Dimensions in Translation Studies” – compels us to conduct a comparative study, defining “old dimensions” against new ones. In order to simplify the discussion, I shall take xin-da-ya as representative of the old paradigm, while various dichotomous modes of thinking will represent the new – these include domestication vs. foreignisation, formal vs. dynamic/functional equivalence, semantic vs. communicative translation, translator visibility vs. invisibility, and the idea of cross-cultural translation. The old concepts of xin-da-ya lasted for a century, surviving well into the early 1990s, while the new dichotomies only began to be discussed in the past couple of decades. In fact, xin-da-ya were the standards set down by Yan Fu mainly for translators of literature and

the social sciences, whereas the new modes of thinking have developed in connection with translation work involving languages other than English and Chinese. Furthermore, the "new modes" have made much use of insights in linguistics and cultural studies.

Apart from seeking to re-interpret xin-da-ya, we need to go one step further to explore new horizons, aiming to find a direction for developing our own brand of translation studies. During the past 10 years, many of our translation scholars have conducted research on the various Western schools of translation theory – including the so-called philological, hermeneutic, linguistic, skopos, cultural and deconstructionist schools. It is high time that we studied in greater depth the translations of our masters such as Yan Fu, Lin Shu, Lin Yutang, Fu Lei, Zhu Shenghao, Liang Shiqiu, Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang, David Hawkes, etc., with a view to understanding how these masters opened up the field of "translation theory" through their own translations. Furthermore, comparative studies of the masters' translations, such those of Shakespeare's plays by Zhu Shenghao and Liang Shiqiu, Honglou Meng by David Hawkes and Yang Xiangyi/Gladys Yang, Jean Christophe by Fu Lei and Xu Yuanchong, etc., will eventually help lay a foundation for formulating our own theoretical framework in translation studies. However, before we embark on comparative studies, we need to first strengthen our translation criticism, since it is the bridge between translation practice and translation studies.

Over the past two decades, we have witnessed in China an increasing trend in deploying Western translation theories, and this has been extensively regarded as a fashionable course of development for translation studies. This is reflected in the theme of the first Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium, held two years ago, which was entitled: "Translation and Interdisciplinary Studies".^[1] The theme of this second conference, "New Dimensions in Translation Studies",^[2] further indicates this force behind translation studies in China and Hong Kong.

In this symposium quite a number of papers pertain to translators and translation development in China during the past century. The old concepts of *xin-da-ya* 信達雅, which have survived more than one century and developed well into the early 1990s, are the standards set by Yan Fu 嚴復 mainly for the translation of literature and the social sciences; by contrast, the new modes of thinking, as mainly represented by the various dichotomous pairs (such as domestication *vs.* foreignisation, formal *vs.* dynamic/functional equivalence, semantic *vs.* communicative translation, visibility *vs.* invisibility) and by the idea of cross-cultural translation, have largely derived from translations involving pairs of languages other than English and Chinese, and have made much use of the insights in linguistics and cultural studies. If we take *xin-da-ya* as representative of an old paradigm, then the various dichotomous modes of thinking represent the new dimensions of translation studies. At the present stage of development, adopting the perspectives of the latter, translation scholars in China and Hong Kong are only beginning to experiment with a micro-philosophical approach with regard to translation between English and Chinese, trying to work out a theoretical framework for the academic discourse on the subject. Is this a correct path which will bear fruit in the years to come? Before we search for an answer, let us examine some characteristics of translation and translators in China over the past century.

A Utilitarian Approach

I will start with Yan Fu, a thinker in the late Qing and early Republican period when China was experiencing much humiliation in dealing with the Western powers and Japan. Translation for Yan Fu and other translators during this period was a means of rescuing China from becoming a colony of the Western powers and Japan (*fu guo qiang bing* 富國強兵) and, therefore, translation in China at that time was not primarily meant for cultural exchange. It was one of the reasons why China did not have an Occidentalist type of scholar-translator comparable to Sinologists in the West, who regard themselves as “cultural ambassadors” with an in-depth knowledge of Chinese history and culture. China was too poor to be able to afford Occidentalism and Occidentalists in the first half of the twentieth century. This historical background of a *fu guo qiang bing* utilitarian approach had a direct bearing on translation studies, i.e. it was one of the factors which delayed the progress of translation studies in China.

The translation of Marxist-Leninist works after the founding of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949 and the demand for a great number of translators and interpreters beginning from the late 1970s, when China started its “reform and opening-up” policy of the “four modernizations”, also served deep-rooted utilitarian purposes. During the twentieth century, the history of China repeatedly indicated that translation was viewed as a means to strengthen the nation and that translators were intellectuals engaged in translation for patriotic reasons.

Devoted and Learned Scholar-Translators

There were of course translators in China who were involved in

bi-cultural and bilingual activities due to their love of literature and culture. Translators like Zhu Shenghao 朱生豪, Xiao Qian 蕭乾, Yang Xianyi 楊憲益 and Gladys Yang, belong to this category. They all had a great devotion to their work and their interest was in English-Chinese or Chinese-English renditions, not so much in translation studies. They were sparing in offering their opinions on translation, their views showing a brevity similar to Yan Fu's *xin-da-ya*. In fact, they were the most qualified people to develop a theoretical framework for E-C or C-E translation. However, they chose to let their translations speak for themselves, rather than devise a complex theory. To them, translation was a job they had a passion for.

They were also learned scholars, who translated: Fu Lei 傅雷 studied European art history in Paris and toured extensively in Europe, studying in great detail a great number of masterpieces of painting and sculpture at museums, art galleries and chapels; Yang Xianyi spent several years at Oxford University studying Latin and Greek; Xiao Qian was a reporter for the *Da Gong Bao* 大公報 and a talented writer; Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書, an Oxford graduate in Greek and Latin, had a photographic memory and was a highly capable linguist who was proficient in five languages. Apart from Yang Xianyi, who earned a living by translating Chinese literary works into English for the Foreign Languages Press in Beijing after 1949, the others were all freelance part-time translators, translating literary works out of a passion for them. When these translators wrote prefaces for their translations, they shed some light on their views and their experience, but these were very brief. For example, Fu Lei wrote: “As far as the effect is concerned, translation is the same as the copying of a painting: what is aimed at is an affinity in quintessence over resemblance” (Liu 1981/1990: 68-69). Lin Yutang 林語堂, echoing Yan Fu's *xin-da-ya*, set three standards for translators to follow, viz., faithfulness (*xin*), readability (*da*) and

aesthetics (*ya*) (Liu 1981/1990: 32-47). Similarly, Lin Yiliang 林以亮 (penname of Stephen Soong Chi), a translator and translation scholar in Hong Kong, set three conditions for translators to observe: comprehension of the original work, mastery of the mother-tongue, as well as a vivid imagination (Liu 1981/1990: 83-111). Yang Xianyi on many occasions stressed the importance of proficiency in languages and of profound understanding of the cultures with which the translator is involved.^[3] None of the masters during the early and middle of the twentieth century ever recognised the importance of translation studies and none of the old masters' requirements of and standards for being a translator went beyond Yan Fu's *xin-da-ya*.

In fact, when we compare Fu Lei, Lin Yutang, Qian Zhongshu, Zhao Yuanren 趙元任, Hu Shi 胡適, Zhu Guangqian 朱光潛, Lin Yiliang, etc., with Western Sinologists, we can justifiably and comfortably call them "Occidentalists", because they were learned scholars of French art history and literature (Fu Lei), American literature and culture (Lin Yutang, Hu Shi, Zhao Yuanren and Lin Yiliang) and German aesthetics (Zhu Guangqian), among other things. These are all great masters of translation and scholarship and their translations should be the source of inspiration for our translation studies in the twenty-first century.

New Developments

Following China's "reform and opening up" policy, translation, both as an applied and as an academic discipline at tertiary institutions, has grown in importance throughout China. During the two decades from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, translation programmes and translation departments were established one after another at tertiary institutions in Hong Kong. In Mainland China, translation programmes

were normally provided by English or foreign languages departments; however, since the mid-1990s, more and more undergraduate translation programmes (or even translation departments) as well as postgraduate institutes of translation and interpreting have been set up to cope with market needs. By its very nature, university education is academic and research-oriented and therefore courses have been offered not only in practical translation but also in the academic discipline of translation studies (Liu 2001). As a result, since the 1990s, a group of "pure theorists" have emerged and we have started to have two types of translation professionals at the university level: one teaching theories and the other teaching translation practice.

Works on foreign translation theorists and theories have also been in great demand in China. The Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press published in 2001 a series of twelve titles on "Foreign Translation Studies", featuring works by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, Basil Hatim, Christiane Nord, Peter Newmark, Wolfram Wilss, Eugene A. Nida, Gideon Toury, etc. (for a full list, see Appendix 1). This series of twelve titles is indeed a needed and timely addition to *Masterpieces of Western Translation Theory* (Chan and Chang 2000), published by the City University of Hong Kong Press. There are of course many more works on contemporary Western translation theories published in book form or as articles in journals and papers in proceedings. It is impossible to discuss all these publications here in this paper. However, the facts mentioned above will suffice to show that the current trend of translation studies is predominantly Western-oriented. There may still be works revisiting *xin-da-ya* with new interpretations, but they are really the minority rather than the majority.^[4]

Translation Criticism: Foundation of Translation Studies

However, translation studies should be closely associated with translation practice and translation criticism. This is comparable to Chinese literary studies, which is based on a solid groundwork of literary criticism and historical studies. The two voluminous works on Chinese literature, one on Chinese classical novels by C. T. Hsia 夏志清 (C. T. Hsia 1968) and one on Chinese left-wing writers by Tsi-an Hsia 夏志安 (Tsi-an Hsia 1968), will serve as good examples. These two masterpieces are in fact outstanding works of literary criticism. Obviously we need similar works of translation criticism, so as to lay a good foundation for our translation studies.

There are a few good works of translation criticism which are based on the "old concepts" of *xin-da-ya*. "David Hawkes' English Translation of *The Story of the Stone*" by Lin Yiliang (Lin 1976) is an example. In it Hawkes' translation is subjected to a detailed and thorough scrutiny. Lin Yiliang was a *Honglou Meng* 紅樓夢 scholar and a practicing translator himself; he was therefore able to spot Hawkes' miscomprehension of and mistranslations in *The Story of the Stone*. Another example is Qian Zhongshu's "The Translations of Lin Shu" (Lin Shu de Fanyi 林紓的翻譯), which is an outstanding piece of criticism of the "old school" (Liu 1981/1990: 302-332). There are quite a few other articles which can be used as references for developing our own brand of translation studies, although it is true that the scope of these works of criticism mentioned above is largely confined to the discussion of literary and linguistic aspects, lacking the magnitude and latitude of the Western translation theories such as those of the philological, hermeneutic, linguistic, skopos, cultural and deconstructionist schools. These schools have expanded the theoretical base by involving multiple disciplines.

It should be noted that there are hurdles for us when we develop our own translation criticism. The first of these is that probably there is not a platform for discussions and for translation scholars to air their views. In Mainland China, university teacher-theorists need a lot more than the space available for their articles to be published. In Hong Kong, the situation is the opposite: as far as the *Translation Quarterly* is concerned there has been a constant shortage of contributions of good quality, especially articles written in English, over the past nine years. The second hurdle might be translation scholars' proficiency in foreign languages. For example, some articles written in English by Chinese translation scholars published in some "core" journals of translation have been embarrassing, to say the least. The third hurdle for Hong Kong scholars is the criteria set for the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) by the Research Grants Council (RGC) of the University Grants Committee (UGC) of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.^[5] The policy adopted is such that, for example, book-reviews published are not counted as research publications. University teachers in Hong Kong have been pressurised by a new university appraisal culture imported from the United States, which has seriously interfered with their teaching and research. Ironically, such an appraisal system has already been abandoned by university management in the States. In Hong Kong, the managerial culture of universities during the past decade has undergone a profound transformation. It has been gradually sucked into the world of finance, commerce and business, with more emphasis on cost-effectiveness and value for money, as remarked by Professor Nigel Reeves in his article presented in this Symposium: "Translation is an essential support service in international trade, never more so as globalisation gathers pace." It is blatantly true that translation and translation studies are rapidly becoming part of commercialism and globalisation.

Globalisation of Translation Theories?

Globalisation is a trendy word and it is now a powerful force in the areas of finance, industry, culture, fashion, commodities, management, etc. In translation studies, there is also a voice advocating globalisation, i.e. emphasizing the "common characteristics" in translation theories. The voice stresses that even if there are special features in different languages, such differences are only reflected in the applied theory of translation, but not in pure theory (Xie 2003: 9). Such a view contradicts the fundamental relationship between translation practice and translation studies. As I understand it, all theories are derived from practice and translation theories are tied up with the languages used in translation. When we talk about translation studies, we should associate them with the languages involved and we should have a thorough understanding of the history of the languages and their cultures. Translations of works by Confucius, Qu Yuan 屈原, and Cao Xueqin 曹雪芹 are definitely different from those of works by Chaucer, Shakespeare and Romain Rolland. Depending on the languages used, the end products (translation theories) evolving from the translated works of the writers mentioned above will have different perspectives and contain different semantic, philological, linguistic and cultural nuances. If translation theories are to be deduced from translation practice, then our translation studies should provide a different but complementary perspective as compared to that of our Western counterparts. I am not quite sure if, in the course of developing translation theories, we can get away from substantive translation criticism with special reference to translation practice involving the Chinese language, and proceed by merely copying Western theories.

In learning from the West, China has made many (some very serious) mistakes from the mid-nineteenth century up to the present. Some have been corrected and some have been re-adjusted; but there are

still others which remain. The mentality to learn from the West has taken a deep root in the minds of the Chinese people, especially in the educated sector.

Globalisation is fine when applied to travelling abroad. It is very convenient to have Euros which can be used in a great many European Union member countries. The globalisation of telecommunications is very convenient too, which connects us with our friends all over the world. But in culture and languages, globalisation is not necessarily a good thing and should not be encouraged indiscriminately.

Concluding Remarks

"The moon will have to be rounder and brighter" in China, if we are to build up our own framework of translation studies. There are many masterpieces of translations for us to explore: we have several versions of translations of *The Story of the Stone*, *Jean Christophe*, Shakespeare's works, *La Divina Commedia*, *Ulysses*, etc. We should encourage translation criticism, from which we will be able to gradually build up a theoretical framework with Chinese as the core language involved. We should welcome discussions employing high quality examples, so as to ensure that the theoretical structure is closely reflective of Chinese language, culture and tradition.

Translation in China over the past century was largely a history of a utilitarian approach. It was, on the whole, also a history of emulating the West, and this is still true at the beginning of the twenty-first century. And such a mentality dies hard, unfortunately. While globalisation brings nations closer in certain aspects, it also has an adverse effect on many other aspects of our work and life. We should indeed absorb useful ideas from the West, but we should not ignore our own language, culture and

tradition. After all, China is a great country of translation and therefore there are abundant sources of inspiration for us to draw on to develop on translation studies with special reference to Chinese. For this very reason, translation practitioners as well as theorists in China, while experimenting with a micro-philosophical approach adopted from the West as mentioned earlier in this paper, should explore their own heritage and potential and work out their own theoretical framework.

Let's start with translation criticism.

* Closing speech delivered at the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium at Lingnan University on 6 June 2004.

Notes

- [1] The first Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium was organised by the Department of Foreign Languages of Tsinghua University (Beijing) and the Department of Translation of Lingnan University (Hong Kong).
- [2] The second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium was held at Lingnan University in Hong Kong from 5-6 June 2004.
- [3] The author visited Mr. Yang Xianyi many times at his residence in Beijing during the 1980s. On many occasions Yang told the author the importance of proficiency in languages and the profound understanding of the cultures with which the translator was engaged.
- [4] For example, there is one book by Shen Suru entitled *On Xin-da-ya*; and the author's "Preface" written for *Translation: A New Focus* also touched upon *xin-da-ya*. See the References below.
- [5] The University Grants Committee [UGC] is a setup to allocate funds to seven leading universities in Hong Kong. The Research Grants Council [RGC] is a sub-committee of UGC looking after funding for research activities of the UGC-funded universities. The Research Assessment

Exercise [RAE] is held every three years to assess the research achievements of those universities.

References

- Chan Tak-hung 陳德鴻, and Chang Nam-fung 張南峰, eds. (2000). *Xifang fanyi lilun jingcuan* 西方翻譯理論精選 [*Masterpieces of Western Translation Theory*]. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
- Hsia, C. T. 夏志清 (1968). *The Classic Chinese Novel: A Critical Introduction*. New York & London: Columbia University Press.
- Hsia, Tsi-an 夏志安 (1968). *The Gate of Darkness: Studies on the Literary Movement in China*. Seattle & London: University of Washington Press.
- Lin Yiliang 林以亮 (1976). "Honglou meng" Xi You Ji "紅樓夢" 西遊記 [Honglou meng in the West – A Critical Review of the New Translation]. Taipei: Lian Jing Publishing Press.
- Liu Ching-chih 劉靖之, ed. (1981/1990). *Fanyi lunji* 翻譯論集 [*Essays on Translation*]. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing (H. K.) Co. Ltd., 3rd reprint 1990.
- Liu Ching-chih 劉靖之 (2000). "The Role of Hong Kong in the New Millennium". *Translation Quarterly* No. 24: 1-32.
- . (2001). "Xianggang de fanyi yu kouyi jiaoxue" 香港的翻譯與口譯教學 [Teaching of Translation and Interpreting in Hong Kong]. *Chinese Translators Journal* (May): 36-43.
- . (2003). "Preface". *Fanyi xin jiaodian* 翻譯新焦點 [*Translation: A New Focus*]. Ed. Liu Ching-chih. Hong Kong: Commercial Press (H. K.) Ltd., pp. i-viii.
- Shen Suru 沈蘇儒 (1998). *Lun Xin-da-ya* 論信達雅 [*On Xin-da-ya*]. Beijing: Commercial Press Ltd.
- Xie Tianzhen 謝天振 (2003). *Fanyi yanjiu xin shiye* 翻譯研究新視野 [*New Perspectives in Translation Studies*]. Qingdao: Qingdao Publishing Press.

Appendix 1:

"Foreign Translation Studies" Series (國外翻譯研究叢書)

1. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (2001). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (文化構建——文學翻譯論集).
2. Basil Hatim (2001). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics* (跨文化交際——翻譯理論與對比篇章語言學).
3. Christiane Nord (2001). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained* (目的性行為——析功能翻譯理論).
4. Leo Hickey, ed. (2000). *The Pragmatics of Translation* (語用學與翻譯).
5. Peter Newmark (2001). *Approaches to Translation* (翻譯問題探討).
6. Wolfram Wilss (2001). *The Science of Translation* (翻譯學——問題與方法).
7. Peter Newmark (2001). *A Textbook of Translation* (翻譯教程).
8. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (2001). *Discourse and the Translator* (語篇與譯者).
9. Eugene A. Nida (2001). *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translation* (語言與文化——翻譯中的語境).
10. Gideon Toury (2001). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (描述翻譯學及其他).
11. George Steiner (2001). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (通天塔之後——語言與翻譯面面觀).
12. Mary Snell-Hornby (2001). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (翻譯研究——綜合法).

About the Author

Liu Ching-chih, PhD, FIL, Hon MIL, Hon. FHKTS, served as Translator at the British Broadcasting Corporation, Administrator and Researcher at the University of Hong Kong, and Professor and Hon. Professor in the Department of Translation, Lingnan University, from 1966 to 2001.

He is now Hon. Professor and Hon. Research Fellow of the Centre of Asian Studies at the University of Hong Kong, Visiting Fellow of the Research Institute of Music of the Academy of Arts China and the Central Conservatory of Music Beijing, and Visiting Professor of the Shanghai Conservatory of Music and the Jiling Academy of Arts. He was President of the Hong Kong Translation Society for 13 years (1986-2004), and was President of the Hong Kong Ethnomusicology Society (1986-2004). He is now President Emeritus of the Hong Kong Ethnomusicology Society; Adviser, Fellow and Hon. Life Member of the Institute of Linguists (London) and President of its Hong Kong Regional Society; Founding Chief Editor of *Translation Quarterly*, a journal of the Hong Kong Translation Society. He is the author and editor of 21 books on music, two books on classical Chinese literature and 10 books on translation as well as numerous articles and reviews on music, books and culture.

從“傳譯”到“譯傳” ——兼談文學翻譯中的“探驪”與“得珠”

金聖華

Abstract

From Fou Lai's Translation to Translating Fou Lai (by Serena Sheng-hwa Jin)

Fou Lai, one of the most dynamic and influential translators of the twentieth century in China, was a writer, an educator and an art critic. Of his five million words of translation, fifteen of Balzac's novels, including Le Père Goriot, Eugénie Grandet, La Cousine Bette, and Romain Rolland's Jean Christophe have been regarded as masterpieces. In his lifelong career as a literary translator, Fou Lai had constantly endeavoured to achieve the goal of "fluency of writing, richness of expression and subtlety of colours" in his works.

The author of this article is the translator of many of Fou Lai's English and French letters addressed to his son Fou Ts'ong and daughter-in-law. These letters, together with other letters addressed to Fou Ts'ong's piano teacher and father-in-law — the renowned violinist Yehudi Menuhin — are all included in the Complete Works of Fou Lai. Here, the author is able to trace the characteristics of Fou Lai's style of translation as reflected in his own writings, thus creating a basis for comparison and analysis.

“夫千金之珠，必在九重之淵，而驪龍頷下。”

《莊子·列禦寇》

要得千金之珠，必涉探驪之險，潛泳者需身懷絕技，諳熟水性，奮不顧身，躍入深淵，方能真正有所收穫。倘若只知在崖邊逡巡往回，審視山石亂堆，察看草木怒生，繞場三匝，徒有威武之表，而無上陣之實，則無論如何不能自封為探驪專家，更遑論得珠而返？

2002年12月，籌劃多時的《傅雷全集》，由中國遼寧教育出版社隆重推出，全集共20卷，舉凡傅雷的譯作、著作、家書、書信、遺稿等，全部收編在內。宏富的內容，配以珍貴的圖片及手稿，使這位以譯介法國經典名著而為人熟知的大譯家，終於以著譯皆能、百藝精通的全貌，呈現在讀者眼前。

傅雷不僅是名聞遐邇的翻譯家，才華橫溢的著作家，“貫通中西文化的藝術批評家；更是一位成績卓著的教育家”。^[1]他的多重身份與才藝，充份表現在《全集》所收錄的作品之中。這些作品涵蓋的範圍極廣，既有譯作，亦有著作，共計有關小說、傳記、藝術、政論等譯作36部，譯文25篇；除《世界美術名作二十講》和《貝多芬的作品及其精神》之外，涉及文學、美術、音

樂、政論等文章 136 篇，還有家書 175 通及致友人書 265 通，^[2]不但集《傳雷譯文集》及《傳雷文集》之長，也盡量輯錄闕佚，使讀者披卷摩挲，得窺全豹。

在歷來出版的傳譯之中，享譽最隆及影響最廣的乃羅曼·羅蘭及巴爾扎克的作品，而譯家用力最深的當推後者的傑構。傳譯巴爾扎克的小說，前後共計 15 部，除在文革中佚失的《貓兒打球號》之外，14 部作品在譯壇上閃爍生輝，歷久不衰。《高老頭》、《歐也妮·葛朗台》、《幻滅》、《貝姨》等名譯，已經昂然進入華文創作的殿堂，並列其中，而毫不遜色。

傳雷的翻譯生涯，自 1929 年發表《聖揚喬而夫的傳說》起，至 1966 年文革浩劫中憤而棄世止，前後經歷 37 年，而傳雷的譯著共計五百餘萬言。在這時久量多、幅員廣闊的煌煌大業及浩瀚天地之中，巴爾扎克作品的翻譯，始終佔有中心的地位。根據傳雷自己所言，遠在 1938 年已經開始打巴爾扎克的主意，可是遲至 1944 年，才開始動手翻譯第一部巴氏的小說，即《亞爾培·薩伐龍》，至 1946 年則譯竣出版，前後歷時八年之久。^[3] 1938 年，傳雷剛屆而立之年，真正質量並重的大部頭譯作尚未面世，僅在 1937 年出版了《約翰·克利斯朵夫》第一卷，以及早前的一些零星譯作而已，至 1944 年着手翻譯巴爾扎克時，在譯作方面，已譯畢《約翰·克利斯朵夫》全集，並重譯《貝多芬傳》、翻譯杜哈曼的《文明》；在藝術方面，與黃賓虹結為莫逆之交，書信往返不斷，並於 1944 年在滬舉辦“黃賓虹八秩誕辰書畫展覽會”，刊印《黃賓虹先生山水畫冊》及《黃賓虹書展特刊》，在特刊上撰寫〈觀畫答客問〉一文，介紹黃老畫藝。同年，傳雷亦翻譯了膾炙人口的巴氏名著《高老頭》一書。在音樂方面，傳雷於 1946 年發

起為意大利音樂家，亦即傳聰鋼琴老師梅·百器舉辦“追悼音樂會”。此外，由 1942 至 1945 年，曾與志同道合的友好共組茶話會，暢論文藝、科技等學術專題，參加者有姜椿芳、周煦良、沈知白、雷垣、宋奇、周夢白等十餘人。^[4] 由此可見，傳雷至此不論在思想感情、學術修養、著譯風格等各方面，都已臻成熟完備、蓄勢待發的階段，正抖擻精神，準備在長途漫漫、千山萬水的譯道上邁步前進。

在拙文〈傳雷與巴爾扎克〉、〈傳譯《高老頭》的藝術〉、〈傳雷翻譯巴爾扎克的心路歷程〉中，已先後將譯者傳雷與原作者巴爾扎克兩人從性情、氣質，對生命、文學的看法，對工作的態度與習慣等各方面來加以研究，並以客觀與主觀的因素，仔細分析傳雷選譯巴爾扎克的原由，剖析譯者在翻譯前、翻譯中及翻譯後的種種摸索經營及自省求進的過程，故此處不贅。值得注意的是，由於全集的面世，讀者可以充份認識到傳雷是一位對音樂、美術、文學、建築、戲劇，甚至出版、古物保管等各方面，皆面面兼俱、事事留心的通才，這也是造就他成為翻譯專家的先天條件，令他在翻譯氣勢澎湃的傑作如《人間喜劇》時，可以得心應手，遊刃有餘，而不致如某些文化修養不足的譯者一般，在巴爾扎克營造的巍巍巨構中捉襟見肘，徬徨失措。

傳雷是個愛惜筆墨、努力不懈的翻譯家，凡是自己的譯作，都一改再改，精益求精，即以《高老頭》為例，亦前後翻譯三次，主要的原因，不但是因為自身語文的造詣不斷提高，也因為在漫長的譯途中，對翻譯的認知已有所不同。

先說語文的造詣。如所週知，傳雷的文字以流暢優美見稱，不論書信或翻譯，都是現代文學中的精品，足以成為研究的對

象，學習的範本，但是傅譯之所以家喻戶曉，為人稱道，也不是一蹴而就的。我們且看他第一篇發表的譯作《聖揚喬而夫的傳說》，不論造句遣辭或標點符號，都有明顯的歐化痕跡：

奧倍萊，虔敬地，同情於她的幻想，不時用言語勸慰她，鼓勵她，在詩中為她唱出春之消息，歌詠她現實生活的詩景，她機械地首肯着……直到燈火搖落，報告安息的時間已經來到的時份。^[5]

這篇作品譯於1929年，當時白話文的發展，尚未成熟，而傅雷的翻譯技巧，也剛在摸索之中，因此譯文的質素自然不夠理想，許多同期譯家的作品都有這種傾向。日後，傅雷在不斷的實習與努力中，逐漸體會到中西文化的異同。他認為兩種語文的表達方式往往南轅北轍，因此一方面怕“太濃厚的中國地方色彩會妨礙原作的地方色彩”，而對使用方言有所顧忌；另一方面又怕“純粹用普通話吧，淡而無味，生趣索然，不能作為藝術工具”，^[6]譯家時常以如何掌握譯文的風格自苦，認為要“形成和諧完整的風格，更有賴長期的藝術薰陶。……文字問題基本也是個藝術眼光的問題；要提高譯文，先得有個客觀標準，分得出文章的好壞。”^[7]由此可見，傅雷在譯途上是不斷自淬自勵，反覆思考內省的。他在一遍又一遍的重譯之中，往往把自己的舊作改得體無完膚，不留情面的程度，遠遠超過任何最為嚴苛的編審者或評論家。我們大可以說，這位潛泳者，在涉險探驪的過程中既非毫無準備、冒昧入水；亦非避重就輕、臨淵卻步。且看傅雷在1951年9月《高老頭》重譯本的序言中，已“相當全面而深刻地總結了一個翻譯者在具體的翻譯活動中所能遭遇的不同或差異……傅雷還

透過這多方面的‘不同’，看到這些‘不同’之間所產生的相互影響，認識到語言層面與社會、文化及思想方面之間的差異的互動關係。”^[8]因此，他是個從實踐中得出理論，又以理論不斷改進實踐的翻譯家。

傅雷在漫長的翻譯生涯中，一面譯，一面思索，一面改進，一面再思索。雖然從表面上看來，似乎並未留下太多純粹討論翻譯的文章，但在致友人（如林以亮）的書信中，在其他談論音樂、藝術的文章裏，都可以發現不少線索，足以匯集為融會貫通、自成體系的譯論，而傅雷在翻譯各種有關音樂、藝術、文學、戲劇的文章裏，又受到滋潤與啟發，在思想境界與語言技巧方面不斷得到提升，從而沃養了文學翻譯的園地，使之綠意盎然，平添無窮無盡的原創力與生命力。

傅雷對自己的譯文，曾提出以“行文流暢、用字豐富、色彩變化”為指標，^[9]而在拙文〈傅譯《高老頭》的藝術〉中，亦曾對傅譯特色作過剖析，此處再嘗試從譯家其他的譯著之中，探溯這些特色的源頭。

先說“行文流暢”的特點。如上文所述，傅雷早期的譯文，與後期的傑作，在行文流暢方面，實在有顯著的分別，傅譯專家羅新璋對此曾經發表如下的評論：

《羅丹藝術論》，先生譯於1931、32年冬春之際，距“五四”新文化運動12年，當時白話文尚處於形成時期。以今天眼光看，譯稿文字帶有白話文由是脫胎而來的文言痕跡：個別字眼顯得老舊，文白夾雜，有不夠和諧之弊，行文也不及後期傅譯那樣流暢，朗朗上口。但儘管有這些不足，拭去塵翳，仍不失為劉老

（本文作者注：即劉海粟）所稱的“明珠”，看出一代譯界巨匠在很年輕時已顯露的不凡譯才。由是有所感矣。^[10]

傅雷對自己的文字技巧要求甚嚴，終其一生，都在悉心改進，刻意求工。“琢磨文字的那部份工作尤其使我長年感到苦悶。中國人的思想方式和西方人的距離多麼遠。……不在精神上徹底融化，光是硬生生的照字面搬過來，不但原文完全喪失了美感，連意義都晦澀難解，叫讀者莫名其妙。”^[11]

傅雷對於自己翻譯作品中語言運用及表達方式的要求，在長子鋼琴家傅聰長年累月、磨練琴藝如苦行僧的歲月中，再次得到了體現與發揚。傅雷於1955年曾將傅聰業師杰維茨基教授所撰〈關於表達蕭邦作品的一些感想〉一文譯出，其中提到“至於蕭邦作品的內容和它的表現方法，可以說是用最凝練最簡潔的形式，表現出最強烈的情緒的精華。”^[12]在某種意義上來看，這也可說是傅雷在翻譯法國名家經典作品時的一種自我期許吧！

有關“用字豐富”的特點，我們可以從傅譯《藝術哲學》一書見到端倪。法國史學家兼藝評家丹納（1828-1893）這部著作，傅雷早於1929年負笈法國時就有意翻譯，然而當時只譯就第一編第一章，至1958至59年，方全書譯竣。丹納博學多才，精通多國文字，足跡遍及英、比、荷、德多國，並曾應巴黎美術學校之聘，擔任美術史講座，其後一生又以書齋生活為主，在這些經歷上，與傅雷頗有些相似之處。^[13]傅雷對丹納這部著作，相當重視，由於1959年譯畢後，出版社擱置一年零八月，尚未付印，故特於1961年初，用一個多月功夫，以毛筆抄錄該書第四編“希臘的雕塑”（共六萬餘字）寄予傅聰，以提高其藝術修養。在這篇

從“傳譯”到“譯傳”

談雕塑的文章中，亦涉及了有關語言及文學的問題：

所有我們的哲學和科學的詞匯，幾乎都是外來的；要運用確當，非懂希臘文和拉丁文不可；而我們往往運用不當。這個專門的詞匯有許多術語混進日常的談話和文學的寫作；所以我們現在的談話和思索，所依據的是笨重而難以操縱的字眼。我們把那些字的現成的，照原來配搭好的格式拿過，憑着習慣說出去，不知道輕重，也不知道細微的區別；我們不能充份表達心裏的意思。作家要花到15年功夫才學會寫作，不是說寫出有才氣的文章，那是學不來的，而是寫得清楚，連貫，恰當，精密。他必須把一萬到一萬二千個字和各種辭藻加以鑽研，消化，注意字與詞的來源，血統，關係，然後把自己所有的觀念和思想按照一個別出心裁的方案重新建造。如果不下過這番功夫而對於權利，責任，美，國家，一切人類重大的利益發表議論，就要暗中摸索，搖晃不定，陷入浮誇空泛的字句，響亮的濫調，抽象而死板的公式。^[14]

傅雷對此顯然十分認同，他在同年4月15日寫給傅聰的英文函件中，就提醒兒子在使用英文時對造句遣辭，要多加留意：

我得提醒聰在寫和講英文時要小心些，我當然不在乎也不責怪你信中的文法錯誤，你沒時間去斟酌文字風格，你的思想比下筆快，而且又時常匆匆忙忙或在飛機上寫信，你不必理會我們，不過在你的日常會話中，就得潤飾一下，選用比較多樣化的形容詞、名詞及句法，盡可能避免冗贅的字眼及辭句，別毫無變化的說“多妙”或“多了不起”，你大可選用“宏偉”，“堂皇”，

“神奇”，“神聖”，“超凡”，“至高”，“聖潔”，“輝煌”，“卓越”，“燦爛”，“精妙”，“令人贊賞”，“好”，“佳”，“美”等等字眼，使你的表達方式更多姿多彩，更能表現出感情、感覺、感受及思想的各種層次，就如在演奏音樂一般。要是你不在乎好好選擇字眼，長此以往，思想就會變得混沌、單調、呆滯、沒有色彩、沒有生命。再沒有甚麼比我們的語言更能影響思想的方式了。（1961年4月15日，譯自英文）^[15]

運用語言要層次分明與用字豐富，這是傅雷對兒子的要求，也是對自己譯文的要求，對一切藝術形式表現方法的要求。

有關“色彩變化”的特點，傅雷早在40年代初就有體會，於《黃賓虹書畫展特刊》上〈觀畫答客問〉一文中，曾有以下的論述：

筆者，點也線也。墨者，色彩也。筆猶骨骼，墨猶皮肉。筆求其剛，以柔出之；求其拙，以古行之；在於因時制宜。墨求其潤，不落輕浮；求其腴，不同臃腫；隨境參酌，要與筆相水乳。物之見出輕重向背明晦者，賴墨；表郁勃之氣者，墨；狀明秀之容者，墨。筆所以示畫之品格，墨亦未嘗不表畫之品格；墨所以見畫之丰神，筆亦未嘗不見畫之丰神。雖有內外表裏之分，精神氣息，初無二致。乾黑濃淡濕，謂為墨之五彩；是墨之為用寬廣，效果無窮，不讓丹青。且唯善用墨者善敷色，其理一也。^[16]

傅雷談論的雖是“用墨之道”，但是在層次分寸的掌握上，亦可

運用於翻譯的技法上。

丹納《藝術哲學》其他各章，亦談到風格的形成，語言的特性、^[17] 建築學中日光的層次、空間的深度，以及藝術品裏色彩的力量等等問題，^[18] 尤其是色彩，更著意描述：

色彩之於形象有如伴奏之於歌詞；不但如此，有時色彩竟是歌詞而形象只是伴奏；色彩從附屬品一變而為主體。但不論色彩的作用是附屬的，是主要的，還是和其他的原素相等，總是一股特殊的力量；而為了表現特徵，色彩的效果應當和其餘的效果一致。

^[19]

其實色彩的運用，豈止於藝術品而已，這種濃淡分明，層次井然的技法，對傅雷翻譯理論的肌理脈絡，亦產生了一定的影響。

傅雷最為人熟知的譯論，即為“重神似不重形似”，這是他在1951年於《高老頭》重譯本序言中提出的主張。其實，早在1934年編撰的《世界美術名作二十講》第八講米開朗琪羅（下）之中，已可見到端倪。文中談到米氏對美的觀念與眾不同，他“要抓住傳統，擷取傳統中最深奧的意義，把自己的內生活去體驗，再在雕塑上唱出他的《神曲》。在此，米開朗琪羅成為雕塑上的‘但丁’了。……他從來不願在他的藝術品中攙入些甚麼肖像的成份，他只要雕像中有偉人的氣息。”^[20] 要“氣息”而不要“肖像”，這不是“重神似不重形似”的最佳詮釋麼？

在前述〈觀畫答客問〉一文中，傅雷再一次點出藝術作品之中，“神似”與“形似”的差異所在：

客：黃公之畫甚草率，與時下作風迥異。豈必草率而後見筆墨耶？

曰：噫！子猶未知筆墨，未知畫也。此道固非旦夕所能悟，更非俄頃可能辨。且草率果何謂乎？苦指不工整言：須知畫之工拙，與形之整齊無涉。若言形似有虧：須知畫非寫實。

客：山水不以天地為本乎？何相去若是之遠！畫非寫實乎？可畫豈皆空中樓閣！

曰：山水乃圖自然之性，非剽竊其形。畫不寫萬物之貌，乃傳其內涵之神。若以形似為貴：則名山大川，觀覽不遑；真本具在，何勞圖寫？攝影而外，兼有電影；非惟巨纖無遺，抑且連綿不斷；以言逼真，至此而極；更何貴乎丹青點染？

傅雷是位藝評家，也是一位翻譯家，他對藝術的看法，是“師古人、師造化”，這也是傅聰日後在音樂演奏中所領悟的道理。傅雷又說：

夫寫貌物情，摠發人思：抒情之謂也。然非具煙霞嘯傲之志，漁樵隱逸之懷，難以言胸襟。不讀萬卷書，不行萬里路，難以言境界。襟懷鄙陋，境界逼壓，難以言畫。作畫然，觀畫亦然。子以草率為言，是仍囿於形跡，未具慧眼所致。若能悉心揣摩，細加體會，必能見形若草草，實則規矩森嚴；物形或未盡肖，物理始終在握；是草率即工也。倘或形式工整，而生機滅絕；貌或逼真，而意趣索然；是整齊即死也。此中區別，今之學人，知者絕鮮；故斤斤焉拘於跡象，惟細密精緻是務；竭盡巧思，轉工轉遠；取貌遺神，心勞日拙；尚得謂為藝術乎？^[21]

這一段文字極其重要，傅雷談的是藝術，但卻把翻譯中的“神”與“形”，把重現原著神髓的活譯與拘泥於字面意義的死譯兩者之間的區別，闡述得清清楚楚。傅雷的藝術觀與翻譯觀其實是前後連貫、一脈相承的，論者假如不悉心細讀傅雷的種種論著，並與其譯作仔細參照、互相印證，就難以了解傅雷在文學翻譯中探驪得珠的前因與後果。

三

歷來研究傅雷的專著不少，如金梅的《傅雷傳》，葉永烈的《傅雷一家》，^[22]拙編《傅雷與他的世界》等，評論傅譯的文章則更多，如許鈞的一系列文章等，^[23]但是真正有幸翻譯大譯家本身作品的譯者，相信應該只有羅新璋及本文作者兩人。

1979年底，我遠赴巴黎進修，當時擬以巴爾扎克及其譯者傅雷為題，撰寫論文。由於需要搜集許多大量有關原始資料，經名作家及傅雷故友宋淇介紹，於80年初由巴黎前往倫敦，拜望卜居當地的傅聰及其正在造訪的胞弟傅敏兩人。

承蒙傅氏昆仲不吝賜教，並慨允借出大批珍貴版本、手稿、信件、資料，研究得以順利進行。1983年完成論文後，返港繼續執教，此時，正值增補本《傅雷家書》在籌劃出版中，家書裏有許多信件，是傅雷以英、法文寫給傅聰當年的新婚妻子彌拉（亦即名小提琴家梅紐因之女）的，由於涉及英、法兩種文字，這翻譯的重任，就因緣際會，落在我的身上。

傅雷英、法文家書的中譯，首先編收於北京三聯書店於1984

年出版的《傅雷家書》中。這時候，以譯者的資歷來說，我已在香港中文大學執教 19 年，於 1973 年成立的翻譯系中執教 11 年，並出版了討論翻譯的專著及一些譯作。儘管如此，我着手翻譯傅雷家書時，仍然戰戰兢兢，頗有如臨深淵、如履薄冰之感，原因不言自明。傅雷是名聞遐邇的大譯家，如今要把他的英、法文信件，還原為中文，再並列在其他原以中文撰寫的家書之中，珠玉在前，譯文即使不能與原文同樣文采斐然，亦不應暗淡無光，啞然失色，更不能讀來詰屈聱牙，變成以瑕掩瑜的點點斑跡。文學翻譯是一項艱苦的工作，恰似探驪之前，必須在各方面做足準備功夫，方可入水涉險。

正如傅雷翻譯巴爾扎克一般，譯者在動筆之前，除了吃透原文，精研資料之外，最重要的兩個步驟，就是如何定調及如何掌握原著的神韻氛圍。

先說如何定調。譯者翻譯前需要仔細領悟原著的風格，翻閱譯入語中其他相類的作品，研讀作者的語言技巧，悉心揣摩，互相參照，才能有所體會與借鑒，此所以傅雷譯巴爾扎克之前，往往要先閱讀《紅樓夢》與老舍作品的原因。^[24] 翻譯傅雷英、法文作品，由於作者不論外語造詣有多深，在思想境界、思維方式等各方面，始終受到中國文化的影響，因此，譯者實際上是將作者的外語還原為中文，故定調時，應該參閱的主要是傅雷本身的文字。《傅雷家書》中的文字情真意摯，傅雷當年執筆時，並未想到將來作出版之用，故信中語言以自然親切為主，但傅雷畢竟為大譯家，下筆行文，信手拈來，粲然成章，絕不會冗長累贅，流於俗套。《家書》出版後，“傳誦一時，一再加印，增補至五版，行銷數突破百萬，成為傅雷著作中最有影響的一本書。……

‘文化大革命’後的新讀者，往往通過家書才認識傅雷，甚至把書信家傳雷置於翻譯家傅雷之上。”^[25] 譯傅雷英、法文家書時，首要之事，就是通讀作者所有其他的中文家書，從中學習，例如對某些事物的看法觀點，對某些辭彙句法的驅遣運用，作者必然有一番獨特的慣例及規則，翻譯時需細心體會，咀嚼再三，亦步亦趨，方能盡職。

其次，是如何掌握原著神韻及氛圍，亦即是如何領悟原著中所表達意境與所營造氣氛的問題。翻譯與寫作相同，都是一種創作性的行為，在落筆之前，往往需要一段長時期使含蘊心中的點滴美感經驗醞釀發酵，方能產生甘醇，芳香四溢。傅雷在四年留法生涯中，曾經潛心苦讀，精研法國名著；前往羅浮宮美術史學校及梭邦藝術講座聽講；參觀各地美術館；拜會藝術大師馬蒂斯；也曾與友好遍遊瑞士、比利時、意大利等地，沐受自然美景的洗禮。這種讀萬卷書行萬里路的經歷當年滲入傅雷的心坎深處，因而日後在家書中就情不自禁流露出來。傅雷熱愛巴黎，他在回國數十年後，對之依然念念不忘，於是就在 1963 年給兒媳彌拉寫了如下一段剖白：

看到你描繪參觀羅浮宮的片段，我為之激動不已，我曾經在這座偉大的博物館中，為學習與欣賞而消磨過無數時光。得知往日熏黑蒙塵的蒙娜麗莎像，如今經過科學的清理，已經煥然一新，真是一大喜訊，我多麼喜愛從香榭麗舍大道一端的協和廣場直達凱旋門的這段全景！我也永遠不能忘記橋上的夜色，尤其是電燈與煤氣燈光相互交織，在塞納河上形成瑰麗的倒影，水中波光粼粼，白色與瑰色相間（電燈光與煤氣燈光），我每次坐公共汽車

經過橋上，絕不會不盡情流覽。告訴我，孩子，當地是否風光依舊？（《傅雷家書》，1963年10月14日，譯自法文）^[26]

我當年翻譯傅雷家書時，正好在負笈巴黎數載之後，巴黎的一樹一木，一景一物，猶歷歷在目，心馳神往。傅雷的家書，令我讀後感同身受，勾起了遙念巴黎的思緒，因而就順理成章譯出了如上的文字。作者與譯者在對名都的共同依戀中，自然而然找到了心靈互通的和弦。

白先勇曾經在一篇講辭中，提到小說中“人”與“地”的問題，他認為“對有些作者而言，地點可以決定小說的風格。有些作者把某個地方寫得很成功，換另一個地方就不成了。”由此之故，魯迅寫紹興，老舍寫北京，張愛玲寫上海，就顯得特別得心應手。^[27]一處地方，對作者來說，往往帶“有歷史象徵上的意義，不僅是地理上的名詞。”^[28]而與一地有關的人物故事，山水景色，也就成為創作時穿插全局的主線，營造氛圍的礎石。可以說，“地方”乃創作的“原鄉”，兩者息息相關，不可分割。其實，豈止創作而已，文學翻譯之中，亦有“地緣”的因素。舉例來說，論名著名譯，我們一定會想起喬志高（高克毅）翻譯的《大亨小傳》（*The Great Gatsby*）。費茲傑羅這本膾炙人口的小說，至今為止，有好幾個中譯版本，但以喬譯最為人稱道，譯者自己對此卻十分謙遜，他說：“單講費茲傑羅這本書，拿拙譯跟別的譯作相比，總使我覺得有點不公平。撇開語文修養不談，本人在美國，尤其在紐約，待了如此之久，耳濡目染所得以至舊夢重溫的情緒，在譯書過程中到處可以派上用場……。”不錯，書中提到的歌，譯者耳熟能詳；描繪的“中央公園”，譯者於抗戰

勝利後曾陪當年的女伴、日後的夫人并肩坐敞篷車踟躕過；書中的一景一地，譯者不是足跡踏過，就是駕車穿過……，“種種回憶都叫我跟本書發生共鳴”，高先生繼道，“翻一本小說有這一類的‘準備’，怎麼能期望一般中文譯者都辦得到呢？”^[29]固然，一般譯者翻譯一本原著時，未必能親臨書中描繪的場所或背景，浸淫在當地的文化氛圍之中，但是許多出色的譯品卻往往有這種機緣。曾經負笈京都，在當地亭台樓閣、古剎名園感受四季風貌的林文月，傾注五年半心血譯出《源氏物語》；曾經遊學翡冷翠，在阿諾河畔，聽流水潺潺，遙想詩人但丁當年邂逅初戀情人貝緹麗彩情景的黃國彬，以18載漫長譯程，完成《神曲》的中譯。這些，都是不可多得的“地緣”，傅雷之與巴爾扎克，又何嘗不是如此？

傅雷於1927年12月31日赴法，經過數十日的海上航程，於翌年2月3日在馬賽上岸，再轉往巴黎。^[30]傅雷在《法行通信》中寫道，“我們住的是第五區，有名的學生區域。巴黎大學的文科理科都在這區內”，“抵巴第二日，就逢星期，飯後鄭君陪我去逛了一次Jardin Luxembourg……以後每逢飯後未到大學校上課的時間，他們總是在那邊散步的……我也常跟着他們……今早乘便獨自去繞了一轉，在靜默中得有思索觀察的餘暇，不覺受到了不少的感觸。”^[31]傅雷當年造訪之地，亦是我留法時常到之處。梭邦大學中古趣盎然的庭院迴廊，氣氛肅穆的劇院講堂，盧森堡公園中的遍地栗樹、玲瓏雕像，盛夏濃蔭與深秋殘葉，都是鏤刻心中、歷久彌新的場景，從我流連忘返的日子，從傅雷負笈法國的往昔，從巴爾扎克寫作的年代，從巴氏筆下《人間喜劇》搬演的歲月，即一脈相承，由來已久。原作者與譯者，譯者與其研究

者及日後的譯者，就憑藉冥冥之中的一線牽引，結下了一代又一代的文緣與譯緣。

1958年，傅雷錯劃為右派份子，自此閉門謝客，長年累月，埋首翻譯於書齋中。平時往來的朋友極少，能夠接觸的資訊更極為有限，精神上的苦悶，唯有與萬里之外的長子傅聰書信往返，才能得到紓解。翻譯傅雷家書時，必須要注意作者當年的精神狀態與心靈渴求，方能譯出信中難以遏制的強烈感情和綿綿心意。

傅雷在多年的魚雁往返之中，把長子傅聰當作精神上的知己，藝術上的同道中人，此外，為了使兒子婚後琴瑟和鳴，他認為必須向兒媳灌輸精神教育，故寫信給彌拉時，總不忘循循善誘，諄諄教誨，但另一方面又不能絮絮不休，失諸嘮叨，因此，信中的遣辭用字，都特別留神。傅雷長年累月伏案翻譯巴爾扎克，少不免在思想感情方面受到巴氏的深刻影響。致兒媳的信中，不時引用巴氏的著作，以為借鑒，例如建議兩小口閱讀巴爾扎克的《奧諾麗娜》，以免重蹈書中人感情糾葛的覆轍；提醒兩人樽節用度，量入為出，因巴爾扎克貧困一世，為債所逼等等。^[32]傅雷亦在信中提到藝術家的孤寂，他說：“人類有史以來，理想主義者永遠屬於少數，也永遠不會真正快樂，藝術家固然可憐，但是沒有他們的努力與痛苦，人類也許會變得更渺小，更可悲。”（《傅雷家書》，1962年11月25日，譯自英文）。這一番肺腑之言，在傅雷埋首書齋、潛心譯著時，應早已有所體會：“新的巴爾扎克譯了一半，約舊曆年底完工……近一個月天氣奇好，看看窗外真是誘惑很大，恨不得出門一次。但因工作進展太慢，只得硬壓下去。”（《傅雷家書》，1954年11月1日）。巴爾扎克當年飽受經濟拮据之苦，往往須手不停揮，以稿費還

債。據說因為《高老頭》脫稿在即，作家居然把與情人韓斯加夫人的約會之期也延誤了。而我當年盛暑隻身在巴黎巴爾扎克故居伏案研讀時，聽窗外遠處人聲隱約，望眼前書桌日影斑駁，室中靜穆，巴爾扎克的《人間喜劇》陳列四壁，傅雷的譯著擱置手旁，思潮起伏，豈能不深切體會到有史以來古今中外藝術家的孤寂與奉獻？這種感受，又怎會不流露在日後所譯傅雷家書的字裏行間？

譯《傅雷家書》，前後花費不少時間，所幸譯竣後得到傅氏昆仲的肯定。傅聰尤其說有時幾乎分不清哪些是原信，哪些是譯作，這無疑是最令人鼓舞的評語，使我感念在心，因而在漫長譯途上倍添勇氣。

《傅雷家書》自1981年初版後，廣受歡迎，一版再版。1984年的增補版中摘編了我所翻譯的17封英文信及6封法文信。至1987年《家書》刊印第三版，循各界讀者熱烈要求，除重新整理摘編外，欲將家書中所有的外文逐字譯注，這譯注的工作，也就順理成章由我負責擔任。有關譯注的過程，曾在拙文〈譯注《傅雷家書》的一些體會〉中詳細敘述，此處不贅。總結來說，全書需譯注之處，約有七、八百項之多，工作量極大，除需將內容分門別類、仔細研究之外，最困難的是把單字片語還原成中文，再一個個“鑲嵌”在前文後語中，當時曾經說過，“整個譯注過程，就像受托重鑲一件價值不菲的珍飾，卸下顆顆紅寶，換上粒粒綠玉，但整件作品必須盡量保持原有的光彩，以免愧對原主。”^[33]由於這種先天的制約，這種將“翻譯應注意語境”的特性推至極限的情況，整個譯注的過程變得困難重重，而解決之後，也特別感到如釋重負的喜悅。當日文章發表後，獲得不少迴

響，宋淇曾致長函鼓勵。對於譯注中的一些嘗試，例如“kind”一字的譯法（《傳雷家書》，1961年7月7日），亦引起專欄作家的垂注。傅雷在該信中向兒子傅聰提及兒媳彌拉少不更事，收到家姑禮物後毫無表示，不知言謝，希望做兒子的能從旁提點——

“但這事你得非常和緩地向她提出，也別露出是我信中嗔怪她，只作為你自己發覺這樣不大好，不夠 kind，不合乎做人之道。”^[34]此處“kind”一字很難掌握，不能逕譯為“客氣”、“仁慈”、“賢慧”、“溫柔”等詞彙，經再三考慮，譯為“周到”，以與上下文互相呼應。司徒華在專欄“三言堂”中特別討論這個譯法，認為值得商榷。他表示“周到”是形諸外的行為，而“kind”則涉及“有諸內而形諸外的表現”，故建議譯為“謙厚”。^[35]但是縱觀全文，正因為傅雷不欲直接批評兒媳，而要兒子從旁婉轉提點，故在家書中避重就輕，用了一個英文字“kind”，倘若還原為“謙厚”，全句就變成“不夠謙厚”，如此說法，語氣過重，似有指責之嫌，與原意就有出入了。無論如何，用“周到”或是“謙厚”，見仁見智，難有定論，但通篇譯注《傳雷家書》之難，由此可見一斑。

1996年，傅聰重訪波蘭，發現當年傅雷寫給傅聰波籍鋼琴老師杰維茨基的14封法文信。這批信件一直收藏在波蘭，從未公開發表過，於是，在1997年初由傅敏來函囑我譯成中文，以便收錄在1998年由安徽文藝出版社刊印的《傳雷文集》中。

這批函件寫於1954至1962年，前後跨越八年之久。接受任務之初，首先要考慮的是定調的問題。《傳雷家書》數百通都是用白話寫成的，父子或翁媳之間的通訊，真情流露，自然暢順，完全不見咬文嚼字的痕跡。傅聰與兒子業師杰維茨基的書信往

返，卻禮儀周周，進退有據，不論語調或行文，都特別謹慎與用心。以文體來說，傅雷當年寫給兒子的家書或友好的信件，都不宜成為仿效對象，唯有致忘年交黃賓虹的函件，方可借鑒；以內容來說，翻譯前自然得再三通讀《家書》，以求彼此呼應，前後連貫。譯這批信件，雖不足兩萬字，但前後歷時數月，完成後，曾將經過情況詳述於拙文〈譯傅雷致杰維茨基函件有感〉之中，發表於1998年6月北京三聯的《讀書》期刊中，此處不贅。唯有當時在文中曾提及完成初譯後，攜稿赴歐，以便在旅途上隨時校閱修改。自羅馬返港途中，遇到氣流，航機顛簸不堪，九霄驚魂之際，心中所慮的竟不是個人安危，而是怕萬一不幸出事，散落人間的將來是尚未成形的譯稿片片，措辭欠佳，行文乏善，豈非愧對原作，難辭其咎？這一段文字發自內心，誰知竟遭當時的編者刪除，如今補陳於此，以表明一名認真執着的譯者，對本身譯作的期許與要求，更何況傳譯字斟句酌，嘔心瀝血，譯傳又豈能掉以輕心，草率從事？

1999年，著名小提琴家伊虛提·梅紐因與世長辭，遺孀狄阿娜夫人把一批傅雷當年寫給親家的法文函件交回傅聰。這批信件約十多封，寫於1961至1966年。內容除閒話家常外，還涉及對人生的看法及對藝術的追求等，頗多啟發。這些信件亦是從未公開發表過的，我有幸再次應邀將之譯成中文，首先發表於2000年第6期的《收穫》期刊中。

這次翻譯，儘管積累了不少的經驗，卻又有一番嶄新的體會。80年代初譯傅雷法、英文家書時，由於書信對象是傅聰及彌拉，故全部採用白話文譯出；1997年譯致杰維茨基函，由於致函對象是德高望重的傅聰業師，故主要以文言文譯出。這次書信的

對象是梅紐因伉儷；信件往返的兩造是親家，地位相等，關係密切，然畢竟一為中、一為西，兩者之間，不論所處環境或文化背景，都大不相同。梅紐因固然在西方音樂界中名聞遐邇，地位顯赫，但傅雷往來的朋友，亦多為文化界、音樂界或藝術界的傑出人士，故此兩者在人情關係上是姻親，在思想境界上，卻是志同道合、氣味相投的朋友。要在字裏行間譯出兩者平起平坐、既親切又客氣的關係，要分辨談小兒女身邊瑣事及論大宇宙人生境界的不同筆調，譯者必須借助一種文白相糅的體裁，這種體裁，在傅雷致友人（如劉抗、成家復、朱嘉棣等）書中，常見採用。^[36]

傅雷本身，正如其同時代的許多文學大家一般，擅於運用文言、白話、半文言等多種文體，視不同場合，不同語境而分別採用之。中文裏對遠近、親疏、尊卑、長幼的對象，即使涉及同一題材，亦有種種不同的說法。而親友之間的稱呼，更五花八門，不一而足。傅雷在法文信中，稱呼梅紐因伉儷時，只有“Cher Ami, Chers Amis, Mes chers Amis”等幾種方式，如按字直譯，就變成“親愛的朋友，親愛的朋友們，我的親愛的朋友們”，此等中文，如何能出自翻譯大家的手筆？“Cher Ami”是寫給親家梅紐因的，“Chers Amis”則是寫給梅紐因伉儷的，故此，我按情況譯為“伊虛提如晤”及“伊虛提、狄阿娜雙鑒”，這也是傅雷在其他致友人書中常用的起首語。

在翻譯的過程之中，心中彷彿有一把無形的尺，時時刻刻都在量度、在拉長縮短、收緊放鬆。正如余光中所言，“很多人以為白話取代了文言之後，文言就全廢了，其實文言並未作廢，而是以成語的身份留了下來，其簡練工整可補白話的不足，可在白話的基調上適時將句法或節奏收緊，如此一緊一鬆，駢散互濟，

文章才有變化，才能起波瀾。”^[37] 翻譯傅雷的文字，當然不能不注意行文的變化起伏。翻譯致梅紐因函件時，前後九易其稿，譯文中文氣的拉緊與放鬆，文白的驅遣與調配，正是譯者的用心所在。

傅雷在 1962 年 1 月 7 日的函件中，談到自己翻譯巴爾扎克名著《幻滅》的情況，以及跟梅紐因的關係：

Je puis maintenant travailler un peu plus de 8 heures par jour; mais *LES ILLUSIONS PERDUES* de Balzac est un grand oeuvre qui me coûte beaucoup de peines à traduire. Je vis journellement avec les personnages fictifs presque aussi intimement que leur créateur: je me trouve souvent dans l'état d'un somnambule.

Nous nous félicitons toujours qu'une fois liés par nos chers enfants, nous nous sommes devenus de si bons amis en si peu de temps. ... Il nous semble en effet qu'on se connaît depuis de longues années déjà.

這段文字，可用白話文直譯如下：

目前我可以每天工作八個多小時，但是巴爾扎克的《幻滅》是一部偉大的作品，令我譯得十分辛苦。我每天跟書中人物一起生活，親密得簡直可以跟他們的創造者比較：我發現自己經常處於一種夢遊的狀態之中。

我們因為我們親愛的子女的關係，而連接在一起，我們在這麼短的時間之內變為這麼好的朋友，真是值得慶幸。……你跟我

好像是認識了許多年的朋友似的。

最後的定稿翻譯如下：

目前我每日可工作約八小時，然而巴爾扎克《幻滅》一書，誠為巨構，譯來頗為傷神。如今與書中人物朝夕與共，親密程度幾可與其創造者相較。目前可謂經常處於一種夢遊狀態也。

因姻親關係，我們能在如此短時間之內變成莫逆之交，實屬萬幸。……你我之間確有相交經年之感。

這一前一後兩種譯法，顯然有許多不同之處：前譯鬆散，後譯緊湊；前譯帶有許多代名詞如“我們”、“他們”、“我”，許多量詞如“一部”、“許多年”、“八個小時”等等，在後譯中都已刪除不見。

觀乎傅雷自己的譯著，若以最初的作品及成熟期的作品相比較，則漸趨精練簡約的風格，宛然可見。許多知名的譯者，在修改舊譯時都有這種趨向，^[38]可見現代漢語的發展，從民初的一味西化，棄文倡白，已經演化至今日的“中西相容，文白並存”了。

此外，後譯中增加了不少四字結構如“朝夕與共”、“莫逆之交”、“實屬萬幸”、“相交經年”等。用四字結構或成語，當然必須小心分辨，如原擬用現成的“一見如故”來譯“on se connaît depuis de longues années”，但由於傅雷終其一生，都未曾有緣與親家梅紐因相見，故此處並不適用。

在傅雷致梅紐因函件中，有一封是傅夫人朱梅馥寫給梅紐因

夫人狄阿娜的（朱梅馥 1961 年 2 月 23 日致狄阿娜函）。這是兩親家母之間的通訊，內容涉及一些女性的話題，好比如如何撫養子女、如何將庶出視如己出等等，^[39]由於兩者為姻親，然而又素未謀面，故其關係既親切又疏遠，再加傅夫人在函首為遲覆致歉，並自謙外文欠佳，在函末又讚揚狄阿娜及其長子杰勒德才華卓越，這一抑一揚之間，既要保持身份，不可過謙；又要表示誠意，不能溢美，因此，翻譯時對於語調及文氣的掌握，煞費功夫。

翻譯朱梅馥信件有幾種考慮：其一、除了在《傅雷家書》中可以發現朱梅馥一、兩封信件之外，沒有其他書信或文章可供參考，因此，頗難定調；其二、朱梅馥在信中說：“為表達暢順起見，此信我先以中文撰寫，再由外子譯成英文。”因此，這封由傅雷譯出的信件，實際上，已帶有傅文風格；其三、即使能看到中文原件，但朱梅馥與傅雷長年共處，相濡以沫，不但照顧夫婦起居生活，且為之抄謄稿件，打點一切，故後期連字體也跟傅雷十分相似，更遑論思想感情方面的默契與共鳴了。

由此上述原因，譯朱梅馥信件經過幾重轉折：首先，因為內容涉及女性之間閒話家常，曾嘗試完全以白話譯出，結果譯文顯得十分鬆散；其後，因為要貼近傅雷語調，故以文言應變拉緊，結果譯文讀來過份拘謹；最後，在文言基礎上再加以調整放鬆，總算得到自認為比較可以接受的結果，定稿譯文如下：

來信所言，使我思潮起伏。我深切了解要將一個不是己出的孩子撫養成人，確非易事，箇中困難且隨時存在，隨處可見。即使親生骨肉，亦無法時時知道如何對待。不同年齡必然會帶來不同看

法與感受，加以現代生活紛擾，發展迅速，使我們與年輕人之間更增隔閡。（朱梅馥 1961 年 2 月 23 日函）

總結我翻譯傅雷的經驗，除了要研習背景資料，查閱參考文獻，以客觀描述的角度來研究傅雷的種種翻譯活動之外，最要緊的仍然是潛心鑽研其譯著文字本身。俗語說，“不入虎穴，焉得虎子”，其實，亦可改為“不入深淵，焉可探驪”。與其臨淵羨“珠”，不如投身其中，如此方知水之冷暖深淺，己之虛實短長，至於“得珠”與否，那就要看譯者本身的功力與機遇了。無論如何，只顧紙上談兵，而毫無實戰經驗，又如何能運籌帷幄，決勝於千里之外？

四

從研究傅譯到翻譯傅雷，使我在過程中深切體會到文學翻譯是巍巍高山，也是九重深淵，越登高，越深入，越感自身能力之有限，“譯然後知不足”，^[40]誠然是過來人語。傅譯專家羅新璋為研究大師的譯風，曾經把傅譯逐字逐句抄錄在法文原著上，前後足足抄了九個月，共二百五十四萬八千字。羅氏今日之能卓然成家，可說是由來非易也。當然，我們未必人人皆有羅新璋的苦學精神與毅力，但假如要研究傅雷，對其洋洋五百萬言的譯作避而不談，煌煌 20 大卷的全集視若無睹，再引進多少外國理論，套用多少現代學說，亦無濟無事。

同理，談楊憲益與戴乃迭而不涉其數千萬言譯著，討論梁實

秋而對其所譯莎士比亞全集不屑一顧，都是避重就輕、繞道而行的弊端。近年來，學術界似乎有種方興未艾的趨勢，認為研究翻譯，凡與之有關的一切問題，都可討論，唯獨譯作本身，卻恍如禁區，不可涉足。外國譯論固然有其長處，足以借鑒，但倘若不加釐清，全盤照搬，卻未必是正確的方向。

學術界從早期只談譯作本身，只重文本分析，不涉其他背景資料的傾向，一變而為今時今日之只談譯作外圍，不涉譯作本身的潮流，不啻是從一極盪向另一極、矯枉過正的做法。一般年輕的學子，更將文本視為畏途，凡撰寫論文或研究大綱時，只知把某一套舶來理論奉如圭臬，自囿其中，不敢越雷池半步。他們往往提出翻譯經驗不科學、不深入、不全面、易流於瑣屑主觀等等人云己云、似是而非的說法。其實，理論與實踐，兩者並無衝突，不論採取何種立場，在處理資料時只有主從先後之分，而無互相排斥之理。不論從事翻譯研究或翻譯實踐，都應了解理論與實踐之間不是隔岸相望、而是中流相遇的關係。固步自封、劃地為王的做法，在學術研究中不足為訓。

在文學翻譯的過程中，要探驪得珠，沒有偷工減料的可能，勘地形、觀天象、思前想後，固然重要，但不顧基本功，不躍入深淵，沉潛其中，又怎能成功而返？

注釋

[1] 羅新璋，〈出版說明〉，見《傅雷全集》1，沈陽：遼寧教育出版社，2002，頁 V。

[2] 同上。

[3] 金聖華，〈傅雷翻譯巴爾扎克的心路歷程〉，見金聖華、黃國彬主

編，《因難見巧：名家翻譯經驗談》，香港：三聯書店，1996，頁192。

[4] 傅敏、羅新璋，〈傅雷年譜〉，見金聖華主編，《傅雷與他的世界》，香港：三聯書店，1994，頁314-316。

[5] 《傅雷全集》15，頁339。

[6] 傅雷，〈翻譯經驗點滴〉，原載《文藝報》1957年第10期，見《傅雷全集》17，頁226。

[7] 同上。

[8] 許鈞，《翻譯論》，武漢：湖北教育出版社，2003，頁328。

[9] 傅雷，〈論文學翻譯書〉，見羅新璋編，《翻譯論集》，北京，商務印書館，1984，頁694。

[10] 《傅雷全集》14，頁106。

[11] 同注^[6]。

[12] 《傅雷全集》15，頁426。

[13] 《傅雷全集》16，頁3。

[14] 同上，頁251。

[15] 《傅雷家書》，北京：三聯書店，1988，頁245-246。

[16] 《傅雷全集》18，頁203-204。

[17] 《傅雷全集》16，頁341-342。

[18] 同上，頁348-349。

[19] 同上，頁348。

[20] 《傅雷全集》18，頁57。

[21] 同上。

[22] 金梅，《傅雷傳》，長沙：湖南文藝出版社，1996；葉永烈，《傅雷一家》，天津：天津人民出版社，1992；金聖華編，《傅雷與他的世界》，香港：三聯書店，1994。

[23] 肖紅、許鈞，〈試論傅雷的翻譯觀〉，《四川外語學院學報》2002年第3期；許鈞，〈作者、譯者和讀者共鳴與視界融合——文本再創造的個案批評〉，《中國翻譯》2002年第3期；許鈞，〈“形”與“神”辨〉，《外國語》2003年第2期。

[24] 見〈傅雷致宋淇函，1953年2月7日〉，《因難見巧：名家翻譯經驗談》，頁201-202。

[25] 羅新璋，〈出版說明〉，《傅雷全集》1，頁XIII。

[26] 《傅雷家書》，頁374。

[27] 白先勇，〈談小說中的“人”與“地”〉，《明報月刊》2002年1月，頁73。

[28] 同上，頁74。

[29] 喬志高，《恍如昨日》，香港：天地圖書有限公司，2003，頁342。

[30] 陳子善，〈傅雷先生的《法行通信》〉，見《傅雷與他的世界》，頁226。

[31] 金聖華，〈傅雷與巴爾扎克〉，見《傅雷與他的世界》，頁280-281。

[32] 同上，頁285。

[33] 《傅雷家書》增訂第五版，北京：三聯書店，1999，頁339。

[34] 同上，頁343。

[35] 司徒華，〈“周到”和“謙厚”〉，《明報》2000年9月23日。

[36] 《傅雷文集》，〈書信卷上〉，安徽文藝出版社，頁8-29、141-144。

[37] 余光中，〈成語和格言〉，《香江文壇》2004年4月號，頁27。

[38] 張嘉倫，〈以余譯《梵谷傳》為例論白話文語法的歐化問題〉，台中：台灣東海大學中國文學研究所碩士論文，1993年。

[39] 狄阿娜夫人為彌拉的後母。

[40] 羅新璋語，見金聖華，《認識翻譯真面目》，香港：天地圖書有限公司，2002，頁108。

作者簡介

金聖華，香港崇基學院英語系畢業，美國華盛頓大學碩士，法國巴黎大學博士；現任香港中文大學翻譯系講座教授及香港翻

譯學會會長，中國翻譯工作者協會理事及福建師範大學外國語學院客座教授。1990 至 1992 年任香港翻譯學會會長，任內曾籌辦十項大型活動，籌募翻譯基金，並創設本港首項翻譯獎學金。1998 至 2000 年為香港中文大學籌辦“第一屆新紀元全球華文青年文學獎”，2002 年則推出第二屆文學獎。金教授曾編撰多本著作，如《橋畔閒眺》、《打開一扇門》、《一道清流》、《英譯中：英漢翻譯概論》、《英語新辭辭彙》、《橋畔譯談：翻譯散論八十篇》、《傅雷與他的世界》、《因難見巧：名家翻譯經驗談》、《春來第一燕》、《認識翻譯真面目》、《譯道行》等；並翻譯出版多部文學作品，如麥克勒絲的《小酒館的悲歌》、康拉德的《海隅逐客》、厄戴克的《約翰·厄戴克小說選集》、布邁格的《石與影》和《黑娃的故事》，以及傅雷英法文書信中譯等，並為《翻譯學報》創刊主編，《外文中譯研究與探討》及《翻譯教學研討會論文集》主編。1997 年 6 月因對推動香港翻譯工作貢獻良多而獲 OBE（英帝國官佐）勳銜。

語言學途徑的語篇轉向和發展

李運興

Abstract

The Textual Turn and the Future of the Linguistic Approach (by Li Yunxing)

This article starts with a critical review of the development of Translation Studies in the past 50 years. It argues that Translation Studies features three major approaches due to the inflow of ideas from different disciplines, and that the linguistic approach took a textual turn in the 1990s, which points to a new research paradigm. The article then elaborates on the prospects of the paradigm in terms of research method, scope, procedure and corpora.

一、翻譯研究模式和理論移植途徑

按研究模式，現代翻譯研究可分為對比模式、過程模式和因果模式（comparative model, process model, causal model）等三種（Chesterman 2000: 15-21）。對比模式涉及兩個或兩個以上語篇，這些語篇可以是不同語言中的，也可以是同一語言中的。過程模式着眼於翻譯操作中的決策、選擇等心理活動及翻譯各階段間的序列關係。因果模式旨在建立翻譯活動中情景、社會、文化

等因素與其所導致的翻譯決策、選擇和譯文功能間的因果關係。

按理論移植途徑來看，翻譯研究可大致分為以其主要理論供體學科（donor discipline）為準的語言學途徑、文化學途徑和文學途徑等。在這方面，不同學者的分類，有粗有細，不盡相同，但大同小異。比如，Hermans（1998: 155）例舉出語言學（包括結構語言學、語篇語言學、心理語言學）、符號學、社會文化和文學等四大途徑。譚載喜（2000: 40）也提出過類似的文藝學途徑、語言學途徑、交際學途徑、社會符號學途徑和翻譯學途徑等。前面四種顯然也是按主要供體學科分類的，但最後一種的分類參照點似與前面有所不同。^[1]

研究模式和理論途徑之間的聯繫是顯而易見的。對比模式主要移植語言學理論，過程模式移植認知理論、心理學理論，而因果模式則倚重於文化學、文學和社會學理論。

按模式和途徑兩個角度觀察當前的翻譯研究，具有很強的概括力和啟示性。模式是一種橫向的分類，途徑則可揭示出不同模式和流派的發展脈絡。下面就以理論移植途徑為主線，按語言學、文化學和文學等三大途徑對翻譯研究的歷程進行一番回顧和反思，以期對今後的發展有所啟迪。

二、三大途徑和兩大流派

語言學理論用於翻譯者，主要是句法學、語義學、語用學和語篇語言學／話語分析。

句法學和語義學有助於揭示“每種語言與另一種語言相比，

總會存在許多差別和錯位”（Fawcett 1997: 19）的事實。因此，“源語和譯語諸詞項極少具有語言學意義上的同等的意義；卻可能同樣的情景中行使功能。”（Catford 1965: 49）這種認識導致了許多基於實際語料的對翻譯中句法結構和語義處理方法的總結和描述（國外如 Malone 1988；國內如譚載喜，2000: 73-85）。

語用學關注語言使用和語言使用者之間的關係，即語篇的意圖和功能的實現。語用研究中的語言行為理論（speech act theory）、關聯理論、合作原則（cooperative principle）及預設（presupposition）等概念均已被植入翻譯研究領域（如 Hatim、Gutt 等）。

語篇語言學／話語分析可植入翻譯研究的概念和模式非常之豐富：從語篇自身結構的銜接、連貫和主位推進模式到涉及語言與使用／使用者關係的語域和語境，以至涉及社會／文化因素對語篇的制約和影響的批評語篇分析理論。語篇語言學具有注重交際語境的寬泛理論框架，這使之最有可能成為語言學途徑中的帶頭供體學科（李運興，1999）。

Bassnett 和 Lefevere（1990）宣佈了翻譯研究中發生的文化轉向，“研究的目的已被重新定義。研究對象是嵌於源語文化和譯語文化符號網路中的語篇，這樣，翻譯研究學派既可以運用語言學方法，也可以超越它的局限。”不過，儘管他們聲稱語言學方法和文化學方法是同等重要的，十餘年來的實踐表明，翻譯研究學派所關注和做出貢獻的領域是翻譯活動的歷史、文化和社會層面。它擺脫了語言學方法對“對等”的關注，轉而探討影響譯語語篇構建的相關因素，強調語篇構建過程中的社會／文化制約。總之，翻譯研究學派從日益關注多元性和社會學研究方法的文化

研究中汲取了很多養份，而與此同時，文化研究也在時時審視着翻譯活動的作用。

以文學理論為供體的移植有兩類：一是以 Even-Zohar 和 Toury 為代表的對俄國形式主義中的“系統”概念的移植；二是以 Venuti 為代表的對解構主義概念的移植。他們借鑒的是文學理論，所針對的翻譯研究領域也基本是文學翻譯。“系統”概念的移植導致了多元系統理論的形成。它關注翻譯文學在譯語文學多元系統中的作用，以及譯語多元系統——包括文化多元系統、宗教多元系統、政治多元系統、文學多元系統等——對翻譯作品的構建和存在的種種制約和影響。解構主義的翻譯觀則對作者／原文和譯者／譯文的關係提出了全新的理解：原文是靠譯文才得以生存的，原文的意義存在於不同時期、不同譯文的不斷闡釋之中。而譯者的任務則是凸顯語言間的差異，譯文不是原文的複製品而是與其形成平等的互補關係。它打破了語篇具有一成不變的內在價值的迷信，強調語篇的價值是由一系列權勢關係決定的。

上述理論途徑呈現出兩大跨學科移植趨勢：一是以語言學為供體學科的移植，二是以文化學、文學理論為供體學科的移植。前者常被稱為語言學派或科學派，後者即是 20 世紀 90 年代以來的翻譯研究中的文化轉向——下文稱之為文化派。借用 Tymoczko (2000) 的比喻，它們就如同物理學研究中的微觀（顯微鏡）和宏觀（望遠鏡）兩個視角，“從某種意義上說，開創了兩種新的無限序列：將語篇分割為越來越小的語言單位所帶來的實際上無盡的可能性，和將語篇與語境的諸多層次聯繫起來所產生的同樣是無盡無休的可能性。”但 Tymoczko 說的並不完全對，因為語言學派並沒有將語篇分為越來越小的單位。文化派倒確實是將語篇

和越來越多的文化／社會層面聯繫了起來，如語篇與權勢關係、女性主義、後殖民主義等等。

三、對兩大流派的認識

從兩大流派目前的研究內容來看。概略地說，語言學派注重的是作為語際交際的信息載體的文本——譯語語篇的構建規律；而文化派關注的則是作為跨文化交際的既成事實的翻譯現象，它何以如此，又如何在譯語文化中運作。它們各自偏重於翻譯活動的一個層面，移植不同的供體學科的相關理論。這兩種移植趨勢是並行的，而不是相悖的；應該相互補充，而不應相互排斥；應該在發展中相互借鑒、豐富，而不應各行其是，分道揚鑣。因為語言和文化本密不可分，語言本身就是文化，是文化的重要組成部份。只關注語篇本身的翻譯研究是不充份的，對語篇的研究必然要和文化因素聯繫起來；而對翻譯現象的文化思考也必然會反映到語篇特徵上來，沒有對語篇的觀察和描寫，文化思考也會成為無皮之毛，無以附焉。

再從翻譯研究的體系來看。根據 Holmes (1972) 的設想，在“純”翻譯研究（“pure”）的兩個分支之一的描寫研究中有三個範疇：^[2]針對產品（product-oriented）的描寫、針對過程（process-oriented）的描寫和針對功能（function-oriented）的描寫。語言學派針對的是作為語際交際活動產品的語篇，而文化派針對的則是翻譯在社會／文化系統中的功能。這兩個範疇所提供的描寫均可被輸入“純”翻譯研究的另一個分支——理論研究（theoretical）

中，以產生整體（general）或局部（partial）的翻譯理論。很明顯，所謂語言學派和文化派只不過是在兩個並列的範疇裏在工作而已。它們的發展和深化都有助於豐富描寫研究，進而也都有助於為翻譯理論的確立提供充份的支援。

一言以蔽之，翻譯研究中對語言學理論以及文化、文學理論的移植是並行不悖的，這兩條途徑應互有啟迪，互為借鑒。認為語言學理論的移植在近十幾年中已漸衰落，已經被文化學、文學，乃至人類學、闡釋學的移植取而代之——這種認識將同一學科領域中不同研究範疇的發展誤認為是科學研究範式（paradigm）的歷時更迭，^[1]未能從學科體系的角度理清其中的發展脈絡，認清其中的聯繫。

所以，準確地說，翻譯研究在整體上並未發生“文化轉向”。實際情況是，文化派開闢了一個新的與語言學派的針對產品的研究平行發展的描寫範疇。它從一開始就體現出明確的針對功能的研究傾向，屬於 Holmes（1988: 177）所謂“社會翻譯研究”（socio-translation studies）。它豐富和充實了翻譯描寫的內涵，但決不是語言學派的後續或更高發展階段。在“文化轉向”發生後，語言學的最新發現繼續被植入語言學派的研究中，語言學派仍在按自己的軌跡發展。如果說發生了甚麼轉向的話，我們倒應該說：隨着有關語言學理論的不斷發展以及對翻譯活動認識的深化，針對產品的描寫範疇中的跨學科移植倒確實發生了明顯的轉向。我們看到，靜態的對比語言學方法讓位於體系明確、強調語篇與語境關係的動態的語用學、語篇語言學理論；關注的焦點從對等、轉換轉向了語篇功能、語篇類型、語域等更具系統性的特徵。應該說，這種轉向是理論移植途徑上的重大進展，但卻

沒有引起應有的強調和重視。為了指稱方便，我們將這種轉向稱為語言學途徑的語篇轉向。

語言學途徑的語篇轉向，嚴格地說，出現在 90 年代，其標誌為 Basil Hatim 和 Ian Mason 於 1990 年發表的 *Discourse and the Translator*。^[4]這本著作突破機械的對比語言學方法，將語篇作為翻譯的策略制定級層，放在現實交際環境中加以考察，將對翻譯的觀察擴展到語篇的社會符號學層面。

德國的功能學派（skopos theory）也常常被歸入翻譯研究的語言學派（如 Gentzler 1993；Fawcett 1997）。但必須看到，功能派雖然始於對語篇類型的關注（Reiss 1997, *English translation: Chesterman* 1989），但其後來的發展途徑卻十分倚重於行為理論和交際理論的觀點。比如 Justa Holz-Mänttari 便強調翻譯的行為層面（actional aspects），還植入了生物控制論（biocybernetics）的有關觀點用以解釋作為社會存在的人相互協調和合作的條件（Nord 1997）。^[5]

四、語言學途徑的發展

我們討論了語言學途徑和文化學途徑的特點和關係，那麼，語言學途徑會怎樣發展呢？可以作出兩點回答：（一）它將按自己的軌跡和規律發展成一個更加成熟和自立的翻譯研究分支；（二）在經歷了語篇轉向（textual turn）之後，它會進一步發生語境轉向（contextual turn）。

先說第一點。說語言學途徑沒有終結，因為它自身已有積

蓄，源頭仍有活水。

首先，過去 50 年來語言學的發展已經而且還將為翻譯研究提供可移植或可借鑒的理論概念和模式。“語言學的主要研究目標已經不僅僅是語言系統本身（如索緒爾的 *langue*），而是語言在各種交際環境中是如何被使用的，語境、語類、認知、社會文化、歷史、思想意識等因素與交際中的語言是如何相互作用和影響的。”（Schäffner 2002: 1）其次，正如我們在“對兩大流派的認識”一節中所提到的，語言學途徑在整個翻譯研究的體系中佔有其不可替代的位置，要對人類的翻譯活動有所認識，這是一個最基本的層面。最後，50 年來語言學途徑的發展已經奠定了一定的理論基礎。語言學途徑在經歷了語篇轉向之後，作為翻譯研究中一種獨特的話語，已經能夠構建起相當寬泛的框架，這個框架遠比所移植的概念的簡單相加要大得多。比如 Hatim 和 Mason (1990: 58) 的三維語境模式（*three-dimensional model of context*）就是一個集功能語法、語用學和符號學有關概念的話語框架，為語言的使用和使用者之間、語篇和外部世界之間提供了相互聯繫的界面。於是，語域分析便擴展到“可以解釋交際過程的種種複雜情況的高度”。（Hatim and Mason 1990: 75）在他們的模式中，交際維度再加上語用維度和符號維度，使翻譯學者可以獲得一種新鮮的視野，從而突破了較早時候語言學途徑的以句為觀察點的圈囿，把各種語境因素，不管是切近的還是稍遠的，都包括在了翻譯研究的視野之中。

Fawcett (1997: 2) 在談到語言學和翻譯的關係時說：

語言學和翻譯的關係可以是雙重的，即可以將語言學的發現運用

於翻譯實踐，也可以確立翻譯的語言學理論，比方說，與翻譯的文學、經濟學或心理學理論相對應。

我把這兩重關係看做兩種有區別意義的研究取向：第一種可能導致離散狀的理論闡述，第二種則有希望向體系化方向發展。在將語言學有關理論移植到翻譯研究時研究人員有一個站位的問題。站在語言學者的立場上，意圖大半是說明某一語言學概念的解釋性如何強大，而站在翻譯學者的立場上，則會以引進的理論作為工具，進而建立翻譯研究的語言學體系。這兩種研究取向所遵循的日程表也會大相徑庭。第一種從已存在的語言學理論開始，然後用翻譯材料予以印證；第二種先要觀察有哪些特定的翻譯現象，然後用語言學理論予以描寫和解釋，並不可避免地要進行某些變通。第一種可能到頭來仍在某語言學理論中轉圈子，除了可能為翻譯學者提供一些不同的角度，或更糟些，只是平添了一些術語和行話，於翻譯理論建設並無大補；而第二種，則有希望導致對翻譯研究體系建設的更多思考，對所植入的理論進行進一步的甄別、篩選和相互融合。現在存在着這樣一種危險性，翻譯研究可能被分割而納入有關學科的應用領域，使翻譯研究體系的建立成為泡影。所以，成功的跨學科移植必須能夠建立起一個開放的系統，一個能接納和融合更多理論概念，能夠按所確立的研究思路對語料進行分析的開放系統。

再說第二點。語言學途徑在經歷了語篇轉向之後，還會如何發展呢？這已經可從語言學途徑的最新發展中看到一些端倪。Fawcett (1997: 145) 在 *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained* 一書的最後一節“Conclusion and Perspectives”中說：

早期的語言學翻譯理論 (earlier linguistic theories of translation) 主要屬於對比語言學，這還不是翻譯語言學 (translation linguistics)，但仍然是翻譯研究的重要組成部份。沒有系統的對比便沒有討論的基礎。但這種對比需要打破——實際上已經打破了——區別語義學和語法 (differential semantics and grammar) 的局限，從而擴展到一個更廣泛的領域：研究語篇結構和功能、研究翻譯的社會—文化功能，以及時間、地點等因素如何制約語篇的發生。

這段話有兩點值得注意。其一，他提出了“早期的語言學翻譯理論”和“翻譯語言學”兩個相對照的概念。要建立“翻譯語言學”就需要更廣泛地從語言學中植入相關的理論，並將其融合為對翻譯現象具有強大而切實的描寫和解釋力的理論框架。它不再是語言學的分支，而是獨立的體系。其次，他正確地指出語言學途徑應涵蓋翻譯的社會／文化和功能範疇。這正是語言學途徑今後一段時間的發展方向。Basil Hatim 和 Ian Mason 已經將一種 Halliday 式的文化、思想意識概念引入他們的研究。但 Munday (2001: 102) 對此似有微詞：“他們的發現頗具啟示性，但儘管分析了一系列的語篇類型（書面的和口頭的），他們的焦點卻常常是以語言學為主導的，包括使用的術語和考察的現象（如‘辭彙選擇’、‘銜接’、‘及物性’、‘風格轉換’和‘譯者介入’等）。”這種批評實屬言不中的。語言學途徑的焦點就是語篇對比，儘管它已帶上功能和文化的傾向，但永遠不會成為文化派或文學派，它應該而且必須繼續保持它以產品描寫為導向的特點，這也正是它的價值所在。

語言學途徑要想重振活力，有兩方面的工作要做。第一繼續致力於語篇分析，分析的工具應不局限於語篇語言學，還應吸收敘事學、語用學和文體學的有益成份，使對語篇的觀察和認識能有所提高。第二要在語篇形態 (text configuration) 分析中開闢一個語境層面，使歷時和共時的社會—文化因素、語篇使用者和語篇的構建產生合理的聯繫。這兩點，尤其是第二點，就是語言學途徑今後的走向——語境轉向。

這似乎是向文化學途徑的靠攏，或更應該說是一種借鑒，而實質上，語言學途徑仍然是它自己，這種發展是它自身的需要，語篇分析歸根到底離不開語境，語篇的特點都可視為社會—文化語境的標引 (index)，而整個語篇作為一個宏觀的語義結構，其意義只能在特定的語境中才能準確地體現。

Snell-Hornby (1995: 31) 就曾提出一個綜合模式 (integrated model)，試圖在以語篇類型和功能為基礎的研究範式中引入文化—社會因素。這種綜合模式實際上並不是兩種研究範式的充份融合，其本質及主導思路仍然是文本類型／功能論。但它的自上而下的格式塔 (gestalt) 模式給我們的啟示是，對語篇的描寫可以是雙向的，既可從語篇到社會／文化，也可以從社會文化到語篇。

五、研究方法

描寫翻譯研究 (DTS) 由 Holmes (1972) 提出，一直被認為是與規範方法相對的最切合翻譯研究實際的研究方法。規範方法從理念出發演繹翻譯原則（翻譯應該是怎樣的），描寫方法從翻

譯現實出發歸納翻譯規律（翻譯是怎樣的）。從方法論的角度講，從具體事實中總結出一般性結論的歸納和從一般到特殊的演繹，都是可行的推理論證方法，但為甚麼當今的翻譯研究卻普遍推崇以歸納推理為主導的描寫方法呢？這是由翻譯研究自身的特點決定的。20 世紀後半葉，西方的語言學取得了突飛猛進的發展，使翻譯學者有可能在自己的研究中植入相關論點，深化對翻譯固有論題的認識。但很快他們就發現，純語言學理論所能提供的理論工具遠不夠充份，因為翻譯活動牽涉的遠遠不止語言這一個層面，於是更多的相關學科的理論被植入，使翻譯研究成為一個十分龐雜的具有跨學科性質的邊緣學科。迄今為止，植入的理論尚處於相互碰撞，衝突，磨合的過程中，要形成一個自足的理論體系，尚待時日，尚需努力。翻譯研究中的理論植入和綜合發展到目前的水平，還不足以進行演繹式的規範性論證。我們急需確立一個描寫體系，去真實地反映以語篇構建為焦點的翻譯活動的運作情況，進而找到理論闡發點，進行歸納和概括。這便是為甚麼描寫方法應成為當前研究的主導方法的根本原因。

語言學途徑的發展，從方法論上講，當然也要堅持描寫的方法。而具體實施起來，則需要注意以下三個方面：

（一）要採取從實際翻譯現象中歸納翻譯規律的方法。但必須注意，這裏的歸納不是具體語言學研究中為揭示某一種語言的內在機制而對其各個範疇所進行分析的單語描寫，也不是對比語言學中對兩種語言的語料的相應範疇進行的分析以揭示兩種語言的異同和相互聯繫的對比描寫。翻譯研究中的描寫應涵蓋誘發和促成譯語語篇生成的包括源語語篇結構特徵在內的語言、文化層面的諸多參數，應凸顯哪些由於受語言／文化規範、翻譯目的、

讀者期待等因素制約而產生的原文語篇在語義、語用和語篇結構層面所出現的轉換現象。

（二）要在確立語篇語言學在語言學途徑中的帶頭供體學科的地位的同時，對其他學科中與翻譯研究相關性強的理論兼收並蓄。近年來語用學越來越重視社會／文化因素以及使用者的認知因素對語言使用的影響（如 Verschueren 1999），也越來越關注語言功能對比模式的建立（如 Chesterman 1998）。翻譯研究應該能從中獲取相關性強的理論概念和模式。

（三）要注意克服語言學途徑自身在具體研究方法上已出現的弱點。最突出的有兩個。首先，對所移植理論的適用性的論證要以翻譯研究的事實為準繩，決定取捨，力戒牽強附會。比如，Malmkjaer (1998: 31) 在試圖將 Grice 的會話合作原則用於翻譯的時候，一方面正確地指出：“由於僅以書面形式為手段的交際者之間的物理的和／或空間的差距”以及“參與者無法，部份地，根據共享的背景知識判斷他們是否已經相互理解”，此項應用可能遭到很多困難。（其實，會話原則用於翻譯還面臨更複雜的情況：由於譯者的介入，作者的交際意圖被干擾、打斷，甚至被扭曲，原作者和譯文讀者間的合作關係很難成為現實。）而另一方面，又牽強地提出譯文中標點符號、拼字法的變化以及注解可以用合作原則加以解釋，說“這些調整可被理解為按合作原則所採取的補救策略：我們可以說編輯／譯者在試圖確保讀者獲得與原作讀者類似的理解線索。”（Malmkjaer 1998: 37）這樣的思路只能導致自相矛盾的結論：“它（合作原則）自身不能作為文學翻譯的理論……但很多翻譯現象可用它的概念和描寫術語相當系統地加以描寫。”（Malmkjaer 1998: 37）一面說一個理論從本質上

將很難運用，另一方面又用它牽強地解釋一些旁枝末節的翻譯現象，給人的印象，立論者不是從翻譯研究的角度探討該理論的適用性，倒像是從語言學家的角度在竭力兜售一種語言學工具。當某一個理論從原則上講並不適用的時候，它所包括的個別概念又能有多少解釋力呢？這時候，翻譯學者的任務只能是為這些翻譯現象尋找更有力的理論。

第二個弱點是，為了涵蓋所要論及的翻譯現象，將有關語言學概念過份擴展或延伸。Hatim (1998: 92) 就曾經把禮貌原則再定義為“滿足全部或某些對規範性和習慣性語境要求的預期，這些預期包括如下領域：語域類別、意圖以及所涉及的社會－文化和社會－語篇實踐。”而禮貌原則在語用學中一般只意味着“對他人表示關切的言語表達（比如：客氣、尊敬）”。(Swann, *et al.* 2004: 242) 將一個語言學概念過份地延伸，使它成為許多子概念的上義詞，至少導致兩個惡果，一是使諸多概念相互大幅度重疊，二是使一些概念泛化，無所不包，同時又不知所指。

總之，語言學途徑的深入發展，必須走對交際語境中的語篇進行系統描寫的路子，為稱謂方便，可簡稱為語篇描寫。我們需從研究方法和思路入手，建立包括描寫範疇、程序和語料在內的明確的研究範式。認同這一研究範式的學者，便可以加強交流、協同攻關，將這一研究領域推向深入。下面分別敘述。

六、語篇描寫的範疇

(一) 譯語語篇構建與源語語篇的關係。旨在觀察翻譯活動

發生時業已存在的源語語篇以及由其引發的譯語語篇在實現概念功能 (ideational function)、人際功能 (interpersonal function) 和成篇功能 (textual function) 方面的特點，以發現譯語語篇構建與源語語篇之間存在的聯繫，勾勒語際信息傳譯規律。這種研究取對比模式。其具體內容可涉及及物性、銜接、連貫、主位結構、互文性和語篇結構等。

(二) 譯語語篇構建與譯語原創語篇的關係。譯語語篇一旦構建完畢，被譯語讀者接受，即成為譯語文化中的一種語篇寫作形式。觀察它與譯語中同一體裁的語篇（一般是有相應體裁的）有何異同，往往可凸顯翻譯語篇作為一個特定語類 (genre) 的辭彙、句法、修辭、結構特徵，進而揭示原創語篇與翻譯語篇之間的互文關係。這與上面第一點一樣也屬於對比模式，只不過一個是語際對比，一個是語內對比。語內對比與語際對比的內容基本相同。就英語和漢語這一語言對組的研究而言，應特別注意信息結構和語篇結構上的差異。對以上兩個範疇的研究，主要理論移植供體學科是：語篇語言學、語用學等。

(三) 譯語語篇構建與翻譯語境的關係。翻譯語境指與譯語語篇構建有關的社會、文化、翻譯主體諸因素。^[6] 這一範疇的研究取因果模式。旨在觀察語境諸因素對語篇構建所造成的形式特徵上的可見後果。在這方面，文化研究、文學理論、社會語言學、交際理論、功能語法等均可提供有益的理論借鑒。具體內容應包括：與語言使用範圍有關的語域、語篇體裁；與翻譯活動發生有關的譯語語篇功能及社會／文化規範對語篇構建的制約、譯者的主體性^[7]等問題。

上述三個範疇，或三大關係的觀察和研究，前兩個是明顯的

對比模式和對比語言學途徑，後一個則體現出某種新的層面，也就是上文所謂的語境轉向。這一轉向有利於翻譯研究描寫分支的針對產品的描寫和針對功能的描寫兩個範疇既有分工又互容、互動地為理論分支提供切近翻譯實際的材料，是語言學途徑進一步發展和深化的必然。這裏還需要強調一點，語境轉向決不是語言學途徑向文化學途徑研究範式的轉移。它不是對作為籠統概念的翻譯活動與文化的關係的考察，而是仍然以語篇為研究的切入點和焦點，語境和譯者的行為必須與語篇結構掛起鉤來，都要“落實”到語篇特點上。

我們看到，語言學途徑的發展，一要加強對已植入理論的融合和體系化，二是借鑒文化學途徑、文學途徑，即文化派的研究方法。實際上如回顧一下前 30、40 年翻譯研究的歷程，就可看到不但語言學途徑出現了語篇／語境轉向（如 Hatim [1997] 對社會及權勢關係對翻譯行為的影響已有所關注），在文化學途徑的發展中也有關注語篇本身的傾向（如 Toury [1995] 就注重從譯語語篇與源語語篇對比中發現譯語社會／文化因素加於翻譯活動的種種“規範”，這是他描寫研究方法三個步驟中至關重要的第二步；德國 Göttingen 大學的研究人員也十分重視對文本進行文字學的分析 [Hermans 1999: 152-153]）。Gentzler (2001: 188) 也特別觀察到“一個縮小內部差別、導致不同學派間更多對話的令人鼓舞的過程已經開始。”這在客觀上有力地表明，描寫分支下的諸範疇是相互聯繫，相互滲透的。它們都在為理論提煉和綜合、抽象，做着中間層次上的準備。^[8]

七、語篇描寫程序

對翻譯研究這樣一門描寫－解釋性的經驗學科（empirical science），其研究工作必須強調語料、假設和驗證三個要素：語料是研究的基礎，假設是理論導向，驗證是理論提升的階梯。Newmark (1991: 5) 和 Hermans (1985: 10) 在論及翻譯研究時，就不約而同地把它看作是“概括與翻譯實例間不斷相互作用的過程”和“理論模式和實際個案研究不斷相互作用的過程”。

語篇描寫的程序可分為兩類，現概略地描述如下。

第一類：（一）從語篇對比研究（包括譯語語篇／源語語篇／原創語篇等的對比研究）中發現某些值得關注的翻譯現象（translation phenomenon），進行初步歸類；（二）針對這些翻譯現象，尋找相關性最強的理論模式或概念，提出具體的可釋性假設（interpretive hypothesis），即理論 X 可用於解釋翻譯現象 A；（三）將這些模式或概念運用於語料分析，提出描寫性假設（descriptive hypothesis），即翻譯現象 A 具有特徵 a, b, c...；及（四）對描寫性假設進行進一步的驗證和修訂，得出初步結論。

第二類：（一）從相關學科的理論著述中發現與翻譯活動和操作相關性較強的理論模式或概念，提出可行性假設（feasibility hypothesis），即理論 X 可能對翻譯現象提供有力解釋；（二）收集有關語料，驗證上述假設。驗證結果有三種可能：假設得到充份支持；假設必須加以變通和調整；假設不能成立；（三）如屬前兩種結果，即可提出描寫性假設；及（四）對描寫性假設進行進一步的驗證和修訂，得出初步結論。

這兩類程序，一個以語料為起點，一個以理論為起點。但這

兩種起點只是相對而言。以語料為起點者不可能理論為零，以理論為起點者也不可能對實踐一無所知。

上面提到可釋性假設、可行性假設和描寫性假設。可釋性和可行性假設在跨學科理論移植中至關重要。此類假設的提出，要基於對相關理論在其自身領域內的理論內涵、成熟程度，及其與移植所針對的範疇的相關性的分析和瞭解。描寫性假設是針對產品的描寫研究的核心，經過充份驗證得出的描寫性結論就是翻譯研究描寫分支的最終成果形式。描寫性假設一經確立便會具有某種闡釋／說明力量（Chesterman 2000: 26）。在這個基礎上便有可能將其輸入理論分支，提出某種解釋性或預見性假設（explanatory/predicative hypothesis），即翻譯現象 A 是由 Y 因素造成的，或 Y 因素會導致翻譯現象 A。這兩種假設的提出要倚重於第三個描寫範疇所提供的材料。這也從另一個角度說明，語言學途徑的深化必須經歷語境轉向的原因。

在語篇描寫研究範式中，語篇特徵被視為翻譯語境的語言形式標引，是交際參與者進行溝通和互動的介面（interface）。對比語言學的觀察結果被納入作者和譯者、譯者和讀者的雙重合作過程中去解釋和闡發。

八、語篇描寫材料

採用語篇描寫方法，語料的收集至關重要。這裏的語料是廣義的，它不僅指源語語篇、譯語語篇和譯語原創語篇諸級層的對照資料，也包括源語文化和譯語文化中相關社會／文化因素的對

照資料以及有關翻譯語境的資料。語料既可是一個語言／文化對組的資料，也可以是多語言／文化對組的資料。而後者尤應提倡。Wilss（1982: 79-80）曾將翻譯理論分為三類，其中特別區分出“考慮語言對組（language-pair-bound）的翻譯學”和“不考慮語言對組（language-pair-independent）的翻譯學”。只有有了充份的多語言對組的語料，才可克服單一語言對組語料可能帶來的片面性，提出更加普遍的翻譯規律。

按照 Baker（1995）的分類，語料庫可取三種形式：源語語篇加譯語語篇的平行式語料庫（parallel corpus）、包括多種語言中屬同一題材和體裁的語篇的多語式語料庫（multilingual corpus）和包括譯語語篇與譯語中同類語篇的對照式語料庫（comparable corpus）。這三種形式的語料庫，對翻譯研究具有重要價值的應屬平行式和對照式兩類。對平行式語料庫，Kenny（1998: 51）總結出三種用處：提供特定語言對組翻譯行為信息，提出源語和譯語間辭彙單位及結構上的某些對等關係，以及研究翻譯體現象。我們覺得，平行式語料庫的主要作用是提供語際信息傳譯的一手資料，揭示語言層面上的信息傳譯規律。源語語篇加譯語語篇可以是“一對一”，但也可以是“一對 X”，即同一原文加數個譯文的語料。這數個譯文出於不同譯者之手，還可能出於不同的時代和社會背景，有利於揭示文化／社會因素、個人因素對翻譯活動的影響。

翻譯研究語料庫的語料，主要應以句群的形式出現。這自然是由句群作為一個承上啟下的語篇級層的重要作用所決定的（李運興，2001: 43）。語料的分類標識（tagging）也是個十分關鍵的步驟。這主要取決於研究途徑，不同的研究途徑將導致不同的標

識體系。語篇語言學、語用學中的某些模式均可作為標識體系的參照。

可以預見，語料庫的建立對翻譯研究的內容和工作程序均會產生重大影響。它使跨學科理論移植有了堅實的實證基礎，使假設的提出、修改、驗證具有了充實的實踐支持，使研究人員慣於使用的印象式概括轉變為以語料為出發點的縝密的歸納和總結。語料庫為翻譯研究提供了有力的新工具，翻譯研究也同時對語料庫語言學“提出了特定的要求，翻譯研究的新發展可導致語料處理的新視角，正如語料庫業已導致了觀察翻譯的新視角一樣”（Kenny 1998: 53）。作為一種研究工具的語料庫的引進同樣要經歷一個“適存”（李運興，1999）的過程。

近年來隨着電腦的更新換代，相應軟體的研製，語料庫語言學取得了長足的進展。語料庫的材料不僅可以驗證理論假設，更可以對現有的語言理論提出質疑和挑戰，從而大大推進語言研究。但語料庫基本只用於單語研究，將其用於語際信息傳譯研究，還要進行許多開拓性的工作。

九、結 論

翻譯研究中的語言學派和文化派這兩大趨勢會如何發展呢？有的學者已表示了對“分裂”（fragmentation）的憂慮。比如，Munday（2001: 190）在談到翻譯研究的跨學科性質時就提出一個問題：“對整個領域來說，這在多大程度是有利的，又在多大程度上是不利的。”尤其是考慮到，在翻譯研究領域已經有人明確

表示對語言學派持排斥態度（Bassnett and Lefevere 1990），令人對翻譯研究的前景有撲朔迷離之感。然而，翻譯研究的發展當取決於科學研究的客觀規律，而不是個人好惡與取捨的問題。問題不是哪個派別取代哪個派別，而是這兩個派別各自如何發展。應當看到，幾十年的跨學科移植所成就的這兩個派別作為翻譯研究的範式都已出現了新意漸少，銳氣下降的趨勢。^[1] 如何為研究範式注入新的活力，優化跨學科移植途徑，才是當前急需探討的問題。

注釋

- [1] 談到翻譯研究所依循的理論途徑，我們傾向按植入的主要供體學科來分類，強調翻譯研究的跨學科移植這一概念（李運興，1999）。因此，我們認為不宜使用“翻譯學途徑”（譚載喜，2000: 51）的提法，因為它是綜合其他翻譯途徑的優點或特點的一個“綜合性途徑”；它的目的是建立“……既具語言學模式特徵，又有文藝學、交際學、社會符號學以及其他相關科學的特徵……”（譚載喜，2000: 53）的理論體系。它本身並沒有確立的理論模式，而只是跨學科移植過程中各植入理論模式或概念以帶頭供體學科（李運興，1999）為基礎相互融合和調整的翻譯學確立過程中的一個至關重要的階段。
- [2] Holmes（1972）用的是 foci 一詞，而 Toury（1995: 11）用的是 approach。
- [3] 範式是科學研究中建立起來的在一定時期內相對穩定的理論和方法論框架。Crane（1972: 40）提出範式總是要經歷一個由興盛至衰變的過程。當聚集在某一個範式下的研究群體出現才思枯竭，著述減少，新意難尋的時候，研究人員就會出現分流，要麼向更專更細的方向深入，要麼分化成不同流派，這將導致該範式的調整或向新的方向發展，或為新的範式所取代。但將此觀點用於語言學派和文化派之爭是

不恰當的。因為翻譯研究中由於植入語言學或文化學、文學等相關學科的理論而形成的研究範式，屬於整個翻譯研究體系中的不同範疇，它們自有其興衰規律，但無相互取代的問題。

- [4] 請注意，與此同時，Bassnett 和 Lefevere 聲稱翻譯研究已經出現“文化轉向”。另外，對早於他們 25 年前試圖用階與範疇語法構建翻譯的語言學理論的 Catford (1965)，他們有如下評價：“大部份的討論針對的只是語言系統的結構對比，而不是跨越文化障礙的交際；只是脫離語境的句子，而不是實際的語篇。”（Hatim & Mason 1990: 26）的確，Catford (1965) 的體系受理論供體的制約，語言級層到句子為止，更大的語言片段無法納入。他的體系雖然觸及語言形式和情景的聯繫，但仍然無法探討語言形式系統之外的文化、社會、情景等因素與翻譯的關係。
- [5] Venuti (2001: 315) 對現代譯學的發展做出過類似的分類：“In the 1990s, as translation begins to emerge as a scholarly discipline in its own right, two rather different paradigms appear to be driving research. On the one hand is an approach that can generally be called text linguistics, in which notions of equivalence are grounded on the classification of text types and functions. On the other hand is an approach that can generally be called cultural studies, which is concerned with how values, ideologies, and institutions shape practices differently in different historical periods.” 他這裏所說大致相當於本文所謂兩大途徑。但他所指的語篇語言學方法似乎僅僅包括德國的功能派所謂語篇類型和功能之說，而未重視 Hatim 等人的研究。
- [6] 過去我們曾將之稱為“翻譯情境”（translation situation）（李運興，2001: 30），而更嚴謹地說，它實際上是情景語境在語際信息傳譯中的一種外延，應單列為一種語境。
- [7] 譯者的主體性指譯者作為翻譯活動主體在促成語際交際方面所發揮的作用，如：譯者如何以自己的知識結構與源語語篇進行交流，又如何以自己的譯語寫作能力和對翻譯任務的理解來構建譯文。目的是揭示譯者作為翻譯活動的核心角色的行為規律。可移植的理論主要來自認

知心理學，對閱讀理解和寫作的研究成果等。

- [8] Hermans (1999: 160) 談到描寫翻譯研究的發展時，引用了 McHale (1994) 的觀點：描寫詩學中，抽象理論和原始語篇（primary text）間必須有一個被稱為中間層次的描寫層次。Hermans (1999: 160) 認為，翻譯研究中的描寫研究正是處於這樣一個中間層次上，既可考察理論假設又不失去與翻譯活動的社會歷史聯繫。
- [9] Hermans (1999: 15) 就提到過這個問題。他認為文化派的“Even-Zohar 和 Toury 的某些近著已失去銳意”。語言學派也有類似情況，審視一下 Hatim 的 *Communication Across Cultures* 確實給人以新意不多的印象。

參考文獻

- Baker, Mona (1995). “Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research”. *Target* 7 (2): 223-243.
- , ed. (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere, eds. (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, Andrew (1998). *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . (2000). “A Causal Model for Translation Studies”. In *Intercultural Faultlines*. Ed. Maeve Olohan. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Crane, Diana (1972). *Invisible Colleges. Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Fawcett, Peter (1997). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London & New York:

- Routledge.
- _____. (2001). *Contemporary Translation Theories* (Revised 2nd Edition). London & New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, Basil (1997). *Communication Across Cultures*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Hermans, Theo, ed. (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. St. Martin's Press.
- _____. (1998). "Models of Translation". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London & New York: Routledge.
- _____. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Holmes, James S. (1972). "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies". In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London & New York: Routledge (2000).
- Kenny, Dorothy (1998). "Corpora in Translation Studies". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London & New York: Routledge.
- Malone, Joseph L. (1988). *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- McHale, Brian (1994). "Whatever Happened to Descriptive Poetics?" In *The Point of Theory: Practices of Cultural Analysis*. Ed. Mieke Bal & Inge Boer. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Munday, Jeremy (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, Peter (1991). *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Nord, Christiane (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Reiss, Katharina (1997/89). "Text Types, Translation Types and Translation Assessment". Trans. A. Chesterman. In *Readings in Translation Theory*. Ed. A. Chesterman. Helsinki: Finn Lectura (1989), 105-115.

- Schäffner, Christina, ed. (2002). *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Swann, Joan, et al. (2004). *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2000). "Connecting the Two Infinite Orders: Research Methods in Translation Studies". A paper presented at the Conference on Research Models in Translation Studies, April 28-30, London.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2001). "American Tradition". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London & New York: Routledge.
- Verschueren, Jef (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Wilss, Wolfram (1982). *The Science of Translation*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- 李運興 (1999), 〈翻譯研究中的跨學科移植〉, 《外國語》1。
- _____. (2001), 《語篇翻譯引論》, 中國對外翻譯出版公司。
- 譚載喜 (2000), 《翻譯學》, 湖北教育出版社。

作者簡介

李運興，天津師範大學外國語學院教授，翻譯研究所所長。多年從事英漢語翻譯教學及研究工作，主要著述有：《英漢語篇翻譯》（清華大學出版社，1998）、《英漢語篇翻譯—第二版》（清華大學出版社，2003）以及《語篇翻譯引論》（中國對外翻譯出版公司，2001）。目前研究方向：翻譯研究中的語言學途徑。承擔天津市社科項目“翻譯研究中的語篇描寫”。

BOOK REVIEW



Classical Chinese Literature in Translation: New Perspectives on Old Traditions

Wang Mingyue

One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature (Approaches to Translation Studies: Volume 18). Edited by Leo Tak-hung Chan. Amsterdam and New York: Editions Rodopi B. V., 2003, 369 pp. ISBN 90-420-0815-6.

Rarely explored in the field of translation research is the translation of canonical works from one language into many. *One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature* is the first anthology of its kind in English that deals in depth with the translation of classical Chinese texts into a host of Western and Asian languages: English, French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Swedish, Hebrew, Slovak and Korean. *One into Many* provides comprehensive information on the translations of classical Chinese texts into various cultures and combines the latest ideas on translation to explore the area of translation studies.

Apart from the "Introduction" and "Conclusion" written by the editor, Leo Tak-hung Chan, this anthology is divided into three sections, which are entitled "Beginnings", "Texts" and "Traditions" respectively. In the "Introduction", Leo Chan attempts to provide us with a new methodological tool for translation studies: the study of multiple

translations. According to Chan, all translations can be regarded as complementary to their originals, or "afterlives" of the originals in the new cultural milieus. Reading all the translations alongside the original language text can not only reveal the polysemantic possibilities of a text, but also offer information on the changes in translation styles, taste and ideology over a period of time. On the one hand, this methodology can show the combined strengths of the two latest translation theories—reception-minded and deconstruction-oriented theories on translation; on the other hand, it calls for the collaborative efforts of all scholars, for few are well versed in more than two languages.

The first section, "Beginnings", is composed of three articles and introduces the first translations in Europe of two Chinese texts—the *Haoqiu zhuan* and the *Mingxin baojian*. Kai-chong Cheung's "The *Haoqiu zhuan*, the First Chinese Novel Translated in Europe: With Special Reference to Percy's and Davis' Renditions" reviews the history of the reception of *Haoqiu zhuan* in Europe and compares the two English versions respectively by Percy and Davis. In his "Modern Translation Theory and Past Translation Practice: European Translations of the *Haoqiu zhuan*", James St. André argues that where a translator is informed by an "orientalist" perspective (to use Said's now famous term), the resulting translation would seem to work against Benjamin's notion of the "afterlife". After laying the theoretical ground, St. André compares the two English versions of *Haoqiu zhuan*, illustrating that Percy adopts a "more open attitude toward other cultures and is more likely to produce the kind of translation Benjamin calls for"; by contrast, Davis, who holds an "orientalist" attitude, tends to "produce translations which go against Benjamin's idea of what a good translation should strive for" (p. 61). In his "The First Translation of a Chinese Text into a Western Language: The 1592 Spanish Translation of *Precious Mirror for Enlightening the Mind*", Hing-ho Chang studies the transmission of *Mingxin baojian* into various

cultures, gives a biographical sketch of Juan Cobo, the Spanish translator, and concludes after studying the Spanish version that the book was co-translated by Cobo and others, and that Southern Min dialect left its imprint on the translation.

All the four articles in the second section of this anthology ("Texts") attempt, to a greater or lesser extent, to compare the original Chinese texts with the translations in more than one language. The multilingual comparison proposed by Leo Chan in the "Introduction" is testified to in this section, especially in the two articles by Laurence K. P. Wong and Birgit Linder. The section begins with André Lévy's "The *Liaozhai zhiyi* and *Honglou meng* in French Translation". Lévy first examines in great detail the French version of *Liaozhai zhiyi*, then introduces the translation of another well-known Chinese novel *Honglou meng* and compares a passage from David Hawkes' English translation with three French translations. He concludes from this illustration that "*Honglou meng* has at long last found in French a rendition not unworthy of its greatness" (p. 95). *Honglou meng* is the subject of another article in this section, Laurence Wong's "Voices Across Languages: The Translation of Idiolects in the *Honglou meng*". Wong approaches the problem from three different aspects: lexical, phonological and grammatical. After comparing the English, French, German and Italian versions, he demonstrates how Hawkes has successfully translate the idiolects into English. Paula Varsano's contribution moves the debate from prose to poetry. Entitled "Emptiness-as-Ambiguity: Hybrid Poetics and François Cheng's Translations of Tang Poetry into French", it enumerates the poetic strategies adopted by Cheng, and highlights the empty spaces deliberately created in his translations. In her "Miss Cui Takes a Hermeneutic Turn: *Yingying zhuan* and Its Various Translations and Retranslations", Birgit Linder uses Popovic's concept of "shifts" to compare the Dutch, German and English versions of the *Yingying zhuan*, and concludes that "[T]he

hermeneutic approach to literary translations allows us to look at a text from various perspectives." The translations she discusses, "taken together as a hermeneutic circle, provide a more comprehensive understanding of the *Yingying zhuan*" (p. 173).

The third section of this volume, consisting of six articles, addresses the reception of Chinese texts in six "Traditions"—Korea, Sweden, Holland, Germany, Bohemia/Slovakia and Israel. In his "The Translation of Chinese Philosophical Literature in Korea: The Next Generation", Young Kyun Oh observes the dramatic changes in the Korean translations of classical Chinese texts in the twentieth century in relation to the rise of the vernacular. He distinguishes two groups of translators: those of the pre-1980s and those of the post-1980s, whose attitudes toward translation are almost contradictory. Evangeline S. P. Almqvist's "From Apology to a Matter of Course: A Century of Swedish Translation of Classical Chinese Poetry (1894-1994)" describes the history of the reception of Chinese poetry in twentieth-century Sweden, illustrating the changing attitudes of Swedish translators from "apology" to "a matter of course" and the increasing interest of Chinese poetry among Swedish readers. Another rich European tradition of classical Chinese translation, the Dutch tradition, is addressed by Wilt L. Idema, who has himself translated many traditional Chinese texts into Dutch. In his "Dutch Translations of Classical Chinese Literature: Against a Tradition of Retranslation", he demonstrates how Dutch translation practice has shifted: where translations were once made indirectly from other Western languages, this now has become rare.

The remaining articles in this third section cover a wide range, from the German translation tradition to other cultural traditions whose encounter with classical Chinese works has hitherto perhaps been less well-documented. In her "China in German Translation: Literary Perceptions, Canonical Texts, and the History of German Sinology",

Birgit Linder provides a rather detailed review of Chinese texts in translation in Germany from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. She concludes that "in three centuries of German sinology, the establishment of a translated literary canon was influenced by cultural currents of the time, political events in China and Germany, and philosophical-ideological factors" (p. 273). Marián Gálik's overview of "Tang Poetry in Translation in Bohemia and Slovakia" provides an insight into a less well-known tradition. Gálik suggests that important cross-cultural influences have been brought into play through translation; Czech readers, for instance, have gained much from the religious and aesthetic values of traditional Chinese literature. Hebrew is another linguistic tradition with which readers in the Chinese translation field may be unfamiliar. In her article "A Critical Survey of Classical Chinese Literary Works in Hebrew", Irene Eber passes personal judgments on the quality of two kinds of Hebrew translations: those translated from intermediary languages and those translated directly from Chinese. She notes Hebrew readers' interest in Chinese literature and draws the conclusion that a translator should be equipped with both linguistic ability and cultural awareness.

In his concluding article entitled "Translation, Transmission, and Travel: Culturalist Theorizing on 'Outward' Translations of Classical Chinese Literature", Leo Chan offers a critical appraisal of several studies of the translations of classical Chinese texts in the past decade or so. He brings forth a new metaphor of translation—travel, which can reveal the processes of cultural communication via translation in a comprehensive way and sharpen our perception of translation against the global backdrop. By using the translations of Chinese literary texts into a multiplicity of foreign languages as examples, Chan first examines "what" and "how" the Chinese texts were transmitted in their "travels" to other cultures, then criticizes some Chinese scholars' distorted, or

somewhat hegemonic, attitudes towards the reception of translations of Chinese literature in other countries. At the end of the article, he concludes that it is futile to expect some "original essence" in Chinese culture to be transmitted by the translation; nevertheless it is a relief for us to know that "translation enables cultures to be shared".

In the past half century scholars have begun to study translation from many new perspectives, among which the cross-disciplinary research method of combining linguistic analysis with cultural studies has flourished. In *One into Many*, comparisons are made between originals and translations as one takes into consideration texts in their cultural environments. To sum up, *One into Many*, which is substantial in content, indicates an integration of theory and practice and provides a new approach to study translation which involves looking at the translations of canonical works from one language into many. All the contributors are well-known scholars in the field of translation, Sinology or cultural studies. This anthology is a good reference book for Sinologists, cultural critics and translation researchers.

About the Author

Wang Mingyue teaches at the Beijing Language and Culture University.

稿約凡例

《翻譯季刊》為香港翻譯學會之學報，歡迎中、英文來稿及翻譯作品（請附原文及作者簡介）。有關翻譯作品及版權問題，請譯者自行處理。

一、稿件格式

1. 請郵寄電腦檔案及列印本。
2. 來稿請附 200-300 字英文論文摘要一則，並請注明：
(1) 作者姓名；(2) 任職機構；(3) 通訊地址／電話／傳真／電子郵件地址。
3. 來稿均交學者審評，作者應盡量避免在正文、注釋、頁眉等處提及個人身份，鳴謝等資料亦宜於刊登時方附上。
4. 來稿每篇以不超過一萬二千字為宜。

二、標點符號

1. 書名及篇名分別用雙尖號（《》）和單尖號（〈〉），雙尖號或單尖號內之書名或篇名同。
2. “ ” 號用作一般引號；‘ ’ 號用作引號內之引號。

三、子目

各段落之大小標題，請依各級子目標明，次序如下：

一、／ A.／ 1.／ a.／(1)／(a)

四、專有名詞及引文

1. 正文中第一次出現之外文姓名或專有名詞譯名，請附原文全名。
2. 引用原文，連標點計，超出兩行者，請另行抄錄，每行入兩格；凡引原文一段以上者，除每行入兩格外，如第

一段原引文為整段引錄，首行需入四格。

五、注釋

1. 請用尾注。凡屬出版資料者，請移放文末參考資料部份。號碼一律用阿拉伯數目字，並用（）號括上；正文中之注釋號置於標點符號之後。
2. 參考資料
文末所附之參考資料應包括：(1) 作者／編者／譯者；(2) 書名、文章題目；(3) 出版地；(4) 出版社；(5) 卷期／出版年月；(6) 頁碼等資料，務求詳盡。正文中用括號直接列出作者、年份及頁碼，不另作注。

六、版權

來稿刊登後，版權歸出版者所有，任何轉載，均須出版者同意。

七、書評

中文書評格式與中文稿例同。

八、贈閱本

論文刊登後，作者可獲贈閱本三冊。書評作者可獲贈閱本兩冊。凡合著者，以均分為原則。

九、評審

來稿經本學報編輯委員會審閱後，再以匿名方式送交專家評審，方決定是否採用。

十、來稿請寄：香港屯門嶺南大學翻譯系轉《翻譯季刊》主編陳德鴻博士。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. *Translation Quarterly* is a journal published by the Hong Kong Translation Society. Contributions, in either Chinese or English, should be original, hitherto unpublished, and not being considered for publication elsewhere. Once a submission is accepted, its copyright is transferred to the publisher. Translated articles should be submitted with a copy of the source-text and a brief introduction of the source-text author. It is the translator's responsibility to obtain written permission to translate.
2. Abstracts in English of 200-300 words are required. Please attach to the manuscript with your name, address, telephone and fax numbers and email address where applicable.
3. In addition to original articles and book reviews, review articles related to the evaluation or interpretation of a major substantive or methodological issue may also be submitted.
4. Endnotes should be kept to a minimum and typed single-spaced. Page references should be given in parentheses, with the page number(s) following the author's name and the year of publication. Manuscript styles should be consistent; authors are advised to consult the *MLA Handbook* for proper formats.
5. Chinese names and book titles in the text should be romanised according to the "modified" Wade-Giles or the pinyin system, and then, where they first appear, followed immediately by the Chinese characters and translations. Translations of Chinese terms obvious to the readers (like *wenxue*), however, are not necessary.

6. There should be a separate reference section containing all the works referred to in the body of the article. Pertinent information should be given on the variety of editions available, as well as the date and place of publication, to facilitate use by the readers.
7. All contributions will be first reviewed by the Editorial Board members and then anonymously by referees for its suitability for publication in *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves on the first page, in the top or bottom margins, or in endnotes. A separate cover page with the title of the article, the name of the author and his/her institutional affiliation should be provided.
8. Book reviews are to follow the same format as that for submitted articles; they should be typed and doubled-spaced, giving at the outset the full citation for the work reviewed, plus information about special features (like appendices and illustrations) and prices. Unsolicited book reviews are as a rule not accepted.
9. Contributions should be submitted in both soft and hard copies, to Dr. Leo Tak-hung Chan, c/o Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong.
10. Contributors of articles will receive three complimentary copies of the journal, but these will be shared in the case of joint authorship. Book reviewers will receive two complimentary copies.