

Translation Quarterly

No. 43 2007

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇七年
第四十三期

《翻譯季刊》

Translation Quarterly

二〇〇七年三月 第四十三期

No. 43, March 2007

版權所有，未經許可，不得轉載。

All Rights Reserved

Copyright © 2007 THE HONG KONG TRANSLATION SOCIETY

ISSN 1027-8559-43



Printing sponsored by

C & C OFFSET PRINTING CO., LTD.

中華商務彩色印刷有限公司

贊助印刷



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

執行編輯 **Executive Editors**

倪若誠 Robert Neather 潘漢光 Joseph Poon

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

楊慧儀 Jessica Yeung

編輯委員會 **Editorial Board**

劉靖之 (主席) Liu Ching-chih (Chairman)

陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan 金聖華 Serena Jin

黎翠珍 Jane Lai 倪若誠 Robert Neather

潘漢光 Joseph Poon 黃國彬 Laurence Wong

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

目錄 CONTENTS

vi Editor's Note

論文 Articles

- 1 英語新詞的構成與翻譯問題 羅志雄
- 23 翻譯與政治：剪不斷，理還亂
——談“李啟純”翻譯的《百獸圖》 白立平
- 63 History, Thought, and Translation (I):
Against a Tradition of Sinological
Translations *Leo Tak-hung
Chan*

書評 Book Review

- 87 Shall I Compare Thee to a “Femme
Fidèle”? *Lie Jianxi*

- 95 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors
- 99 徵求訂戶啟事 Subscribing to
Translation Quarterly
- 101 訂閱表格 Subscription and Order Form

Editor's Note

Three articles – two by Hong Kong scholars, and one by a Mainland student who has come to Hong Kong to undertake his Ph.D. studies, thus enjoying “the best of both worlds” – are featured in the present issue. Lo Chi Hong, who was made an Honorary Fellow of the Hong Kong Translation Society in 2005, presents his views on the formation of English neologisms and suggests eight methods of tackling them in translation. His article abounds with vivacious examples from the past half century, reminding writers and translators of their decades-long flirtation with a wide range of new words coined in the fields of commerce, technology, medicine, politics and art. Some of his solutions to the translation problems these neologisms present are nothing short of novel in themselves.

A translated novel is the subject of discussion in Bai Liping's contribution, although the approach here is evidently a mixture of the evidentiary and the literary-critical. Bai presents a chapter from his dissertation on the Chinese translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, giving meticulous consideration to the intriguing case of a translation possibly attributable to the eminent Chinese translator of Shakespeare, Liang Shiqiu. Bai musters an arsenal of evidence to prove his point, and the reader can decide, after reading the article, if the case is indeed closed.

Concluding the issue is Leo Chan's article relating the

translation of Ge Zhaoguang's highly influential two-volume *History of Chinese Thought* to the tradition of sinological translations that began with such renowned translators as James Legge and Herbert Giles. The reader is treated to, first, a brief survey of the principles of sinological translation as adumbrated by Roger Ames and Chad Hansen, among others; then, a discussion of the scholarly approach to the translation of non-literary Chinese materials; and finally, an account of current trends as well as future possibilities. Accompanying the article is Chan's translation of section one of the Introduction to the book, which reputedly presents "a new method of doing intellectual history".

Lie Jianxi's review of Wang Aixue's recent Chinese translation of Wordsworth's *The Prelude* reminds one of the kind of translation criticism that ought to be done more frequently. Although we are all agreed that the discipline has greatly flourished in the last decade, a puzzling fact is that, during the same period, the number of evaluations of literary translations (especially of translations into English) has dropped rather than increased, judging from the reviews published in the major journals of translation. Readers of this journal are encouraged to bring to the attention of our indefatigable Book Review Editor, Jessica Yeung, newly translated works that can be reviewed in the *Quarterly*.

The Editors

March 2007

英語新詞的構成與翻譯問題

羅志雄

Abstract

The Creation and Translation of English Neologisms (*by* Lo Chi Hong)

In this article the author begins with a consideration of the nature of English neologisms and, on the five principles of frequency of use, unobtrusiveness, diversity of users and situations, generation of other forms and meanings, and endurance of the concept, discusses why some of them last while others do not. He then studies the six different ways in which new words are formed in the English language, as well as eight methods commonly used by translators when rendering them into Chinese.

一、新詞語的產生

在英語世界中，每天都有數以百計的新詞新語產生。它們之中，有部分經過時間的考驗，會保留下來，成為英語詞彙大家庭的一份子；有部分作為專科詞彙，被收進專科辭典中；但是大多數都是曇花一現，轉眼便成為歷史，沒有被吸收入常用詞典中去。

詞典學界普遍認為，新出現的詞語，需要經過十到二十年的考驗，才能決定能否成為語言主體的成份。預測一個新詞語能否成功奠定它的地位，通常會使用一種稱為 FUDGE 的計分方法。FUDGE 含有五個計分元素，我們可以根據每個元素對新詞語打上 0, 1 或 2 分。如果一個新詞語能獲得 7 分以上，它的成功度會相當大。FUDGE 代表了下面五個元素：

F—Frequency of use：使用頻率（很顯然，使用頻率越高，評分越高；例如 Silicon Valley 雖然是美國加州的地名，但是由於它知名度高，常被引用，而且也被廣泛地用來指高科技（研發）中心，例如北京的中關村常被稱為中國的“硅谷”，所以 Silicon Valley 的使用頻率很高。然而，也有些詞語在不同的時間段中，F 的值會不一樣，例如 ground zero 在沉寂了幾十年以後因為九一一事件又被廣泛使用。）

U—Unobtrusiveness：不顯眼；不引人注目（新詞語越像普通的詞語，越容易為使用者所接受，例如 information superhighway 和 personal computer 等都是由兩個常用詞組合而成，雖然出現時間不長，看起來卻好像存在已久。）

D—Diversity of users and situations：使用者和使用場合的多元性（光是專家或特定場合才能使用的詞語，只會成為專用語或行話，評分也自然不高。有些專用語卻吸引到社會大眾的廣泛興趣，流傳甚廣，例如 space shuttle 本來是航天用語，但是現在已經成了家喻戶曉的常用詞。）

G—Generation of other forms and meanings：生成派生詞和其他語義的功能（有這種功能的詞語存在的能力相對強大。例如最近幾年才流行起來的 web blogging 或 webloging（網誌，網上

日誌，台灣的翻譯是“部落格”），就派生出了動詞 web blog 或 weblog（寫網誌，傳送網誌，閱讀網誌），名詞 web blogger 或 weblogger；然後又衍生了 blogging（先是專指用手機寫或閱讀、傳送網誌，後來更包含了歌曲，圖像等內容），blog 和 blogger；近月更出現了 vlogging（專門指把短片上載到手機上供別人觀看，或在手機上觀看別人上載的短片的行為）和 vlog，vlogger。由此可見，blogging 確實有很強的生命力，其存在的機會就非常高。又如 101 派生了多不勝數的用語，如 Golf 101，Romance 101，Pumpkin Carving 101，Grammy Fashion 101 等。）

E—Endurance of the concept：新詞語所代表的觀念和事物的生命力。舉一個例子，政治上正確的用語 rightsizing 的流行程度就遠不如 downsizing；90 年代初曾一度火紅的 CDI（CD Interactive）很快就被對手 CD-ROM 擊敗，現在已經銷聲匿跡了。

以下列舉最近年代出現的一些新詞語的發展以茲說明。

1940 年代出現的新詞，如 bikini，cheeseburger，fax，jet plane，spaceship，tape recorder，TV 等因被廣泛使用被保留下來，成為我們的日常用語。

1950 年代的新詞，aerospace，computerize，data processing，junk mail（詞義已經改變），skydiving 等歷久常新。

1960 年代的新詞中，cable television 戲劇性地重登舞臺，genetic code（遺傳密碼）又一次成了新寵兒，megabyte 和 sitcom，jet lag 等常見應用。

1970 年代出現的 chairperson，personal computer，Silicon Valley，video game 仍然如日方中，但是 diskette 已被 disk 取代，infomercial，passive smoking 等也仍被使用。

1980 年代的 ATM (automated-teller machine) , CD (compact disc) , DTP (desktop publishing) , virtual reality 等至今仍是熱門用詞。

1990 年代的 buffalo wing , carjacking , intranet , Web site 等依然強勁，使麥當勞非常尷尬的 McJob 也成為流行語。

根據美國方言學會 (American Dialect Society) 的評選，20 世紀 90 年代的代表用語包括：

1990 年的 notebook PC (或簡稱 notebook) , bungee jumping , politically correct 等，至於 downsizing 的委婉語 rightsizing 則未見通行。

1991 年有 mother of all (= greatest , most impressive) , rollerblade (溜冰刀) 等。

1992 年有 snail mail 或 s-mail (指一般往來郵件，有別於 e-mail) , ethnic cleansing (種族清洗) , Frankenfood (基因食品) 等。

1993 年有 information (super)highway , McJob , cybersex , street builder (指街頭架起紙板露宿的人) 等。

1994 年有作為詞綴的 cyber，源自德文的 Infobahn，時興的 dress down day 或 casual day。

1995 年風頭最勁的有 World Wide Web 或其變形 the Web , WWW , W3 和 E. Q. (= Emotional Quotient)。值得一提的是 WWW 的中譯。有譯作“全球資訊網”或“世界(資訊)網”，但是最好的翻譯應該是“萬維網”，因為這三個中文字的拼寫都是以 W 開頭的，而且“萬維”非常典雅和達意。

1996 年出現了改變了詞義的幾個詞語，包括指有投票權的家

庭主婦 soccer mom，網址和電郵地址常用的 dot，政治上正確的 urban camping（指街頭露宿）和 food insecure（暗示某些國家或地區的人民無溫飽）。

1997 年首先出現了千年蟲 millennium bug，後來也稱為 Y2K bug，Y2K problem。現在大行其道的 DVD 也於同年誕生。

1998 年以 e- 為前綴的詞語層出不窮，其中以模仿 e-mail 產生的 e-commerce 帶動的 e- 系列詞語最引人注目。

1999 年有 Y2K，dot-com，和指搶先登記網址以出售牟利的 cybersquat，令人嘆息的 humanitarian intervention。

進入 21 世紀，首先出現了因為哈利波特而風行的 muggle，跟着又有因為 2000 年 11 月美國總統選舉而死灰復燃的 chad，2001 年 9 月 11 日以後突然再度風行而專門用來指紐約世界貿易中心原址的 ground zero 和 9/11，最近又有震動美國社會的 Deep Throat（策動水門事件的原 FBI 主管）。勢如卷席的 DC（digital camera）和 DV（digital video），蘋果電腦公司推出的 i-pod，日漸多人使用的 e-payment，e-currency 和 e-text 等估計將會風行一時。

新詞語的產生是非常自然的。當人們發現新事物，遇到新問題，總結了經驗，發展了新思想或有新發明的時候，往往就需要新的詞語來表達，這是因為舊有的、沿襲使用的表達方式已經不適合或者不敷應用了。商業上的新運作模式，戰爭，革命，社會的變革等等也是催生新詞彙的元素。另一方面，由於以英語作為第一語言和第二語言的國家遍佈全球，語言的互通是很正常的，這些不同的表達形式和用語，有不少會被逐漸吸收進經典的英語詞典中。第三，隨着國際交往的日益頻繁，加上人口流動，一些

非英語國家的用語也會進入英語國家的主流社會之中，其中有部分慢慢也會成為常用語彙。

目前，科技的發展一日千里，催生了大量的新詞語，其中不少進入了語言的主體之中。據統計，科學和技術是新詞彙的主要供應者，超過四份之一的新詞源自新科技，尤其是電腦和電子科技。每當有新技術出現，或科技上有所突破，或有新產品面世，就會出現新的詞語或新的詞義。固然有很多是該等學科的專用詞彙，鮮為外行人所知曉，只有專科詞典才有收錄；但是，其中也有不少常被應用和引用，結果成了普羅大眾喜聞樂道的用語。

統計的結果顯示，新詞語的來源眾多，按照佔總量的比例可以分為以下八大範疇：（一）科學與技術，包括電腦和電子科技；（二）生活方式，包括食物、衣着、社會和流行文化；（三）醫學與保健；（四）商業與經濟；（五）藝術，音樂，語言和運動；（六）法律，政治，政府和軍事；（七）宗教；和（八）外來語。

二、新詞語的構成

通過對數以萬計的新詞彙的研究，我們發現新詞語的構成方法可以分為六大類，包括合成法（約佔 62%），增義或轉換法（約佔 17%），縮略法（約佔 9%），拼合法（約佔 6.5%），外借法（約佔 4.5%），創新法及其他（約佔 1%）。下面就這六種方法進行討論。

（一）合成法（**Combining**）：在舊有用詞的基礎上，加上

前綴、後綴或其他構詞成份構成新詞。

- (1) 由兩個或兩個以上的舊有用詞組合成複合詞。用這種方法產生的新詞屬名詞的居多，佔百分之九十以上。例如：information highway，soft landing，click rate，quantum computer，burn rate，lap top (computer)，chat group，content provider，content management，digital signature，digital divide，domain name，Schengen Agreement，single currency，smart card，bush meat，video conference，pepper spray，notebook，spaceship，carjacking，landmark，card-carrying，user-friendly，product-mix，economy-class syndrome，knowledge-based economy 等。
- (2) 用前綴加上現有詞彙組合成新詞。例如：e-commerce，e-book，eco-awareness，microchip，microelectronics，petropolitics，petrodollar，teleprompter，autocue，antikidnapping，photobotany，Eurozone，cybershop，cybercafé，cybercash 等。比較活躍的前綴或類似前綴的詞語包括了 anti-，auto-，bio-，e-，electro-，extra-，geo-，hyper-，i-，in-，inter-，intra-，macro-，micro-，mini-，multi-，nano-，non-，para-，photo-，poly-，psycho- 和 big，golden，motor，power 等。
- (3) 用後綴加上現有詞彙組合成新詞。例如：sit-in，

sleep-in, peacenik, beatnik, folknik, computerese, educationese, Pekingology, mediagenic, radiogenic, telegenic, talkathon, walkathon, Hitchcockian, Chomskian 等。比較活躍的後綴或類似後綴的構詞成份包括了 -able, -age, -aire, -ate, -ation, -cide, -dom, -ee, -eer, -ese, -ian, -ic, -ics, -in, -ion, -ist, -ite, -less, -logy, -ment, -ness, -nik, -phobia, -tomy, -wise 和 -based, -burger, -buster, curtain, -intensive, speak 等。

- (4) 用英文字母加上現有詞語組成新詞語。例如：A-bomb, F-word, U-Drive, V neck, g-string, S curve, A-list, b-ball 等。
- (5) 用英文字母加上數字組成新詞語。例如：G-8, B12, B2B, B2C, C2C, MP3, CIP4, Y2K 等。
- (6) 用數字表達的新詞語。例如：7-11, 7-24 (或 24-7), 9-11, 101, 404 等。

(二) 增義或轉換法 (Shifting)：使舊詞添上新義或轉換其用法或語法結構。

- (1) 近年來，不少沿用的舊詞增添了新的詞義或轉變了用法。這一類的形舊義新的詞語為數不少。例如：gay—原義是快樂的，鮮明的，服飾華麗的；新添的詞義是“同性戀的”，“同性戀者”。不單如此，一系列與 gay 有關的用詞也隨之而生，包括 gay-in (同性戀者性愛大會)，Gay Liberation (同性戀者解放運動)，gaybar (同性戀酒吧) 等。

Swing—原本的含義和用法已經相當多，可作多種詞類。新的意思有（a）跟上潮流，（b）交換性伴侶。而 swinger 現亦用來指“性伴侶交換者”。

Virus—原是醫學用語，指引發疾病的“病毒”。現在用得更多的恐怕是指“電腦病毒”。確實，電腦和電子用語裏面使用了大量的轉義詞，例如 bug，web，dot，word 等。

Happening—舊的用法指一次事件。新的用法指“一種目的使觀眾意外、驚奇和投入的舞臺或其他形式的演出等”，或譯作“哈普寧藝術”。

- (2) 舊詞添新義或擴展其語義場是一種非常慣用的手段。Blueprint 原來是建築上用的“藍圖”或印刷上用的“藍樣，藍紙”，現在常用來表示詳細的計劃；full dress 原指正式場合穿的衣服，現在 full-dress 表示“巨細無遺的”。Streak 原是條紋，斑紋，現在可以用來作動詞，表示“裸跑”。
- (3) 語法的轉變也帶出很多新詞。普通名詞，動詞和副詞可以轉換為形容詞，例如 acid，bananas，blue collar，bottom line，budget，command，cutting edge，key，plastic，pushbutton，reality，built-in，see-through，turnaway，back-to-work 等。名詞也可以從動詞，形容詞，專有名詞等轉換過來，例如 backup，blackout，blowout，countdown，flashback，hold-up，know-how，rundown，spinoff，splash-down，streak，takeover，audible，

durable, fast-food, spectacular, Oscar 和 Coke 等。動詞也可以從名詞和形容詞等轉換過來，例如 audit, blueprint, burn, car pool, cutback, mastermind, microfilm, pinpoint, premiere, sideline, skyrocket, spot check 以及 fast-forward, out, short 等。

- (4) 一部分商標名被接納為普通用詞後，其用法、含義和詞類屬性上亦會產生變化。例如 fax 原為名詞（指圖文傳真郵件），現可作動詞用，表示“以傳真方式傳上”；xerox 原為名詞（靜電影印，乾式影印），現可作動詞；Yahoo 原指網站雅虎，現在可以作動詞，表示“上網”；STP 原為汽油添加劑，現指幻覺劑；Tom 原是名詞（指逆來順受的黑人），現在作動詞用於 Tom it 一詞中，表示“逆來順受”。
- (5) 一些過去並沒有收進常用詞典中的俚語（slang）和口語（colloquialism）也會因為其被普遍使用而隨着語義變化的原則進入常用詞典，例如 posh（非常時髦的），bonkers（瘋狂的），easy meat（易辦的事），like a dead balloon（毫無作用），can of worms（一團糟），go for broke（盡最大努力），carry the can（面對責備，負起責任），gray goods（電腦設備），clean room（無塵工作間）等等。

(三) 縮略法（Shortening）：把長字或詞語縮短而保持原義的新形式。其中包括：

- (1) 縮短前部的，例如 fingerprinting（來自 DNA fingerprinting），Bang（源自 Big Bang），friendly（來自 user-friendly），potato（couch potato）。
- (2) 縮短中間部分的，例如 computeracy（來自 computer literacy），microwave-proof（來自 microwave oven-proof）。
- (3) 縮短後部的，例如 deli—delicatessen，jet—jet-propelled plane，mod—modern，nat—nationalist，neut—neutron bomb，divi—dividend，disco—discotheque，platinum—platinum record album，soap—soap opera 等。
- (4) 很多的新詞語是由多個單詞組成。由於原詞太長，難唸也難記，所以往往用字母，特別是首字母來代替，稱為 alphabetisms 或 initialisms。由於使用和記憶方便，人們往往喜歡使用它們而把原文給忘掉了。例如：

ICBM—intercontinental ballistic missile

DTP—desk-top publishing

EU—European Union

WTO—World Trade Organization

DNA—deoxyribonucleic acid

CEO—chief executive officer

SME—small and medium-sized enterprise

ERP—enterprise resources planning

WWW—world wide web

- (5) 個別的首字母縮略詞可以像普通的英文字般拼讀，稱為 acronyms。例如：

AIDS—acquired immunodeficiency syndrome

SARS—severe acute respiratory syndrome

CEPA—Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement

MIS—management information system

ZIP—Zone Improvement Plan

CIP4—The International Cooperation for the Integration of the Processes in Pre-press, Press and Post-press

一個值得注意的構詞形式是 back-formation，即所謂“逆序造詞”或“倒反構詞”。這是把一個現存的詞的尾部或類似後綴的部分脫落而形成的另一個詞類。例如先有 free association（自由發言，自由聯想），才有 free associate；先有 gift-wrapped，才有 gift-wrap；先有 air conditioning，才有 air condition；先有 brainstorming，才有 brainstorm；先有 soft-landing，才有 soft-land；one-up（勝人一籌的，佔上風的）和 one-upman（勝…一籌，佔…的上風）是從 one-upmanship 一詞倒反構成的。Laser（激光）本是一個字首縮略詞，但是看起來好像是從 lase 變出來的，所以 lase 很自然的成為了一個新動詞，表示“放射激光”，“使受激光照射”。

- (四) 拼合法（Blending）：同時使用合成法和縮略法的構

詞方法稱為拼合法。新生的詞語由兩個以上的構詞成份拼合而成，但是其中有部分被略去。

(1) 略去第一個構詞成份部分的拼合詞：

Adenovirus < aden(oid) + o + virus

Alcometer < alco(hol) + meter

Bar-b-burger < bar-b-(cue) + burger

Femspeak < fem(inine) + speak

Hit woman < hit(man) + woman

Smog < s(moke) + mog

Smist < s(moke) + mist

(2) 略去第二個構詞成份的拼合詞：

Beefcake < beef + (cheese)cake

Bookvertising < book + (ad)vertising

Cheeseburger < cheese + (ham)burger

Gray market < gray + (black)market

Low-rise < low + (high)rise

Moonquake < moon + (earth)quake

(3) 略去第一和第二個構詞成份的相同發音的部分：

Boatel < boat + hotel

Dramedy < drama + comedy

Electionomics < election + economics

(4) 略去第一和第二個構詞成份的部分：

Avionics < avi(ation) + (electr)onics

Globflation < glob(al) + (in)flation

Guppie < g(reen) + (y)uppie

Infotainment < info(rmation) + (enter)tainment

Smaze < sm(oke) + (m)aze

Benelux < Be(lgium) + Ne(thelands) + Lux(embourg)

(五) 外借法 (**Borrowing**)：借用或吸收外來語。這種方法的使用由來已久，英語中不少詞語其實是從外國借來使用的，後來變成了英語中不可缺少的部分。這些外來語很多保留原來的樣貌，有些按英語的習慣拼法改動了，有些按拉丁化拼音拼寫成英語，亦有些被改頭換面或按含義翻譯成英語了。現代英語外來語主要來源包括了法語，德語和西班牙語，葡語、俄語、日語和漢語也有不少。例如：

Disco, discotheque < 法語：的士高，的士夠格

Autobahn < 德語：高速公路

Autostrada < 義大利語：高速公路

Autopista < 西班牙語：高速公路

Westpolitik < 德語：（東歐國家的）對西方政策

Samizdat < 俄語：地下出版（物）

Favela < 葡語：貧民區

Haman < 阿拉伯語：（伊朗的）公眾浴室

Sputnik < 俄語：人造地球衛星

Jeet kune do < 漢語：截拳道

Sushi < 日語：壽司

又如 black humor（黑幽默）原為法語 humour noir，new cuisine（新食譜）原為法語 nouvelle cuisine，found object（拾得藝術）來自法語 objet trouve，barefoot doctor 源自漢語“赤腳醫生”，blonde from the coast（來自地中海的

金髮女郎)是從西班牙語 rubia de la costa 翻譯過來的。

(六) 創新法 (Creating) : 即創造出一個全新的英文字。和一般人想像的不同, 用這種方法產生的新詞所佔的比例非常少, 佔新詞的總量不到半個百份點。這是因為經過千百年的發展, 英語的辭彙量已經非常大, 構詞成份也很豐富, 從無到有創造新詞的機會並不太多。偶爾出現的包括一些科技用語, 從專有名詞轉化成的普通用詞, 或模仿大自然聲音的擬聲詞。例如:

Periapsis—近拱點

Dolby—(杜比) 身歷聲系統

Apolune—遠月點

Perilune—近月點

Frisbee—玩具飛碟

Bleep—(發出) 必必聲

三、新詞語的中譯

和一般的詞語釋義的翻譯一樣, 新詞語的中譯可以根據辭彙單位的可譯度作出不同的處理, 通常採用的手段有三種: 給予絕對對應詞 (absolute equivalent); 給予部分對應詞 (partial equivalent) 和創造新詞語作絕對對應詞或部分對應詞。

所謂絕對對應詞, 即原語和譯語中的兩個辭彙單位, 無論在詞義範圍、詞義色彩和語法範疇都是完全相等的, 雖然有時會存在着形式上的差別 (比如英語中的單字詞, 譯成漢語後可能變成多字詞; 又例如英語中的多音節詞, 譯成漢語以後會變成單音詞

等)。事實上，由於原語社會和譯語社會存在巨大的文化差異，科技發展的速度也存在着一定的差距，而兩種語言也存在着語言差異，在英語和漢語中兩個辭彙單位元的全部成份都絕對相同，為數並不太多。英語新詞中大部分都是文化局限詞和科技局限詞，代表了漢語語彙中暫時不存在的、尚未出現的或無法找到適合配對詞的事物、技術、現象、思想或術語。所以在翻譯新詞語的時候，用得最普遍的是第三種手段，即創造新詞語作絕對對應詞或部分對應詞。常用的方式有：

（一）音譯法：最常見用於翻譯人名（或由人名派生出來的用詞）、地名（或由地名派生出來的用詞）、商標名、醫藥名稱或其他科技新產品，新的潮流用語等。例如 Nixon—尼克松（美國前總統），Nixonomics—尼克松經濟論，Chomskian—喬姆斯基理論的，Israel—以色列，Israeli—以色列人，Euro—歐羅，Intel—英特爾，Panadol—必理痛（一種退燒藥），Yahoo—雅虎，disco（的士高）。

目前，由於兩岸三地尚沒有一套統一的音譯規則，所以用音譯的方法翻譯出來的對應詞可能會大不相同。例如最近被傳於1999年服用禁藥的美國單車（自行車、腳踏車）運動員 Armstrong 的名字就被音譯為阿姆斯特朗、阿姆斯壯、岩士唐、杭思朗等；美國總統 Bush 的譯名起碼有布什、布殊、布希和布斯等；而 disco 也有的士高、的士科、迪斯科、迪斯高等譯法。

除了專有名詞之外，許多文化局限詞和科技局限詞在引進漢語區後，都可以用音譯法處理。例如 hippie(s) 譯為“嬉皮士”，yuppie(s) 譯為“優皮士”，AIDS 分別被譯為愛滋病、愛之病、艾滋病和愛死病。近兩年令人聞而色變的 SARS 譯為“沙士

(病)”，比起它的全名“嚴重急性呼吸道症候群”更為人們接受。Quark 被翻譯為“夸克”已經被科學界甚至普羅大眾所接受；DDT 譯為“滴滴涕”也是不二之選。

有一點需要注意的是，當新詞語的音譯出現之初，由於尚未被讀者廣泛認知，所以有必要在音譯之後加上注釋，以便幫助讀者理解，例如：Hirudoid—喜療妥（一種消炎退腫的藥膏）；Librium—利比安（一種麻醉藥，常被用作鎮靜劑）。

當然，音譯一旦被社會廣泛接受後，就沒有必要附加注釋。例如可口可樂，百事可樂，邏輯，沙發，雷達，比基尼等，就不必夾注。

（二）**意譯法**：意譯法是最常用的釋義方法。使用意譯法的目的，是要在譯語現存的語彙中，替原語找出對應詞。現存語彙中無法找到的，就要運用漢語的造詞（甚至造字）原則，創造合乎漢語規範的新詞語，作為原詞的對應詞。有時候，也可以採用舊詞添加新義的方法，間接上擴大了漢語辭彙的含義量。翻譯上經常採用的有如下幾種方式：

- （1）**字面意譯法**，或稱**對譯法**，即按照詞語的表面含義翻譯出來。在翻譯新詞語的時候，往往會創造出新的漢語辭彙。例如：

Hardware—硬體，硬件

Software—軟體，軟件

Information superhighway—資訊高速公路

Junk mail—垃圾郵件

Instant replay—即時重播

Personal computer—個人電腦

Web site—網址，網站

- (2) 內涵意譯法，即把表面是一種意思，實際上是另有所指的詞語的真正含義翻譯出來。單詞中許多含有比喻或隱喻或引申義者極多，複合詞也非常普遍。

例如：

Funny farm—神經病院

Hit rate—（網站的）點擊率

Burn rate—（上市公司的）花錢速度

Idiot box—電視機

Dead presidents—美元（鈔票）

Fat farm—減肥中心

Streaking—裸跑

Prosumer—半專業級的；半專業級的使用者

McJob—報酬極低的工作

- (3) 增義意譯法，指為了更明確地表明原詞的含義，翻譯時除了譯出字面含義外，還增加說明文字，成為釋義的一部分。例如：

Sit-in—靜坐示威

Street people—街頭頹廢派

Moonport—月球火箭發射場

Lap-top—手提電腦

Mini-summit—小型高峰會議

G8—八大工業國組織

- (4) 還原意譯法，主要是用於翻譯縮略語和字首縮略詞的方法，即把縮略語的原義或所代表的短語的全義

翻譯出來。如果原語太長而漢語已經有慣用的縮略語者，也可以使用。例如：

A-bomb (atomic bomb)－原子彈

sitcom (situation comedy)－情景電視劇

SME (small and medium-sized enterprise)－中小
(型)企(業)

ZIP Code (Zone Improvement Plan) code－郵碼，
郵區代碼

Amtrak (the National Railroad Passenger Corporation)－美國鐵路公司，美鐵

Women's Lib (Women's Liberation Movement)－婦
解，婦女解放運動

Golf 101－《高爾夫入門》

(三) 音譯加意譯法：有一些辭彙，特別是複合詞，本身已經音義結合的，翻成譯語時經常也採用同一辦法處理。例如：

Hitchcockian－希治閣式的

Chomskian－喬姆斯基理論的

Dolby system－杜比(音響)系統

Break dance－霹靂舞

Jazz Rock－爵士搖擺樂

Euro-zone－歐羅區

(四) 借用法：有些外來新詞出現之後，其他使用漢字(不是漢語)的地區，尤其是日本，可能會先於我們創造出新的漢語譯文，又或者他們採用的譯文比我們的為佳，都可能促使我們加以借用。例如：

Club—俱樂部

Economics—經濟學

Calculus—微積分

Infectious disease—傳染病

但是我們注意到由於日本減少了使用漢字，他們對新詞語的翻譯一般都採用音譯法，所以這種情況已經是越來越少了。取代的是兩岸三地的譯名會互為補充。

（五）還原法：西方語言中的一些語彙屬於音譯的外來語，其中不乏源自漢語或日本漢字。翻譯這些詞語的時候，必須把他們還原為本來的漢字。例如：

Kungfu—功夫

Wushu—武術

Dimshum—點心

Wok—鑊

Jet kune do—截拳道

Gai-ge—改革

Aikido—合氣道

Kyudo—弓道

Sushi—壽司

Kutami—九穀燒

有些引入西方語彙中的漢語用詞，還有部分是用意譯的方法英語化的。重新翻譯成中文時，應該使用原來的漢字。例如：

Cupping—拔罐（法）

Acupoint—穴位

Barefoot doctor—赤腳醫生

Paper tiger—紙老虎

(六) 造字法：化學元素的漢語譯名，絕大部分都是用造字法新創出來的。其中有部分採用意譯後轉音譯的方法，如 oxygen 早期譯為養氣，後音譯為氧；hydrogen 原譯為輕氣，後音譯為氫。當然大部分都採用音譯的原則，如 nickel 譯為鎳，nobelium 譯為鐳。

(七) 混合法：科學技術上不少名稱，可以借助英文字母、英語縮略詞使用的字母、阿拉伯數字，或有關物體的形象取其漢語譯名。例如：

5 S—五常法

Six sigma—6 西格碼法

S-turning—S 型彎道

Figure of eight movement—8 字形運動

M O S transistor—MOS 晶體管

MIS—密斯系統

(八) 保留法：英語中很多新的縮略語都可以用意譯法把它們的含義翻譯出來，但是由於譯文很長，使用起來很不方便，我們往往原封不動地使用該等縮略語，並且已經習以為常了。例如：

CEPA—Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement（我們無論是書寫還是口頭上都習慣用 CEPA，很少用“內地與香港關於建立更緊密經貿關係的安排”）

MP3—MPEG-1 Audio Layer-3（MPEG=Moving Picture Expert Group）（原來是指“移動圖片專家集團以數位壓縮格式把音像加碼”，MP3 絕對是通行的用語）

CIP4—International Cooperation for the Integration of the Processes in Pre-press, Press and Post-press（我們只會用 CIP4 而不會說“整合印前、印刷和印後流程的國際合作組織”）

上述的八種方法，大致上總括了英語新詞的中譯方法。使用這些方法所得出的釋義，統稱為翻譯對應詞（translation equivalents），是可以直接應用的語言單位。由於英語新詞語不斷湧現，使用者和詞典學家不得不每天都面對新的難題。

作者簡介

羅志雄，香港資深出版及印刷工作者，早期從事出版、編輯、寫作、翻譯、新聞和教育工作，近年專注印刷事務；對翻譯理論和實踐、社會語言學和雙語詞典編纂皆有涉獵。羅氏於 20 世紀 60 年代末期開始從事業餘的口譯工作並成為報紙的自由翻譯撰稿人，並於 1973 年出版第一本譯著，至今已出版著作及論文數十種。現為香港翻譯學會執行委員、會士、榮譽會士；香港出版學會創會會長、會士；香港印刷媒體專業人員協會創會會長、會士；世界印刷與傳播論壇理事；北京印刷學院客座教授。

翻譯與政治：剪不斷，理還亂

——談“李啟純”翻譯的《百獸圖》

白立平

Abstract

Translation and Politics: On Li Qichun's Translation of *Animal Farm* (by Bai Liping)

Animal Farm is a masterpiece of political satire by George Orwell, and its first Chinese translation was done by “Li Qichun”, which, according to some documents, is the pen name of Liang Shiqiu. This paper analyzes the characteristics of this translation, and, taking the historical background into consideration, investigates the stance and motive of “Li Qichun” when he translates this story, and explores the factors which lead to the characteristics of this version and the reasons why Liang does not use his real name to translate. The study indicates that this translation is the outcome of certain historical period; and, being both consistent and contradictory to Liang's views on literature and politics, it reflects the intricate and complex relationship between translation and politics.

一、引 言

喬治·歐威爾（George Orwell, 1903-1950）的 *Animal Farm* 是 20 世紀傑出的政治諷刺小說。該書寫於 1943 年 11 月至 1944 年 2 月之間，在此之前的西班牙戰爭以及 1936、37 年的其他事件對作者衝擊很大，他說，“1936 年後，我的每一部嚴肅的作品，字裏行間都是直接或間接地反對極權主義，支持民主社會主義（democratic socialism）”（Orwell 1957: 318）。*Animal Farm* 就是這樣的一部“反對極權主義”的作品，作者在書裏尖銳地譏諷了史達林的獨裁專制。^[1]

Animal Farm 在中國最早的譯本是“李啟純”於 1956 年出版的《百獸圖》（臺北正中書局出版）。有證據表明，“李啟純”是梁實秋的筆名。秦賢次在〈梁實秋小傳〉的開頭說，“梁實秋，原名治華，後以字實秋行，筆名有子佳、秋郎、程淑、李啟純等”（秦賢次，1988: 287）。在〈梁實秋先生手訂譯著書目〉裏，就收有《百獸圖》、《蘇俄的強迫勞工》、《法國共產黨真相》這三部署名“李啟純”的著作（梁實秋，1967a）。余光中也曾著文談梁實秋的譯本《百獸圖》的特色（余光中，1971）。胡百華編的〈梁實秋先生簡譜〉（胡百華，1988）裏也記載有《百獸圖》、《蘇俄的強迫勞工》、《法國共產黨真相》三部作品的翻譯時間。劉真曾說：

實秋重然諾，講道義。今年 6 月間，他寄了一本第 3 卷第 7 期的《聯合文學》給我。這一期有胡百華所撰的〈梁實秋先生簡譜〉，實秋在一則譜文旁特別劃了紅線，意思是要我加以注意。

那則譜文是：“民國 46 年（丁酉，1957），56 歲，繼續在師大執教英語研究所主任及文學院長，劉真校長卸任時力辭行政兼職。”我看了這則譜文，不禁感慨萬端。（劉真，1992: 87）

從這裏我們可以看到梁實秋至少是看過胡百華所撰的〈梁實秋先生簡譜〉。另有學者指出，胡百華所撰的〈梁實秋先生簡譜〉曾經過梁實秋親自審定（見李正西，1991: 2）。陳之藩曾告訴筆者，他有把握梁實秋翻譯過《百獸圖》。^[2]所有這些可以使我們肯定“李啟純”非梁實秋的筆名莫屬。但令人困惑的是，梁實秋本人在名為〈《百獸圖》與諷刺文學〉的文章裏說，“此書現有李啟純先生譯本，正中書局出版”（梁實秋，1978: 566）。儼然是在談其他人的譯作。^[3]這是甚麼原因呢？

在討論《百獸圖》這部譯作的時候，本文將借鑒列夫維爾（Lefevere）有關詩學、意識形態及贊助人的論述。列夫維爾認為詩學包含兩方面的內容，其一，是指一套文學手法、文類、主題、人物、情景、及象徵。將這一點引伸到翻譯研究裏，譯者在具體的翻譯過程中所採用的策略可以劃歸到這一方面。其二，在整個的社會系統中，文學的角色是怎麼樣的，或者應該是怎麼樣的。而後者對於社會系統相關主題的選擇有影響作用（Lefevere 1992: 26），包含一定歷史時期某一作家對文學的看法，大概可以等同文藝思想。詩學對翻譯的影響因而可以包含文藝思想對翻譯活動的影響。文藝思想的影響主要體現在翻譯選材方面。譯者在選擇文藝作品進行翻譯的時候，他對某部作品的認識決定了他是否會選擇這部作品進行翻譯。某部作品不一定完全與譯者的文藝思想相吻合，但至少這部作品不會與他的文藝思想相衝突。但這

裏所說的是在一種理想的環境下進行的，即譯者有完全的自主權選擇作品來翻譯，並且有完全的自主權來決定翻譯的方法。但實際情況往往不是如此，譯者的翻譯活動會受到贊助者或某些專業人士的干涉或影響。列夫維爾（1992: 11-25）認為有兩個控制元素可以保證文學系統和社會其他系統不至於有較大的偏差，其中之一便是來自文學系統之外的“贊助”。^[4]“贊助”（patronage）是指那些“足以促成或妨礙文學的閱讀、書寫或重寫的力量（包括個人和團體）”（Lefevere 1992: 15）。贊助人會對譯者翻譯中的意識形態及詩學取向產生影響。在討論《百獸圖》譯文的詩學問題方面，本文將分析該譯作的譯文特點是甚麼，譯者的文藝思想是否對他選材有影響。同時，也將進一步討論這部譯作的背後是否有某個贊助人或贊助機構的影響。

談到梁實秋的文藝思想，必然涉及意識形態的問題，因為梁實秋的文藝思想的一個重要的方面，就是討論文藝是否應該成為意識形態的工具。列夫維爾說詩學的功能組成部份明顯地與來自詩學外部的意識形態影響緊密相關，是在文學系統中由意識形態因素所促成的（Lefevere 1992: 27）。因此在研究文藝思想對翻譯的影響的時候就必然牽涉到意識形態問題。^[5]列夫維爾多次強調意識形態及詩學對於文學翻譯的影響，而前者比後者更為重要。他說，有兩種因素決定着文學翻譯活動，其一是譯者的意識形態（不管他是甘願接受還是贊助者強加給他）以及翻譯進行時譯入語文學的主流詩學。意識形態決定着譯者採用的策略，並對源語與譯入語的“文化萬象”（universe of discourse）引起的問題提出解決方案（Lefevere 1992: 41）。而當語言因素與意識形態和／或詩學因素發生衝突的時候，前者往往會讓位於後者（Lefevere

1992: 39)。梁實秋的文藝思想深受他的美國老師白璧德（Irving Babbitt）的影響。他主張文學應當描寫永恆的人性，強調理性的節制，反對文學成為意識形態的工具。^[6] 他認為，有兩種極端的做法都是不可取的。第一種極端的做法，就是創作出“吟風弄月”、歌頌“詩酒婦人”的文學；另一種極端的做法，就是將文學作為革命和政治的宣傳工具，從而喪失“文學的立場”（梁實秋，1969a: 114）。但《百獸圖》這一部政治性很強的作品，在特定的歷史時期，能夠免於成為意識形態的工具嗎？梁實秋如何評價《百獸圖》這部作品？他以筆名“李啟純”翻譯這本書的時候，在詩學及意識形態兩方面如何作出取捨？梁實秋反對文藝成為意識形態鬥爭的工具，他自己是否真的擺脫了意識形態的影響？這些問題也將在本文中予以探討。

在討論譯文特點時，本文將逐句對照原文與譯文，並參照張毅、高孝先的譯本 1988 年版，重點討論《百獸圖》譯文傳達原文語意及句法的特點，並討論“李啟純”的《百獸圖》與“梁實秋”的《莎士比亞全集》的異同。在討論這部譯作涉及的文藝思想及意識形態的問題時，本文將結合這部作品翻譯的時代背景、以及譯者本人的評論文字，分析“李啟純”在翻譯這部作品時的立場及動機。由於《百獸圖》是一部政治性很強的作品，本文對該譯作的分析也主要在意識形態這一方面。

二、《百獸圖》譯文的主要特點

通過文本對比，我們發現，在句法方面，“李啟純”在譯文

裏試圖與原文亦步亦趨，其中一個重要的方面就是儘量保留原文的標點符號。當然，譯者完全保留原文的標點符號是根本不可能的，但只要不出現“硬譯”，譯者則竭力保留。以下是其中幾個比較典型的例子：

All the animals remembered passing such resolutions: or at least they thought that they remembered it. (Orwell 1954: 72)

一切畜牲都記得通過了這樣的議案：或者是他們以為他們記得。
(李啟純譯，1956: 53)

訂立這些誓言的情形至今都還歷歷在目；或者至少他們自以為還記得有這回事。(張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 72)

“Our Leader, Comrade Napoleon”, announced Squealer, speaking very slowly and firmly, has stated categorically—categorically, comrade—that Snowball was Jones’s agent from the very beginning—yes, and from long before the Rebellion was ever thought of. (Orwell 1954: 91)

“我們的領袖，‘拿破侖’同志，”“尖號者”遲緩而堅決的宣佈說，已經斷然的說過——斷然的，同志——“雪球”從一開始就是鍾斯間諜——是的，在誰也沒想到叛變之前即已如此。
(李啟純譯，1956: 67)

“我們的領袖，拿破侖同志，”斯奎拉以緩慢而堅定的語氣宣

告，已經明確地——明確地，同志們——聲明斯諾鮑一開始就是瓊斯的奸細，是的，遠在想着起義之前就是的。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 91）

比較以上的原文和譯文，我們可以看到，“李啟純”譯文基本上保留了原作的標點符號。而張毅、高孝先的譯本則並沒有受到原文標點符號的限制，翻譯得比較靈活。在第二個例子中，張毅、高孝先的譯本雖然也保留了原文的兩個破折號，但並不像“李啟純”那樣對原文亦步亦趨——“李啟純”將原文的三個破折號完全保留了下來。在“李啟純”的譯文裏，譯文句子的語序完全按照原文的順序，而張毅、高孝先譯本則顯得很靈活，完全符合漢語表達習慣。

“李啟純”在翻譯中試圖保留原文的標點符號，這其實也是“梁實秋”翻譯的《莎士比亞全集》的一個特點。在遠東版的《莎士比亞全集》的〈例言〉就有“力求保存原作之標點符號”（梁實秋，1979: 1）這樣一條翻譯原則。梁實秋試圖保留原作的標點符號是受了《莎士比亞的標點符號》（Simpson 1911）一書的影響。莎士比亞的標點符號與今天的標點符號一個重大的不同之處在於，現代的標點表示的是邏輯關係（logical），而伊麗莎白時期的標點則是一種修辭手段（rhetorical），比如分號的一個用法是來強調它之前的一個詞（見 Brook 1976: 157）。對折本及四開本裏的標點符號、括號以及大寫字母的主要作用在於指導演員如何來念臺詞，告訴演員在甚麼地方停頓，停頓多久，指導演員朗讀的音調節奏，表明需要強調的字詞（見 Wilson 1961a: xxxviii），逗號表示短的停頓，分號表示一個較長的停頓，帽號表示更長的

停頓，句號表示完全的停頓，沒有標點的時候，表示快的語速（見 Wilson 1961b: lviii）。這些標點符號與語法和句法關係並不大，現代的莎士比亞作品編輯者補充了很多標點符號，也將原有的某些標點省略（Pollard 1967: 90）。現代通行的各種莎士比亞全集的版本，其標點符號一般都是現在通用的標點，基本都經過了編輯者的修正，不一定是莎士比亞時期的標點，各個版本的標點也不盡相同。梁實秋“力求保存原作之標點符號”，但這“原作”也只是他選用的經過克雷格（Craig）編輯後的版本。梁實秋試圖保留“原作”的標點符號的實例很多，比如：

North The noble duke hath sworn his coming is
But for his own; and for the right of that
We all have strongly sworn to give him aid;
And let him ne'er see joy that breaks that oath!
(Richard II, Act II, Scene III, Craig 1963a: 393)

腦 這位尊貴的公爵已經發誓說他回國只是為了他個人的權益；
而且那項權益乃是我們全體堅決發誓要幫助他獲取的；
誰要是破壞了這個誓約，
誰就永遠不得快樂！（梁實秋譯，1967c: 83）

諾森伯蘭 這位尊貴的公爵已經宣誓他這次回國的目的，
不過是要求他所原有的應得的權利；
為了幫助他達到這個目的，我們都已經鄭重宣誓給

他充份的援助；

誰要是毀棄了那一個誓言，願他永遠得不到快樂！

（朱生豪譯，1978a: 346）

梁實秋的譯文“這位尊貴的公爵已經發誓說他回國只是為了他個人的權益；而且那項權益乃是我們全體堅決發誓要幫助他獲取的”；完全遵照克雷格版本的標點，但結果卻使得這兩句話顯得冗長，第一句二十五個字，第二句有二十三個字。而朱生豪的譯本則將其分別斷成兩句。由於中英兩種語言差異較大，梁實秋在他的譯文裏並沒有（也不可能）完全做到保留原作的標點符號，比如他在翻譯“*And let him ne'er see joy that breaks that oath!*”這句話的時候也是將其斷為兩句。他所做的，正如他所說的那樣是“力求保存”。

但與莎士比亞全集的翻譯比較起來，《百獸圖》明顯要粗糙很多。梁實秋的翻譯作品中一般都有相當篇幅的序言。比如在他翻譯的每一部莎士比亞作品之前，都有對該作品詳盡的介紹，包括版本介紹、著作年代、故事來源、舞臺歷史等部份，有的還有譯者自己的評論，例如《維洛那二紳士》（梁實秋，1964a）、《空愛一場》（梁實秋，1967b）、《無事自擾》（梁實秋，1964b）幾劇前的序言就包含了“幾點批評”一節；《暴風雨》（梁實秋，1966）一劇的序言裏包括有〈暴風雨的意義〉一節。在《百獸圖》（1956年版）卻沒有序言。^[7] 加注是梁實秋翻譯《莎士比亞全集》一個翻譯原則：“原文常有版本困難之處，晦澀難解之處亦所在多有，譯者酌採一家之說，必要時加以注釋”、“原文多‘雙關語’，以及各種典故，無法逐譯時則加注

說明”（梁實秋，1979: 1）。莎士比亞全集有詳細的注釋，比如梁實秋在《哈姆雷特》（1976年版本）（梁實秋，1976a）一劇的翻譯中有 101 條注釋，而林同濟（1982）、田漢（1932）、曹未風（1955）等基本上沒有加注，朱生豪（1977）只加了 13 個注釋。但在《百獸圖》裏一個注釋也沒有。我們看下面一句話：

As he had said, his voice was hoarse, but he sang well enough, and it was a stirring tune, something between *Clementine* and *La Cucaracha*. (Orwell 1954: 13)

確如他所說，聲音是啞的，但是他唱的很好，是個很激昂的調子，介乎 *Clementine* 與 *La Cucaracha* 之間的一種調子。（李啟純譯，1956: 8）

正如他說的那樣，他聲音沙啞，但唱得很不錯。那首歌曲調慷慨激昂，旋律有點介乎“*Clementine*”和“*La Cucaracha*”之間。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 13）

“李啟純”的譯本和張毅、高孝先譯本都將“*Clementine*”與“*La Cucaracha*”完全照搬到中文，所不同的地方在於，“李啟純”的譯本沒有加注，而張毅、高孝先譯本則在“*Clementine*”和“*La Cucaracha*”之後分別加有這樣的注釋：“一首古老的美國民歌名‘*Clementine*’。節奏緩慢，柔美”；“一首西班牙語的墨西哥民歌名‘*La Cucaracha*’。節奏歡快”（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 13）。這樣的注釋告訴讀者“*Clementine*”和“*La Cucaracha*”的

特點及二者的區別，從而使讀者了解動物所唱歌曲的特點。但“李啟純”的譯本卻沒有加任何注釋，這對讀者的理解造成一定的困難。

在用詞方面，譯文也並不考究。如：

The animals watched his coming and going with a kind of dread, and avoided him as much as possible. (Orwell 1954: 73)

畜牲們看他出來進去，懷着一種恐怖，極力的**避免**他。（李啟純譯，1956: 54）

動物們看着他來來去去，猶有幾分畏懼，**避之唯恐不及**。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 74）

這裏，“avoided”是“迴避”、“躲開”、“躲避”的意思，“李啟純”將其譯為“避免”。“避免”之後應是“避免去做的事”，而不是人。因而“避免”這個詞在這個上下文中並不合適。但張毅與高孝先的譯本將其譯為“避之唯恐不及”，是很恰當的。

At the gate they paused, half frightened to go on, but Clover led the way in. (Orwell 1954: 149-150)

他們走到大門口停止了，**半害怕**不敢前進，但是“苜蓿”領頭走了進去。（李啟純譯，1956: 111）

到了門口，他們又停住了，多半是因為害怕而不敢再往前走，但克拉弗帶頭進去了……（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 150）

在這句話裏，“half frightened”按照字面意思被翻譯為“半害怕”，顯得生硬；張毅與高孝先將其譯為“多半是因為害怕”，則自然流暢得多。

在“李啟純”的譯本中，也明顯地出現了一些粗疏之處：

“I do not believe that,” he said. “Snowball fought bravely at the Battle of the Cowshed …” (Orwell 1954: 90)

“我不相信這話，”他說。“‘雪球’。在‘牛棚之戰’作戰很勇猛。”（李啟純譯，1956: 66）

在“‘雪球’”與“在‘牛棚之戰’作戰很勇猛”之間的句號顯然是多出來的。類似的情況還有出現：

The singing of this song threw the animals into the widest excitement. (Orwell 1954: 15)

一唱這隻歌。眾畜立刻興奮得發狂。（李啟純譯，1956: 11）

在這裏，譯文裏“一唱這隻歌”與“眾畜立刻興奮得發狂”之間顯然應該是逗號，而不應該是句號。這明顯是由於疏忽造成的，很可能是列印錯誤。但出現了這樣的列印錯誤，卻沒有在校對中

發現，看來，這部作品的翻譯及出版似乎顯得有些倉促。

They accepted everything that they were told about the Rebellion and the principles of Animalism, especially from Clover, for whom they had an almost filial respect; but it was doubtful whether they understood very much of it. (Orwell 1954: 141)

他們相信一切有關叛變的故事，畜牲主義的原則，尤其是“苜蓿”所講的，對於她們幾乎有一種孝敬之意；但是他們懂了多少，還是可疑的。（李啟純譯，1956: 105）

在上面一段話裏，譯文中的“她們”是不正確的。原文中的“whom”是指“Clover”，而“Clover”是單數。譯文中出現“她們”可能是列印錯誤，那句話應該是這樣的：“對於她他們幾乎有一種孝敬之意”。

譯文裏也出現了一些漏譯的情況。比如：

They had been credited with attempting to stir up rebellion among the animals on neighbouring farms. (Orwell 1954: 153)

這句話在譯文裏並沒有翻譯過來。

No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old. **No animal in England is free.** The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth. (Orwell 1954: 8)

英格蘭沒有一條畜牲在過了一歲之後還能知道甚麼是幸福和閒暇。畜牲的生活即是苦痛與奴役：這就是明顯的真象。（李啟純譯，1956: 4）

在譯“The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth”這句話的時候，“李啟純”也像他翻譯莎士比亞作品一樣，保留原文的標點符號。在譯“No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old”時，他對原文亦步亦趨，原文一句，他的譯文也是一句。但“李啟純”在這裏漏譯了“No animal in England is free”這句話。

Squealer made excellent speeches on the joy of service and the dignity of labour, but the other animals found more inspiration in Boxer's strength and his never-failing cry of “I will work harder!” (Orwell 1954: 83)

“尖號者”發表幾篇極好的演說，講服務之快樂，勞動之尊嚴，但是其他的畜牲們卻從“拳師”的體力及其永不停止叫喚的“我要更努力工作！”得到更多的**靈感**。（李啟純譯，1956: 60）

斯奎拉則時不時來一段關於甚麼勞動的樂趣以及勞工神聖之類的精彩演講，但使其他動物受到**鼓舞**更大的，卻來自鮑克瑟的踏實肯幹和他總是掛在嘴邊的口頭禪：“我要更加努力工作。”（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 83）

上面一段話裏，“李啟純”將“inspiration”翻譯成“靈感”是不

恰當的。在原文裏，“inspiration”在上下文裏，顯然不是“靈感”的意思，而是“激勵”的意思。張毅與高孝先將其翻譯為“鼓舞”，是準確的。

從以上對譯文的分析可以看出，“李啟純”翻譯 *Animal Farm* 的時候，雖保留了莎士比亞全集譯本的某些特點，如儘量保留原作的標點符號，但並不像他翻譯莎士比亞全集那樣認真仔細，^[8] 甚至給人一種敷衍塞責之感。梁實秋一貫堅持譯者應該以嚴謹的態度來對待翻譯，多次著文闡述這一立場，如在 1927 年 6 月 23 日在《時事新報·青光》上發表短文〈翻譯家〉（署名秋郎），對粗製濫造的譯作進行尖銳的批評（秋郎，1927）。^[9] 《百獸圖》中出現了一些漏譯及疏忽之處，這與他強調譯者應該以嚴謹的態度來從事翻譯的主張顯得很不相稱。在翻譯策略上，梁實秋強調譯文加注，但在這本書裏，他卻在應該加注的地方沒有加注。為甚麼會造成這樣的情況呢？是 *Animal Farm* 與莎士比亞作品有太大的不同而要區別對待？是因為該作品有很強的政治性？是因為受到官方的“贊助”而不太情願從事這樣的翻譯？譯文本身是否也體現出譯者的某種意識形態？以下將首先從最後一個問題入手加以討論。

三、譯者立場在譯文中的體現

我們發現，除了《百獸圖》之外，梁實秋還有另外兩部署名“李啟純”的有很強政治性的作品：^[10] 《蘇聯的強迫勞工》（*Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*）^[11]（Dallin and Nicolaevsky 1947）

與《法國共產黨的剖視》（*A Communist Party in Action: An Account of the Organization and Operation in France*）^[12]（Kendall 1949）。這三本著作出版於 1950 年代。當時，國民黨政府推行的是“反共抗俄”的政治路線，一些翻譯活動也要配合這一路線。比如國立編譯館遷台初期工作重點是：“會集南來學者，維持學術文化事業，加強思想領導，創辦《反攻》與《中國文摘》兩雜誌（後者於 40 年 2 月停辦），並翻譯反共抗俄叢書多種”（國立編譯館，1961: 2）。^[13] 在這樣的背景下翻譯出版的《百獸圖》，自然也會打有當時的政治意識形態的烙印。

有研究者指出，對於翻譯中的意識形態問題應該引起重視，了解譯者在譯文中添加了甚麼、省略了甚麼、他選擇了甚麼詞以及他如何放置這些詞，都是重要的問題，因為譯者做出的這些選擇展示了他的經歷及其所處的社會政治背景（Román and Vidal 1996: 5）。從“李啟純”譯文的措辭上，我們可以窺見譯者在意識形態問題上所持的立場。

從“李啟純”的譯文裏，我們可以清楚地看到譯者對動物持一種鄙視的態度。“李啟純”除了將書名“Animal Farm”譯為“百獸圖”外，其他在內文多次出現的“Animal Farm”則譯為“畜牲農場”，而不是“動物農場”。當然，如果將內文裏的“Animal Farm”翻譯為“百獸圖”顯然是不合適的。本書中其他的“animal”基本上都被“李啟純”翻譯為“畜牲”，比如：

Comrades, here and now I pronounce the death sentence upon Snowball.
“**Animal** Hero, Second Class,” and half a bushel of apples to any **animal**
who brings him to justice ... (Orwell 1954: 79)

同志們，我現在在此地宣佈“雪球”應即處死刑。任何**畜牲**如能將他捕殺，酬以“二等**畜牲**英雄勳章”和半鬥蘋果。（李啟純譯，1956: 59）

同志們，此時此刻，我宣佈判處斯諾鮑死刑。並給任何對他依法懲處的**動物**授予“二等**動物**英雄”勳章和半蒲式耳蘋果。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 81）

比較“李啟純”譯本與張毅、高孝先譯本，我們看到，前一譯本將“Animal”譯為“畜牲”，而後一譯本譯為“動物”。“畜牲”與“動物”相比，後者為中性，而前者卻有貶義，指為人格低下，如同禽獸，如罵人時稱其為“畜牲”。在“李啟純”眼裏，“畜牲”一詞也絕對不可能是褒義的。我們看下面的例子：

Indeed, all the **animals** worked like **slaves** that year. (Orwell 1954: 129)

真是的，那一年所有的**畜牲**們都像是**畜牲**一般的勞作。（李啟純譯，1956: 96）

其實，在這一年，所有的**動物**幹起活來都像**奴隸**一般。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 131）

英文的意思是，動物像奴隸那樣勞作，以奴隸來比喻動物在革命已經成功、已經“當家作主”後的生活狀況。但在“李啟純”的譯文裏，“畜牲們都像是畜牲一般的勞作”，畜牲本來就是畜

牲，為甚麼還要將其比做畜牲？“李啟純”在這裏將“slaves”譯為“畜牲”，“畜牲”明顯的帶有貶義。而張毅與高孝先則將“animal”與“slaves”譯為“動物”及“奴隸”這樣的中性詞。他們將書名翻譯為《動物莊園——一個神奇的故事》，“animal”對應的是中性詞“動物”，“一個神奇的故事”的“神奇”一詞也沒有包含多少價值判斷的成份，譯者的立場則要中立得多。

在譯文裏，“李啟純”在翻譯有關這些動物的詞彙的時候，基本上都使用貶義的詞來翻譯。比如：

Perhaps this was partly because there were so many pigs and so many dogs. It was not that these **creatures** did not work, after their fashion. (Orwell 1954: 142)

這也許一部份是因為豬太多狗太多的原故。這並不是說，他們這些東西不工作，按照他們的工作方式。（李啟純譯，1956: 105）

也許，其中的部份原因是由於豬和狗都多吧。處在他們這一等級的動物，都是用他們自己的方式從事勞動。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 143）

這裏，“李啟純”將“these creatures”翻譯為“這些東西”，“這些東西”明顯地帶有貶義，甚至會用在罵人的場合。（這段話的後一句的翻譯還有一個特點，即譯者保留了原來句子的語序，句子顯得比較生硬，這一點在前文已經提起過。）張毅、高孝先的譯本則將其翻譯為中性詞“動物”。再比如：

For that day we all must labour,
Though we **die** before it break; (Orwell 1954: 14)

我們全要為那一天而努力。
雖然那天未到而先**把命送**，（李啟純譯，1956: 10）

哪怕我們活不到那一天，
但為了那一天我們豈能等閑，（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 14）

以上兩句出自於老少校（Old Major）所編的一首歌 *Beasts of England*（“李啟純”將其譯為《英格蘭的畜牲》）。這首歌號召動物為擺脫人類的奴役而抗爭。“Though we die before it break”的意思為，“雖然那天未到我們就已犧牲”。在動物們看來，他們的做法是正義之舉，因而“die”應該是為正義的事業而犧牲之意，至少不會帶有貶義。張毅、高孝先譯本將其譯為中性的“活不到”，並沒有帶有譯者的感情色彩，但“李啟純”卻將這個詞翻譯為“把命送”，明顯地含有貶義，甚至帶有嘲弄之意。這樣的歌詞經由動物之口唱出，顯然不大相稱。這裏，我們卻看出了譯者對動物試圖擺脫人類統治的做法的立場：他對動物的這種做法顯然並不同情，更談不上是支持了。

All the other male pigs on the farm were **porkers**. (Orwell 1954: 18)

農場上其他的牡豬全是些**等宰的貨**。（李啟純譯，1956: 13）

莊園裏其他的豬都是肉豬。（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 17）

“porker”是指用作食用的豬，張毅、高孝先將其譯為“肉豬”，這個詞是中性詞。“李啟純”將其翻譯為“等宰的貨”，明顯地含有貶義，譯者對書中豬的鄙視在這個詞的翻譯上可見一斑。

在 *Animal Farm* 裏，多次出現了“rebellion”一詞，“李啟純”除了一次將其翻譯為“叛亂”（李啟純譯，1956: 13）之外，在其餘地方幾乎都將其翻譯為“叛變”。比如：

According to Snowball, they must send out more and more pigeons and stir up **rebellion** among the animals on the other farms. (Orwell 1954: 58)

據“雪球”講，他們應該派出更多更多的鴿子在別的農場裏煽動畜牲**叛變**。（李啟純譯，1956: 42-43）

而按斯諾鮑的說法，他們應該放出越來越多的鴿子，到其他莊園的動物中煽動**造反**。（張毅，高孝先譯，1988b: 58）

“李啟純”將“rebellion”譯為“叛變”，含有貶義，而張毅、高孝先將其譯為中性詞“造反”。在第一章裏，“少校”對動物說：

That is my message to you, comrades: **Rebellion!** (Orwell 1954: 10)

同志們，這就是我給你們的消息：**叛變**！（李啟純譯，1956: 6）

同志們，我要告訴你們的就是這個：造反！（張毅、高孝先譯，1988b: 10）

動物稱他們的行動是“叛變”，顯得非常滑稽，因為“叛變”是非正義活動。將“rebellion”翻譯為不含褒貶之意的“造反”則恰如其份。分析“李啟純”的譯文，我們看到，詩學的考慮與意識形態發生了衝突。從詩學上講，梁實秋顯然不會贊成突兀的譯文，“叛變”者會稱他們的活動是“起義”或“造反”，而不會稱為“叛變”。同時，“叛變”這個詞表示脫離或對抗原來的集團，但動物與人原來根本就不能算是一個組織或集團。“李啟純”不可能不清楚這一點，但他還是將“rebellion”翻譯為“叛變”，而不願意將其譯為“起義”，這裏明顯存在着意識形態的影響。在意識形態上，梁實秋不贊成暴力革命，不能接受動物的做法是正義的行為，在意識形態與詩學發生衝突的時候，意識形態壓倒了詩學上的考慮，這樣，在“李啟純”的譯文裏，某些譯文便在詩學上有所缺失——動物們稱他們的做法為“叛變”，顯然是不符合說話者身份的。當然，“李啟純”在翻譯這本書的時候，也有可能受到“贊助人”的影響，“贊助人”或許會對他具體的翻譯策略有一些干預，或許他的譯文在接受審查的時候會受到審查者的改動。儘管我們還沒有確實的證據來證明這一點，但這種情況也可能是存在的。從這部書出版的歷史環境來看，*Animal Farm* 的翻譯也是“反共抗俄”路線的產物，對於暴力革命，當局者當然是極力反對的，因而在譯作裏不大可能使用褒義的詞彙。

Animal Farm 是一部反對極權統治的書。在政治立場上，梁實秋顯然是不能認同共產主義思想的。但在梁實秋看來，*Animal*

Farm 揭示了普遍的人性，因而書中動物們所出現的問題，任何人、任何組織都在所難免，這本書出版時的政府當局也不例外。在這本書裏，動物們彼此稱呼“comrade”，“李啟純”都將其翻譯為“同志”。比如：

Boxer and Clover would harness themselves to the cutter or the horse-rake (no bits or reins were needed in these days, of course) and tramp steadily round and round the field with a pig walking behind and calling out “Get up, **comrade!**” or “Whoa back, **comrade!**” as the case might be. (Orwell 1954: 30-31)

“拳師”和“苜蓿”自己套上“扶土器”或是耙機（這時節當然不需要嚼鐵韁繩之類），很鎮定的在田地上走來走去，一隻豬在後面走着，按照當時情形而高喊“前進啊，同志！”或“向後轉啊，同志！”（李啟純譯，1956: 23）

在譯文裏，“同志”頻繁出現，這一稱呼是共產主義國家裏普遍使用的字眼，我們可以說 *Animal Farm* 是對共產國家的影射。但同一政黨的人之間都可以稱呼“同志”，國民黨內有時候也使用這個字眼。書中“同志”所出現的問題在任何政黨內部都有可能出現。

我們再來看書名的翻譯。“李啟純”沒有將書名“Animal Farm”按照字面意思翻譯為“動物農場”或“畜牲農場”，而是將其翻譯為“百獸圖”。“Animal Farm”的中心詞是“Farm”，而不是“Animal”，“Animal”只是“Farm”的修飾語。“李啟

純”的翻譯裏卻沒有出現“Farm”這個中心詞。“百獸圖”的中心詞是“圖”，即“圖畫”、“場景”。如果從“百獸圖”字面上來看，這本書試圖為讀者展示一幕幕動物畫面，通過這些畫面為讀者揭示這些動物的本質特性，使讀者由“獸性”而推及“人性”。正如這篇小說最後一段所描述的那樣：

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which. (Orwell 1954: 155)

十二個聲音同時怒吼，吼得一樣。豬的臉上究竟發生了甚麼變化，現在是毫無疑問了。外面的畜牲們從豬看到人從人看到豬，又從豬看到人；究竟那一個是豬，那一個是人，已經無法分辨了。（李啟純譯，1956: 116）

人所有的一切習性，動物都具備了；動物的一切習性，在人身上也有跡可尋——“獸性”其實就是“人性”的再現。梁實秋在他的一篇文章裏已經清楚地指出了這一點：

《百獸圖》屬於諷刺文學的類型。在西洋文學裏，諷刺文學作品是不以個人為對象的，不作私人攻訐，亦不指某固定事件而提供意見，既不對人亦不對事，而只是針對着人性中的弱點，（表現出來即為 vices 或 follies），加以誇張形容，使其不合理處

昭然若揭，使其醜態畢露，使其缺陷客觀的陳列在讀者的目前。其手段儘管尖刻，其用心是在規勸儆醒。被諷刺的現象是普遍的，因其是人性之一面。……《百獸圖》裏面的人物固然是俄共的首要及其人民，但是諷刺的真正的對象是一般人普通常犯的毛病——嫉妒、仇恨、殘酷、欺騙、愚蠢。共產黨徒也是人，共產黨犯的毛病即是人性中的惡劣部份之充份的發展。人性中本有一部份獸性，我們常說共產黨違反人性，實際上即是他們過份發展那人性中的獸性。這《百獸圖》正是這獸性發展之最好的一個寫照。（梁實秋，1978: 568-569）

在梁實秋看來，《百獸圖》所諷刺的現象具有普遍的意義，因而這本書同樣對非共產主義的政黨也是有一定的借鑒意義。在第一章裏，“少校”對動物說：

And remember also that in fighting against Man, we must not come to resemble them. Even when you have conquered him, do not adopt his vice ... (Orwell 1954: 12)

並且要記住，和人作戰的時候，我們不可模倣他。就是我們戰勝了他，也不可採取他的罪惡。（李啟純譯，1956: 7-8）

這段話揭示出了歷史上一個普遍的現象，即被統治階級不堪統治階級的壓迫時，往往試圖揭竿而起，建立一個平等的、沒有剝削沒有壓迫的社會。但成功之後，這些起義領導者們卻成了新的統治者、新的剝削者，與以前的剝削者並沒有不同之處。因而“少

校”在還沒有革命之前就已經發出了警告。但此後發生的事情卻不幸言中了。這句話與“李啟純”在《法國共產黨的剖視》的序言裏的一段話比較類似：

本書作者於結束其嚴正的剖析之餘提出一點意見，以為**反對共產黨不可再模倣共產黨**，^[14]語重心長，發人深省。吾人常雲：“即以其人之道還治其人之身”，其意蓋為以眼還眼以牙還牙，揆之對敵人無寬恕之義原無可厚非，但是其間似應有一點分寸。用共產黨的方法對共產黨鬥爭，則可；用共產黨對付人民之道對付人民，用共產黨治理國家之道以治理國家，則不可。^[15]這一點分別是很大的。關於此點，譯者不欲多言，但因本書作者一再叮嚀，故縱筆及之，高明讀者，幸加深思。（李啟純，1953: 2）

“李啟純”在這篇序言裏重申了不可以“用共產黨對付人民之道對付人民”，不可以“用共產黨治理國家之道以治理國家”。這句話與“李啟純”翻譯《百獸圖》裏的那句話非常相近。《百獸圖》的那句話是有一定普遍意義的，“李啟純”在《法國共產黨的剖視》的前言便是將這個道理應用到政府當局身上，希望當局能夠記取教訓。有的西方研究者也認為，《Animal Farm》這本書可以看作是對一般的革命，特別是對俄國革命的嘲諷，該書讓我們對任何形式的威脅個人自由的獨裁制度保持警惕（Armstrong 1985: 53-54）。梁實秋主張人性是超越階級的，蘇聯共產黨出現的問題，任何政黨也同樣會出現。而在事實上，在《百獸圖》翻譯出版的時候，國民黨在意識形態方面控制得相當嚴格，梁實秋翻譯《百獸圖》明為批判共產黨，也暗含了對國民黨政府的警示。要

對這一點進行剖析，就需要從胡適及《自由中國》半月刊談起。1949年初，國民黨政權處於風雨飄搖之際，胡適等人希望“辦一種報紙以振起輿論”，決定命名為“自由中國”（胡適，1989: 132）。胡適曾在《自由中國》雜誌三週年紀念會的致詞裏說：

我們不可以為今天比較安全，可以苟安；或者看共產黨有些甚麼方式，認為應該學共產黨的方式來對待共產黨。^[10]政府為國家的安全，固然有許多地方須要有某種制度。但是，大體上來說，我們國家最大的努力方向，應該還是本社同仁這幾年來所宣傳的、所標舉出來的，就是希望做到自由民主這一方面。（胡適，1989: 132）

胡適為甚麼說“我們國家最大的努力方向”應該是“做到自由民主”呢？之所以要“做到自由民主”，就是因為他認為國民黨當局並不給民眾“自由民主”。他在這裏所說的“看共產黨有些甚麼方式，認為應該學共產黨的方式來對待共產黨”，與“李啟純”在《法國共產黨的剖視》一書的譯者序裏的話非常相似。胡適講的那句話初刊於1952年12月16日；“李啟純”寫的那篇譯序所署的日期為1950年7月（但該譯本則初版於1953年），時間比較接近。胡適所說的這句話曾激怒了國民黨當局，雷震曾在引述這句話時加上了這樣的按語：

胡適這句話，本來是不錯的。也可能是有所鑒而云然，但蔣經國之所以痛恨胡適者，一般人都說是這句話所引起的，因為蔣經國的治台，處處是學共產黨的方式，因為他留學俄國，心目中只知

共產黨的方式，而不知民主國家治國的方式，今日則自食其果也。（雷震，1989: 60）

國民黨使用了哪些“共產黨治理國家之道以治理國家”呢？蔣經國曾於 1925 年至 1937 年於蘇聯學習工作，受過系統的共產主義教育。1925 年入莫斯科孫逸仙大學學習，接受了共產主義思想，並於該年加入共產黨，1927 年入列寧格勒托瑪卡紅軍軍政學校。¹¹⁷ 蔣經國早年長期在蘇聯的生活學習經歷，對他後來回國從政有一定的影響，他的一些具體的措施就是效仿蘇聯共產黨的做法。例如，蔣經國長期從事青年工作，早年是共青團員，並做過團的工作；撤退台灣後，在他的負責之下，台灣各高等院校裏重新建立起國民黨組織，“中國青年反共抗俄救國團”也於 1951 年開始籌建，次年通過了《籌組中國青年反共抗俄救國團原則》，規定高中以上學生需要參加該組織。除此之外，國民黨當局仿效蘇聯，在軍隊裏設立國民黨黨部。雷震在他的回憶錄裏就聲稱，他之所以被捕，就是國民黨仿效史達林作法的體現：

國民黨在我被捕之日散發的《〈自由中國〉違法言論摘要》上所提出的文章，完全是用“曲解”的方式來誣陷的，即胡適所說用共產黨的方法。如在自由民主的國家，《自由中國》半月刊無論那（哪）一篇文章，絕不會解釋為有利於叛徒之宣傳的。國民黨這種作法，完全是仿效共產黨頭子史達林的作法。（雷震，1989: 65）

因而雷震也與胡適一起來反對國民黨當局仿照蘇聯共產黨的作

法，他在《監察院之將來》一書裏說：

國民黨之一度聯俄容共，不論在思想方式上或行動樣態上，均感染了“共型”那一套惡習……我們今日從事於存亡絕續之反共抗俄鬥爭，我們必須一反共黨之所由立，和力抗蘇俄之所由成。換一句話說，我們必須是連根帶蒂的剷除共俄這些思想毒素……
(雷震，1990: 6-7)

看來，“李啟純”在其《法國共產黨的剖視》一書的譯序強調“用共產黨治理國家之道以治理國家，則不可”，是有影射國民黨當局的用意。梁實秋到台灣後，對政治的評論比以前少得多了。這與當局在思想上加強控制有一定關係，同時也在於梁實秋幾乎對政府完全喪失了信心。梁實秋在 30 年代就已經寫過不少文章對當局的某些做法加以抨擊，而到了 50、60 年代，情況反而更加嚴重。在這種情況下，梁實秋便通過署名“李啟純”的翻譯，表面上是反對共產黨，實則在反對國民黨，從他的序言裏可以看到他“哀其不幸怒氣不爭”的心理，他只有借助翻譯來排遣他的鬱悶心情，指桑罵槐，希望當局能夠迷途知返。這樣看來，“李啟純”翻譯《百獸圖》其寓意是很特別的。

四、結 語

《百獸圖》的譯者是如何來看待這部作品的？“李啟純”在《百獸圖》裏沒有序言，但“梁實秋”後來則寫專文〈《百獸

圖》與諷刺文學》來談這部作品。梁實秋並不諱言《百獸圖》“具有強烈的反共意義”（梁實秋，1978: 568），但同時認為，這部書更值得稱道的是其對人性的深刻剖析：

這部書之真值得讚美處，並不在於它具備強烈的反共意義。老實說，俄國共產黨那一些罪過、殘酷、虛偽、橫暴、誰人不知，誰人不曉？更何待文學家用小說的筆法曲予描繪？這本小說之所以令人叫絕，是在於它的描寫人性之透澈，描寫手段之高明，使得它成為一部優秀的文藝作品，反共云云，其餘事耳！（梁實秋，1978: 568）

這裏，梁實秋認為對人性的淋漓盡致的描寫是最值得稱道的地方，而其中的反共思想則是次要的。但不管孰為主，孰為次，在梁實秋看來，兩者其實已經水乳交融地在書裏表現了出來。

儘管梁實秋說該書的反共思想是次要的，但他對這一點顯然有所強調。張毅與高孝先的譯本出版於大陸，他們在〈譯序〉裏指出該書是“諷刺史達林的獨裁專制的寓言”（張毅、高孝先，1988a: 1），並對蘇聯在糾正史達林錯誤路線上的努力給予肯定：

所幸的是，今天的蘇聯，正在真正徹底清算史達林個人專斷所造成的遺害，他們不僅勇敢地承認了歷史的失誤，並且強調“民主是改革的靈魂”（戈爾巴喬夫語）。他們不僅對個人專斷作出了嚴厲的批判，而且已經開始了民主的實踐。（張毅、高孝先，1988a: 7）

張毅與高孝先只是說該書是針對“史達林的獨裁專制”，梁實秋在評述《百獸圖》作者的政治意圖的時候，主要側重其反共這一方面。這與台灣在 50 年代初期的“反共抗俄”這一主流意識形態是有一定關聯的。對歐威爾的反共的思想，梁實秋所持的是一種正面的評價。他在〈《百獸圖》與諷刺文學〉一文對歐威爾作了簡要介紹，指出，歐威爾的作品“特別值得我們重視，因為共產黨是人類最大的威脅，而歐威爾又有他的特殊的犀利的文筆，予以無情的諷刺”（梁實秋，1978: 566）。歐威爾寫作《百獸圖》所持的政治立場梁實秋也是完全認同的。

從梁實秋的評論，我們看到他在《百獸圖》這本書裏似乎找到了他政治上反共和文學上宣傳人性的契合點。他之所以反共，是因為在他看來“共產黨違反人性”（梁實秋，1978: 569）。他的文藝思想決定了他不能夠認同共產主義思想。梁實秋主張文學當描寫永恆的人性，但他也不否認階級性，只是階級性是文學背景研究的一個部份，而不是全部。人性與階級性二者有輕重之別，人性高於階級性，正如他在〈人性與階級性〉一文中所說：“階級性只是表面現象。文學的精髓是人性描寫。人性與階級性可以同時並存的，但是我們要認清這輕重表裏之別”（梁實秋，1997e: 453）。翻譯具有反共思想的作品，與他的文藝觀也有相合之處，同時，梁實秋認為《百獸圖》一書也有其高超的文學價值：“《百獸圖》就妙在故事寫得入情入理，沒有一點張牙舞爪的氣味，使讀者感到作者是在發掘人性——給人性做‘滌瑕蕩穢’的工作”（梁實秋，1978: 570）。作者歐威爾在寫作的時候也是很注重其作品的藝術性的，他試圖將他寫作的政治意圖與藝術的美融為一體，他說，“在過去十年裏，我最希望做的事是使政治

作品的寫作成為一種藝術”（Orwell 1957: 318）。^[18]這一點是深得梁實秋欽佩的，也可能是梁實秋選擇翻譯的一個原因。

然而，當這部作品成為上層下達的一項政治任務的時候，情況可能出現微妙的變化。“李啟純”的這部譯作在文字上為甚麼會有那些疏漏？有這樣兩種可能性：第一，可能是時間倉促，沒有進行認真的校對工作；第二，這部作品是政府下達的翻譯任務，是以服務政治為目的的，本來可以在主動的狀態下完成的翻譯卻要在被動的狀態下進行，這樣，儘管譯者也認同這部作品反映的主題，但在心理上卻難以接受，因而並不像他對待《莎士比亞全集》那樣傾注了大量的心血。我們現在還沒有證據來證實第一種可能性，但第二種可能性是完全存在的。梁實秋很有可能是在一種矛盾的心理下從事這樣的翻譯的。一方面，梁實秋沒有拒絕翻譯這本書，是因為這本書的思想性與他的文藝思想有吻合之處。另一方面，這本書的翻譯也使他處於一種尷尬的境地。此時國立編譯館翻譯的一個主要動機就是要使翻譯成為“反共抗俄”的工具。梁實秋是不大可能同意這種做法，因為這是與他所信奉的新人文主義及自由主義思想完全背離的。作為一位新人文主義者，他不能認同文學或翻譯成為某一意識形態的工具；作為一位自由主義者，他主張知識份子要保持自己思想及言論的自由以及人格的獨立性。梁實秋非常推崇胡適的這句話：“獅子老虎永遠獨來獨往，只有狐狸和狗才成群結隊”（梁實秋，1989b: 105）。像“獅子”與“老虎”那樣獨來獨往，極力保持自己作為知識份子精神上的獨立性，而不願像“狐狸”與“狗”那樣成群結隊，這是作為自由主義者的梁實秋的寫照。他說，“我沒有政黨立場，完全是自由主義”（見何懷碩，1988: 56）。身為一位有獨立

思想的知識份子，他是難以適應官場生活的。他在 1949 至 1950 年期間曾擔任國立編譯館館長，但不久便遞交辭呈，而專心從事教學與文學創作及翻譯工作。^[19] 梁實秋是有自己政治主張的，但他的這些主張完全是出於他自己的看法，而不是依附某一階級的結果。他說：

文學家永遠不失去他的獨立。在革命期中的文學家作品，往往隱示着民間的苦痛，諷刺着時代的虛偽，這並不是受任誰的命令，除了他自己的內心的命令；文學家沒有任何使命，除了他自己內心對於真善美德要求使命。（梁實秋，1969b: 6）

梁實秋堅持自己的文學主張、不盲從別人，極力保持知識份子人格和精神的獨立和自由，他不會輕易融入某一政治機構。他反對政治或意識形態對文學的干涉，反對文藝成為政治鬥爭的工具，但《百獸圖》出版的時間與地點以及當時的歷史時代背景卻使該譯作客觀上淪為意識形態鬥爭的工具，成為服務“反共抗俄”政策的工具。梁實秋在〈《百獸圖》與諷刺文學〉一文裏說，“此書現有李啟純先生譯本，正中書局出版”（梁實秋，1978: 566）。他似乎在這裏故弄玄虛，像在談論其他人的翻譯作品。如果不知道梁實秋有“李啟純”這個筆名的話，從這裏讀者會認為這本書不是他翻譯的。他之所以使用筆名，很有可能是因為他並不是非常情願去從事這樣的翻譯，似乎向讀者表明：這本書是“李啟純”翻譯的，而不是翻譯莎士比亞全集的那位“梁實秋”譯的。（“李啟純”的譯文雖然沒有莎士比亞全集那樣認真嚴謹，畢竟還有某些相似之處。）但他畢竟還是翻譯了，文學與政治或意識

形態在這裏展示出的是一種又有瓜葛、又糾纏不清的曖昧關係。

這裏還涉及一個關於翻譯充當意識形態及詩學的工具的問題。列夫維爾指出，在各種不同的意識形態及詩學的衝突中，翻譯能夠扮演重要的角色（Lefevere 1990: 23）。一般而言，譯者會選擇與自己意識形態及詩學相近的作品進行翻譯，以此來對抗與之對立的意識形態及詩學。“李啟純”翻譯的《百獸圖》明顯的有反共性質，但他卻似乎也以此來警示推行“反共抗俄”的當局者。這也是翻譯活動中一個有趣的現象。

總之，《百獸圖》的翻譯似乎是在一種複雜矛盾的狀態下進行的。梁實秋翻譯這部作品，既與他的文藝思想及政治觀念有一致之處，又有矛盾之處。《百獸圖》折射出了一些文學翻譯中詩學及意識形態的問題以及翻譯與政治之間剪不斷、理還亂的錯綜複雜的關係。與梁實秋不同的是，歐威爾並不諱言藝術與政治的密切關係，他在〈我為甚麼寫作〉（Orwell 1957）一文裏談到寫作的政治目的時說，“沒有完全擺脫政治偏見的作品，認為藝術不應該與政治有任何關係的觀點本身就是一種政治態度”（Orwell 1957: 316）。梁實秋的情況不幸被歐威爾言中了，他最終還是沒有擺脫意識形態的影響。魯迅與梁實秋論戰期間曾寫有這樣的文字：“有馬克斯學識的人來為唯物史觀打仗，在此刻，我是不贊成。我只希望有切實的人，肯譯幾部世界上已有定評的關於唯物史觀的書……那麼，論爭起來，可以省說許多話”（魯迅，1997: 167）。從《百獸圖》的翻譯，我們看到，翻譯又何嘗不是為梁實秋“省說許多話”呢？而所省的那些話豈能一言道盡呢？

注釋

^[1] 《百獸圖》講述了一群動物對人發動的“革命”。在名叫“拿破崙”的豬的領導下，群獸將人驅逐出了農場。“革命”成功後，群獸制定了七條原則：一、兩條腿的是敵人；二、四條腿的或有翅膀的是朋友；三、畜牲不可以穿衣服；四、畜牲不可以躺在床上睡覺；五、畜牲不可飲酒；六、不可殺害畜牲；七、畜牲一律平等。但成為新剝削階級的豬卻破壞了這七條原則，並將其中的幾條任意篡改。豬掌有給群獸分配糧食的權力，可以專享牛乳，可以享受用雞蛋換來的美酒，如有其他動物不服從，便將其處死。豬之後也學會了直立行走，並會使用皮鞭來督促其他動物工作。後來豬請了人來赴宴，其他動物簡直無法將人與豬區分開來。《百獸圖》影射的是蘇聯以史達林為首的專制獨裁統治。作品完成時，由於蘇聯與英美兩國是反對法西斯德國的盟國，直到 1945 年該書才得以出版。

^[2] 1950 年，梁實秋擔任國立編譯館館長時，陳之藩曾任職於該館。

^[3] 筆者曾就這一點寫電郵請教梁實秋先生之子梁文騏先生。梁文騏先生回信說：“對不起，我不知道‘李啟純’這個筆名。我父親使用過很多筆名，但我不知道他在翻譯作品裏用過筆名”（原文是由英文寫的，這裏是筆者的翻譯）。“李啟純”的譯文出版時，梁文騏還身在大陸，加之梁實秋的筆名較多，梁文騏不知道這個筆名是完全有可能的。

^[4] 另外一個元素是文學系統本身的一些“專業人士”（professionals）。

^[5] 列夫維爾本人在他的著作裏也沒有給意識形態下一個明確的定義。他在談論“贊助”時，借用了詹姆士的界定（Jameson 1974: 107），指出“意識形態”並不局限於政治領域，而是包含了任何能夠指引行為的形式、習俗、以及信仰（Lefevre 1992: 16）。這一定義也涵蓋很廣的意義。在本文中，“意識形態”這一術語則限定在政治領域，等同於“政治意識形態”或“政治觀”。

^[6] 有關梁實秋的文藝思想，可參看梁實秋（1989a；1989c）、侯健（1974）、Hou（1980）等文獻。

^[7] 梁實秋後來在寫有名為〈《百獸圖》與諷刺文學〉的文章，算是一個

補序。但他卻是以一個旁觀者的角度來評價《百獸圖》：“此書現有李啟純先生譯本，正中書局出版”（梁實秋，1978b: 566）。似乎在談論他人的譯文。

- ¹⁸⁾ 梁實秋在翻譯莎士比亞全集的時候，傾注了大量的心血，他在青島開始翻譯莎士比亞全集時，條件相當艱苦。首先是能夠從事翻譯的時間有限。他每週要教十二小時課（梁實秋，1970: 98），翻譯只能在課餘時間進行。其次是資料缺乏。要忠實地譯出莎士比亞的作品，就需要準確地理解原作，必須查找相關的參考資料。為了解決資料缺乏的問題，梁實秋試圖從各種管道蒐集有關莎士比亞的資料，“積五六年的功夫也略有規模，比任何學校的設備還要強一些”（梁實秋，1970: 98）。他希望蒐集到的不止包括“注釋本”，“舉凡與莎士比亞有關的書籍文字”他都希望能夠參閱，*Shakespeare Society Transactions*（莎士比亞學會論文集）他就收集了很多（梁實秋，1970: 106）。收集資料的過程是很艱辛的，在抗戰期間，他聽說有一本“新集注本”的版本出版，便千方百計地想購置一本。恰好一位朋友的親戚去美國，梁實秋便請其代買，然而回來時，給他帶來的只是一些禮物，他夢寐以求的書並沒有買到，梁實秋對此深感遺憾。到台灣後，他更極力希望購置一些莎士比亞研究的新資料，但當時台灣外匯不自由，申請手續繁複，十分困難。後一位美國朋友答應幫他買書，梁實秋喜出望外，但由於“這些書都是有關一個‘英國’作家的”而未能批准，梁實秋對此哭笑不得（梁實秋，1970: 107）。儘管條件艱苦，梁實秋“那時有的只是一股熱心”，他要像愚公移山那樣，“一步一步的去作，作多少算多少”（梁實秋，1970: 98）。梁實秋對待翻譯的態度是嚴肅的，最終以頑強的意志和毅力完成莎士比亞全集的翻譯，得到學者的普遍讚譽，其譯文嚴謹，並不像《百獸圖》譯文那樣在篇幅並不大的一本書裏出現那麼多粗疏之處。

- ¹⁹⁾ 除此之外，梁實秋於1932年10月1日的《圖書評論》上發表了一篇名為〈莎翁名著哈姆雷特的兩種譯本〉（梁實秋，1932）的文章，對邵挺的譯作《天仇記》和田漢的譯作《哈孟雷特》提出批評；在《創造週刊》1923年第9號上，梁實秋著文〈讀鄭振鐸的《飛鳥

集》)對鄭振鐸翻譯的印度詩人太(泰)戈爾的作品提出批評(梁實秋, 1923: 7)。

- [10] 梁實秋用李啟純這個筆名還翻譯過一篇有關莎士比亞的文章。1966年9月, 國立編譯館出版《莎士比亞誕辰四百週年紀念集》, 內有梁實秋譯文三篇: Dora Jane Hamblin 作〈莎士比亞的作品是誰作的〉, Boris Pasternak 著〈關於莎士比亞〉, 以及署名李啟純的〈莎士比亞傳略〉(F. E. Halliday 原著)。這篇署名李啟純的譯作是純學術性的作品, 作者 F. E. Halliday 是莎士比亞研究的學者。
- [11] 《蘇聯的強迫勞工》(李啟純, 1951)剖析了蘇聯的勞工營及流徙制度, 抨擊了史達林統治下的蘇聯對強迫勞工的殘酷剝削與迫害, 追述了蘇聯強迫勞工的歷史與現狀, 敘述了其由初期的嘗試逐漸形成龐大體系的過程, 以及當局對待勞工觀念的演變: 最初以人道主義來對待, 而到後來演變到毫無人性的殘忍手段。
- [12] 這本書分三十四個章節, 對法國共產黨的歷史沿革、運作方式、機構設置等進行了全面詳盡的剖析。
- [13] 國立編譯館在 1949 年 7 月到 1950 年 12 月的《工作概況》中有“翻譯世界名著”一欄, 但卻說, “為配合反共抗俄國策並闡述民主自由思想之真諦, 特選譯各種名著。茲將譯印情況列表於後……”(國立編譯館, 1961: 2)。這裏的“世界名著”則主要是“反共抗俄”的作品。梁實秋在此期間, 也翻譯了幾部這樣的著作。在所列的“世界名著”裏赫然印有李啟純譯的《蘇聯的強迫勞工》及《法國共產黨的剖視》, 並注明這兩本書已經由正中書局印行。(國立編譯館, 1961: 14, 15)
- [14] 文中黑體為筆者所示。
- [15] 文中黑體為筆者所示。
- [16] 文中黑體為筆者所示。
- [17] 在蘇聯期間, 他曾在給生母的信(信尾的日期為 1935 年 1 月 23 日)中對共產黨予以高度評價: “共產黨員是為爭取自己的真理甚麼都不怕的戰士。他們為了創造人民幸福的生活在鬥爭着”(蔣經國, 1989: 235)。蔣經國在信中也表明了他的共產主義信念: “……今天我成

了一個共產黨員。有人也許會覺得奇怪，但是我對共產主義的信念一點都不動搖。我有充份的自覺，對真正的革命理論成就有研究、有認識”（蔣經國，1989: 236）。

[18] 該文寫於 1947 年。

[19] 梁實秋在《槐園夢憶》裏講到了他為何放棄編譯館館長職務之事（參見梁實秋，1976b: 78-79）。

參考文獻

- Álvarez, Román and M. Carmen-África Vidal (1996). “Translating: A Political Act”. In *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Ed. Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., pp. 1-9.
- Armstrong, Jean (1985). *Animal Farm by George Orwell*. Houndmills, London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Brook, G. L. (1976). *The Language of Shakespeare*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Dallin, David J. and Boris I. Nicolaevsky (1947). *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hou, Chien (1980). *Irving Babbitt in China*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.
- Kendall, Willmoore, trans. (1949). *A Communist Party in Action: An Account of the Organization and Operation in France* (by A. Rossi). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lefevere André (1990). *Translation: Its Genealogy in the West*. In *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London and New York: Pinter Publishers, pp. 14-28.
- _____ (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Orwell, George (1954). *Animal Farm*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- _____ (1957). “Why I Write”. In *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Doubleday, pp. 313-320.

《翻譯季刊》第四十三期

Pollard, Alfred W. (1967). *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of His Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, Percy (1911). *Shakespearian Punctuation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, John Dover (1961b). "A Note on Punctuation". In *The Tempest*. Ed. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. lvii-lx.

曹未風（譯）（1955），《漢姆萊特》，上海：新文藝出版社。

國立編譯館（1961），《國立編譯館概況》，臺北：國立編譯館。

何懷碩（1988），〈悵望千秋一灑淚——告別梁實秋先生感懷〉，《傳記文學》第二十五卷第一期（總第 308 期），頁 54-56。

侯健（1974），《從文學革命到革命文學》，臺北：中外文學月刊社。

胡百華（1988），〈梁實秋先生簡譜初稿〉，余光中編，《秋之頌》，臺北：九歌出版社，頁 507-554。

胡適（1989），〈《自由中國》雜誌三週年紀念會上致詞〉，傅正主編，《雷震全集 13—雷震與自由中國》，臺北：桂冠圖書股份有限公司，頁 131-134。原載於 1952 年 12 月 16 日《自由中國》。

蔣經國（1989），〈蔣經國指控蔣中正〉（陳丹譯自日本學者波多野峻一的《中國共產黨史》），傅正主編，《雷震全集 12—雷案回憶》，臺北：桂冠圖書股份有限公司，頁 234-239。

雷震（1989），〈《自由中國》與胡適〉，傅正主編，《雷震全集 11—雷案回憶》，臺北：桂冠圖書股份有限公司，頁 58-65。

李啟純（譯）（1951），《蘇聯的強迫勞工》（Dallin, Nicolaevsky 合著），臺北：國立圖書館。

——（1953），〈譯者序〉，李啟純譯，《法國共產黨的剖視》（A. Rossi 著），臺北：國立圖書館，頁 1-2。

——（譯）（1956），《百獸圖》，臺北：正中書局。

李正西（1991），《不滅的紗燈——梁實秋詩歌創作論》，臺北：貫雅文化事業有限公司。

劉真（1992），〈實秋先生不朽〉，陳子善編，《回憶梁實秋》，長春：吉林文史出版社，頁 73-93。原載於 1987 年 12 月臺北《傳記文學》

第 51 卷第 6 期。

秦賢次（1988），〈梁實秋小傳〉，蕭蕭編，《六十七年散文選》，臺北：九歌出版有限公司，頁 287-290。

梁實秋（1923），〈讀鄭振鐸的《飛鳥集》〉，《創造週刊》1923 年第 9 號，頁 7-9。

_____（1932），〈莎翁名著哈姆雷特的兩種譯本〉，《圖書評論》11 月 1 日，頁 61-64。

_____（譯）（1964a），《維洛那二紳士》，臺北：文星書店。

_____（譯）（1964b），《無事自擾》，臺北：文星書店。

_____（譯）（1966），《暴風雨》，臺北：台灣商務印書館。

_____（1967a），〈梁實秋先生手訂譯著書目〉，《書日季刊》第二卷第一期，頁 77-79。

_____（譯）（1967b），《空愛一場》，臺北：台灣商務印書館。

_____（譯）（1967c），《利查二世》，臺北：遠東圖書公司。

_____（1969a），〈現代文學論〉，《偏見集》，臺北：文星書店，頁 107-141。

_____（1969b），〈文學與革命〉，《偏見集》，臺北：文星書店，頁 1-11。

_____（1970），〈關於莎士比亞的翻譯〉，梁實秋、余光中等，《翻譯的藝術》，臺北：晨鐘出版社，頁 93-110。

_____（譯）（1976a），《哈姆雷特》，臺北：遠東圖書公司。

_____（1976b），《槐園夢憶》，臺北：遠東圖書公司。

_____（1978），〈《百獸圖》與諷刺文學〉，《梁實秋論文學》，臺北：時報文化出版事業有限公司，頁 565-570。

_____（1979），《莎士比亞全集》，臺北：遠東圖書公司。

_____（1989a），〈我是怎樣開始寫文學評論的？——“梁實秋論文學”序〉。原載於 1978 年 3 月 12 日臺北《中國時報·人間》。收於梁實秋著、陳子善編《梁實秋文學回憶錄》，長沙：嶽麓書社，頁 2-14。

_____（1989b），〈“新月”前後〉。原載於 1977 年 10 月 14 日臺北《聯合報》副刊，收於梁實秋著、陳子善編《梁實秋文學回憶錄》，長

《翻譯季刊》第四十三期

- 沙：嶽麓書社，頁 124-127。
- （1989c），〈影響我的幾本書〉。原刊於 1985 年臺北九歌出版社《雅舍散文》。載於梁實秋著、陳子善編《梁實秋文學回憶錄》，長沙：嶽麓出版社，頁 15-29。
- 林同濟（譯）（1982），《丹麥王子哈姆雷的悲劇》，北京：中國戲劇出版社。
- 魯迅（1997），〈文學的階級性〉，最初發表於 1928 年 8 月 20 日《語絲》第四卷第三十四期，原題目為〈通信・其二〉，收入《三閑集》時改為〈文學的階級性〉，載於黎照編，《魯迅／梁實秋論戰實錄》，北京：華齡出版社，頁 165-167。
- 秋郎（1927），〈翻譯家〉，1927 年 6 月 23 日雜感在《時事新報・青光》。
- 田漢（譯）（1932），《哈孟雷特》，上海：中華書局。
- 余光中（1971），〈梁翁傳莎翁〉，《望鄉的牧神》，臺北：純文學月刊社，頁 175-182。
- 張毅、高孝先（1988a），〈譯序〉，《動物莊園——一個神奇的故事》，上海：上海人民出版社，頁 1-8。
- （譯）（1988b），《動物莊園——一個神奇的故事》，上海：上海人民出版社。
- 朱生豪（譯）（1978a），〈理查二世〉，《莎士比亞全集 4》，北京：人民文學出版社，頁 301-400。

作者簡介

白立平，南京大學英文系碩士，香港中文大學翻譯學哲學博士，現為香港理工大學中文及雙語學系翻譯研究中心博士後研究員。曾在《中外文學》（台灣）及 *Humanitas*（美國）等刊物上發表比較文學及翻譯學論文多篇。

History, Thought, and Translation (I): Against a Tradition of Sinological Translations

Leo Tak-hung Chan

Abstract

The author of the present essay discusses the nature and characteristics of “sinological translations” in terms of his own translation of Ge Zhaoguang’s History of Chinese Thought. He delineates the background to his attempt to render into English the monumental work by one of the leading historians in Mainland China. With due attention paid to the potential readership, he has sought to use an eclectic approach, favoring commonly accepted philosophical terms and striving to come up with an eminently reader-friendly translation. In this he was aided by Ge himself, who rewrote and edited his original text for the translator. Appended to this essay is the “Introduction” to the first volume, History of Chinese Thought up to the Seventh Century, here translated into English for the first time. It contains a sustained reflection on the methodology of writing an intellectual history (or more literally, “a history of thought”).

Among the many surveys of Chinese intellectual history in the past decade is a remarkable work by Ge Zhaoguang, who is currently Professor of Chinese and Director of the Center for Chinese Studies at Fudan University, Shanghai. It consists of two volumes: *History of Chinese Thought up to the Seventh Century*, published in 1998; and *History of Chinese Thought from the Seventh to the Nineteenth Century*, which came out in 2000. What is most notable about the *History* is its breadth of focus. Instead of focusing on abstract ideas and writing what would amount to a history of philosophy, Ge seeks to delineate how elite thought interacts with general types of knowledge such as those related to religion, technology and the cosmos. According to Carine Defoort, “this approach allows him to traverse the boundaries of various disciplines including philosophy, history, anthropology and archaeology” (Defoort 2002b: Preface II). Ge’s distinctive historiographical approach was the cause of some controversy after the book was published, as summed up by Defoort (2002a; 2002b). Other than that, it displays an amazing use of primary and secondary sources. Sources ranging from almanacs to ritual books, as well as previously unstudied artifacts to recently discovered texts preserved at the museums, make this book worthy of scholarly attention and most worthy of translation.

Translation of the *History* can be seen as yet another example of sinological translation that originated in Europe but later was no longer confined geographically. Such tradition even included works carried out by scholars, primarily of the classics of philosophy, in China herself. Although it has a history of several centuries, the tradition has really flourished in the last two hundred years or so. James Legge’s English renditions of the Chinese classics marked a significant point of departure, especially for translations into English (rather than French or German). With the accumulation of a body of famed translations of the major philosophical texts—like Arthur Waley’s *Analects* (1938) and *Shijing* (1937);

Bernhard Karlgren's *Shujing* (1950); Burton Watson's *Zhuangzi* (1968), *Hanfeizi* (1964) *Mozzi* (1963) and *Shiji* (1971); D. C. Lau's *Daode jing* (1963), *Mencius* (1970) and *Analects* (1979); A. C. Graham's *Zhuangzi* (1981); and others—this tradition has continued unabated into the twenty-first century. Scholar-translators have sought to fill out such gaps as still remain of key texts, which were previously untranslated for a variety of reasons. The ostensible justification has been to make such texts accessible to Western readers who cannot read the original texts in the classical language. Nonetheless, many of the projects continue to be of an academic nature and are meant as a method of presenting new interpretations of these texts—examples are translations of the *Heguanzi* (Defoort 1997) and the *Taixuan jing* (Nylan 1993), works previously neglected but are now considered worthy of translation. Retranslations of the classics are aplenty (e.g. Knoblock 1988-1994). Perhaps the best known of these is the *Daode jing*, which has reappeared in many new guises (e.g. Le Guin 1997; Lynn 1999; Carus 2000; Roberts 2001; Ames and Hall 2003). Most interesting of all is a new wave of enthusiasm for translating religious Daoist texts—spearheaded by Bokenkamp, among others—and Buddhist scriptures (e.g. Bokenkamp 1997; Campamy 2002; Sharf 2002).

The translation of Ge's *History* should be considered in this context, though perhaps a bit differently. As an endeavor to present Chinese scholarship in intellectual history to the Western world, it has few precedents, and cannot be said to constitute part of any tradition. There are hardly any appropriate models. Derk Bodde's brilliant translation of Feng Youlan's *A History of Chinese Philosophy* (Bodde 1952-63) is possibly the only one still generally available and worth consulting. Bodde's book is a fundamental resource upon which translators can still rely when tracking down certain translation equivalents or standardized terminology used in the field. The situation is, to say the least, far from desirable.

Among the reasons that can be adduced for this is the lack of publication channels for such translations. Despite the fact that, in the past two decades, translation has successfully established itself as an academic discipline, the venues available for publishing translated non-literary works have dropped rather than increased. This can be said as much of book-length translations as of shorter pieces. *Chinese Studies in Philosophy*, a major translation journal published by M. E. Sharpe since the late 1960s, has ceased publication since 1997, leaving the reader only with its sister publication, *Chinese Studies in History*. For decades, other than these two journals, scholarly translations have found a niche in only a smattering of academic journals such as *Philosophy East and West* (which hails from Hawaii) and less academically inclined ones like *Asian Culture* (from Taiwan). The view is often reiterated that the reputation of a journal could be tarnished by the inclusion of translations. Needless to say, journals that publish English translations of the kind here discussed are virtually non-existent in the Mainland.

We can turn to look, more specifically, at comprehensive histories (*tongshi*) translated from Chinese into English. Again, no more than a handful of examples can be identified from the past few decades. In the field of aesthetics there is Gong Liseng's translation of Li Zehou's history of Chinese aesthetics, which generated some intense debate when it appeared in print (Gong 1994). In the field of political thought there is Frederick Mote's translation of Xiao Gongquan's *A History of Chinese Political Thought* (Mote 1979), and in the field of literature there is Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang's translation of Lu Xun's *A Brief History of Chinese Fiction* (Yang and Yang 1973). Of course one can argue that, after all, there are not too many comprehensive histories or that, for some unexplained reason, Western readers are not as fond of these histories as their Chinese counterparts. One might even argue that they are useful basically as textbooks in introductory courses in American or British

universities. The fact remains, however, that the situation is symptomatic of a deep-seated rationale concerning the choice of texts for translation in general. It would be interesting, for translation studies scholars if not for sinologists, to review the overall attitude toward the translation of Chinese scholarship into English (or Western languages, for that matter) from broader cultural or ideological perspectives. Although one constantly hears of calls for more translations of Chinese scholarship—in more than just the fields of history and philosophy, of course—the fact is that little has been done, and somehow Western scholars are depended upon to select, and then undertake, the translations necessary to disseminate research carried out in China.

In the discussion above I have highlighted the special attention paid by major sinological translators to materials of a non-literary nature. This is not to imply that translations of belletristic literature like *Dream of the Red Chamber* or *The Water Margin* do not belong to the category of sinological translations. One can even see translations of contemporary Chinese novels, short stories, poetry and so on as sinological. This is so regardless of whether the translators are themselves Westerners or ethnically Chinese. Nevertheless, the strength of sinological translation for the past two centuries or so has been most clearly manifested in non-literary translations, principally of works in the philosophical genres. We must acknowledge that non-literary translation is an altogether different kind of activity than literary translation, and as the tradition of sinological translation developed, the latter somehow came to be eclipsed by the former. In recent years in particular, great effort has been expended on the translation of contemporary Chinese literature into foreign languages, particularly English, in Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, and it has been complemented by the work of literary translators from the West. The tremendous success of such translations is nothing less than an established fact, beside which the more typical sinological translations

have paled.

In the many sub-fields of non-literary translations, that of Chinese scholarship, whether in the humanities, the social sciences, business, or science and technology, has fared particularly badly. In fact, the present translation of Ge's *History* can be viewed as an attempt to strike out in a new direction. The pervasive forces of globalization have left university administrators with no alternative but to consider taking appropriate action to deal with a unique problem. Research not presented in the global language (English) can place not only Chinese scholars at a disadvantage, but also scholars in regions using minority languages. Even as the present essay is being written, active steps are being taken by a consortium of East Asian universities, including those in Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Thailand and Vietnam, to ensure that research published in languages other than English is given the recognition it deserves, recognition that will count materially, for instance, in the worldwide ranking of tertiary institutions. Clearly, translation has an enormous role to play in the rapidly transforming academic scene.

As another instance of a sinological translation, the present rendition of Ge's *History* cannot but take into account the principles adumbrated by Ames and Hall exactly two decades ago in their *Thinking through Confucius* (1987). Ames and Hall's book is itself an attempt to make Confucius understandable to a Western readership, which effectively makes it a sinological translation of a particular kind. Though hardly concealing their desire to build bridges, Ames and Hall still caution against cross-cultural anachronisms and emphasize the historical and cultural distances that separate the present-day Western reader from the philosopher who lived well before the Christian era. They repeatedly emphasized that Chinese philosophy is differently structured to Western philosophy. A somewhat similar argument is advanced by Chad Hansen, who in a series of lengthy footnotes to the first chapter of his *Daoist*

Theory of Chinese Thought (1992) reveals his perennial interest in the issue of how to translate classical Chinese philosophical terms adequately. Hansen begins by inveighing against the widespread translation paradigm in sinological studies. In terms of what he calls the EORL (English is the only real language) fallacy, everything turns out to mean something in the English language (Hansen 1992: 8-9), since the reader erroneously assumes that the Chinese philosophers actually think in English and express what is essentially English thought. Eventually, for Hansen, such thinking results in the erosion and erasure of the special character of Chinese concepts, in a failure to see the different worlds embodied by the two languages. Quite unambiguously, he pinpoints a most fundamental problem with widely circulated translations which constrain, even distort, the Western understanding of Chinese philosophy.

It is a pity that little theorizing on sinological translations has surfaced after Ames/Hall and Hansen. Practically the only work of note in the past decade or so is *Translating Chinese Literature* (Eoyang and Lin 1995). Quite a few articles in this anthology, though, are still preoccupied with the practical aspects of tackling difficult classical language texts. None of them wrestles with the differences between literary and non-literary translations, the two main categories of texts that sinological translators work with, as well as the approach that is appropriate for each of them. Furthermore, the majority of authors in this anthology point out the prevalence—and presumably the usefulness—of the scholarly approach to translating classical Chinese literature. Yet, no one has theorized on the shortcomings of such an approach, or how it must be related to a multiplicity of cultural circumstances and historical time-frames. Almost no one has dealt with the possible advantages, and uses, of the opposite, more reader-friendly approach. Under what circumstances would an attempt to curry the general reader's favor be necessary, or at least more effective? It is in such questions as these that

the sinological translator-scholar can profit from the research findings of the Western translation theorist.

The above comments are meant to provide a backdrop against which the translation of Ge's *History of Chinese Thought*, of which only one brief introductory section is appended here, can be read. I need to conclude with one final piece of information concerning the "how"—and not the "why"—of the translation: the translator has had the opportunity of working closely with the author. The two have agreed on the need to drastically remove chunks of text so that the voluminous, one-million word original could be made to fit within two English volumes of less than 400 pages each. This turned out to be something that further complicates an already complicated scenario. The translator ended up having to strike a delicate balance between competing demands and requirements that directly affect his choice of strategies: to preserve the step-by-step, well thought-out arguments that the author took such pains to present; to produce a fluent translation so that those not academically inclined will not be put off; to deploy standardized terminology that has been in use for some time; to avoid resorting to different terms in different contexts; to overcome the redundancies of expression often found in Chinese prose; to be explicit where necessary; to retain what is characteristically Chinese in the author's discourse and manners of expression; to give readers some sense of the solid research carried out on which the author's conclusions are grounded; and so on and so forth. In all this the translator has been aided by the author himself, who relentlessly rewrites, edits, prunes and trims his work, so that the original may even at times be seen as a mirror-reflection of the translation. However it appears to the reader, the translation should be an instance, unique in its own way, of author-translator collaboration.

Works Cited

- Ames, Roger T., and David L. Hall (1987). *Thinking through Confucius*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- _____. (2003). *Daodejing: Making This Life Significant: Translation and Philosophical Interpretation of the Dao de jing*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bodde, Derk (1952-63). *A History of Chinese Philosophy*. By Feng Youlan. Two volumes. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bokenkamp, Stephen R. (1997). *Early Daoist Scriptures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campany, Robert F. (2002). *To Live as Long as Heaven and Earth: A Translation and Study of Ge Hong's Traditions of Divine Transcendents*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carus, Paul, trans. (2000). *The Teachings of Lao-Tzu: The Tao te ching*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Defoort, Carine (1997). *The Pheasant Cap Master: A Rhetorical Reading*. State University of New York Press.
- _____. (2002a). "Preface I". *Contemporary Chinese Thought* 33.3 (spring) (entire issue).
- _____. (2002b). "Preface II". *Contemporary Chinese Thought* 33.4 (summer) (entire issue).
- Eoyang, Eugene, and Lin Yao-fu, eds. (1995). *Translating Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gong, Lizeng, trans. (1994). *The Path of Beauty: A Study of Chinese Aesthetics*. By Li Zehou. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, Chad (1992). *A Daoist Theory of Chinese Thought: A Philosophical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knoblock, John (1988-1994). *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Le Guin, Ursula K., trans. (1997). *Lao Tzu: Tao te ching: A Book about the Way and the Power of the Way*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Lynn, Richard J. (1999). *The Classic of the Tao-te ching of Laozi, as Interpreted by*

- Wang Bi*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mitchell, Stephen (2000). *Tao te ching: A New English Version*. New York: Perennial Classics.
- Mote, Frederick, trans. (1979). *A History of Chinese Political Thought*. By Xiao Gongquan. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nylan, Michael (1993). *The Canon of Supreme Mystery: A Translation with Commentary of the T'ai hsüan ching*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Roberts, Moss, trans. (2001). *Dao de jing: The Book of the Way*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sarf, Robert H. (2002). *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treasure*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Yang, Hsien-yi, and Gladys Yang, trans. (1973). *A Brief History of Chinese Fiction*. By Lu Xun. Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press.

∞ The Translation ∞

Writing an Intellectual History—A History of Thought

R. G. Collingwood's view that "all history is intellectual history" has been highly praised as well as criticized. If we understand that traditional thinking about history as well as historical traditions of thought continue up to the present, perhaps one can sympathize with him. What is history? If it is said that history consists of people, matters and events of the past, then these have vanished with the passage of time, recoverable only in museums, archaeological sites, past documents and history textbooks. Such history does not relate at all to the "present". However, I think two aspects of history have truly lasted and affect life in the present day. First, there is knowledge and there are techniques that have continued to improve over the course of millennia. Our predecessors

have accumulated such knowledge and techniques for the benefit of posterity. Those who come later can pick up where their predecessors have left off. In this way, we see history extending forward endlessly. Second, over the millennia, men have repeatedly raised deep questions and formed ideas about the meaning of the cosmos and of human life. Their views on cosmic, social and individual problems have influenced the way people think in the present day. They often follow traditional lines of inquiry with respect to these difficult problems. Here history continues to repeat itself. If it is said that the first aspect belongs to a history of knowledge, then the second belongs to a history of thought or intellectual history. Thought was transmitted from generation to generation through the written word, what was heard and seen, formal learning and influences outside the school. Because of such “transmission”, men of today can revisit ideas of the past, which have contemporary relevance. According to Collingwood: “Historical knowledge is the knowledge of what mind has done in the past, and at the same time it is the redoing of this, the perpetuation of past acts in the present” (*The Idea of History*, p. 218). In each generation, the questions to be tackled, the modes of thinking, the styles of interpretation and the methods of attainment are repeated, altered, circulated and renewed. With continuity through time and space, intellectual history comes into being.

Thus there is significance in writing such a history. However, in surveying our recent history of Chinese scholarship, we see that in China, what is called “intellectual history” has never been as well-received as the “history of philosophy”. One reason is that the multipurpose Western concept of history of philosophy has afforded the Chinese scholar convenience in an era of scholarly transition. Second, the Western concept represented an allure and challenge for scholars in the first half of the twentieth century. Third, with the establishment of a discipline-based

department called philosophy in the university, there arose a need for corresponding teaching material. As a result, some scholars have attempted to appropriate the terminology and logic of Western philosophy to sum up the course taken by Chinese scholarship. Others try to find, in the traditional Chinese context, “philosophy” which they consider equivalent to that in the West. Still others seek to compile teaching materials for their philosophy courses at the universities. Therefore, among academic books listed in published catalogs, there are more “histories of philosophy” than “intellectual histories”. What is more, some intellectual histories have not gone through a relatively complete process of improvement or attained a degree of maturity.

Let us review the writing of Chinese histories of philosophy over the years. In 1916, Xie Wulian wrote *Zhongguo zhexueshi* (History of Chinese Philosophy). Nevertheless, other than a catchy title and some crudely selected materials, it fails to set a paradigm for history-writing. In 1919 it was eclipsed by Hu Shi’s *Zhongguo zhexueshi dagang* (An Outline History of Chinese Philosophy) published by the Commercial Press. Later Hu spoke of himself as having pioneered the writing of histories of philosophy in China, as if Xie never existed. Cai Yuanpei did praise the four special features of Hu’s history (its evidential method, laconic style, fair judgment and systematic approach), but it was hastily written and ended abruptly. It was replaced by the more complete *Zhongguo zhexueshi* (History of Chinese Philosophy) (1930-1933) written by Feng Youlan, who had received more systematic training in philosophy. Of course the significance and influence of Hu’s work are still felt today, but its impact is not on historical narration *per se*. Rather, it stimulates discussion on the evolution—and disappearance—of a new model of scholarship. This is because its paradigmatic significance is greater than its explanatory significance. Feng’s work is systematic, comprehensive, and of the right length for the general reader. In particular, his mixture of orthodox with

normative description (blending the orthodoxy of the Dao with philosophical narration) better suits the taste of a Chinese readership. Thus when it was printed as lecture notes for use at Tsinghua University, it received high praise. When published by Commercial Press, it sold extremely well.

However, it too was susceptible to the ravages of time. By the 1960s, Ren Jiyu's *Zhongguo zhexueshi* (History of Chinese Philosophy) superseded it by virtue of its clarity and logic, by its ideological explanations, and by its lucid style of expression. By the 1980s, when ideological influences had lessened, there was a reprint of Feng's work by Chung Hwa Bookstore. An updated seven-volume edition was put out by the prestigious People's Publishing House. Thus history seems to have made a detour and returned to where it started. All the same, after such a history of more than eighty years, much has been learned about the writing of histories of philosophy that must be included if we want to "rewrite" them.

But here a question arises. Undoubtedly, the historians of philosophy make use of much accumulated experience, but right from the start they have borrowed—even appropriated—a ready-made model from Japan and the West. As Feng Youlan said at the beginning of *Zhongguo zhexueshi*, "philosophy" is a Western term. One of our main tasks in the discussion of the Chinese history of philosophy is to select and narrate the different facets of learning in this history which can be identified. In reference to Western concepts, he points out that histories of philosophy in its modern sense include cosmology, ethics and epistemology, so historians have a clear notion of what they are attempting to define. For a long time I have thought rather stubbornly that, even though the "philosophy" and "history of philosophy" coming from the West via Japan provide excellent conceptual tools for rethinking and narrating traditional Chinese thought, it still seems a little awkward to

talk about China using Western standards without modifying them. There is bound to be misunderstanding and distortion when we forcibly stretch and twist the connotations of Western terms to fit Chinese thought. I think it is questionable whether Chinese thought can be discussed as “philosophy”. Others have previously noted this problem. For example, in the letter he wrote to Cai Yuanpei in 1918, Fu Sinian remarked that Chinese philosophy is founded on history, and that it is not “philosophy” at all. Ten years later, he asserted that in traditional China “there was no philosophy, only alchemy”, encouraging the idea that considering the non-existence of philosophy in traditional China is “healthy”. And when Cai wrote his *Jianyi zhexue gangyao* (Simplified Outline of Philosophy) in 1924, he was apparently reminded of what Fu had said. While comparing “philosophy” to “study of the Dao”, he also noted that “the philosophy of our country does have scientific presuppositions; it has always been based on the words of the sages”. For that reason, “this philosophical outline cannot be Western-based”. Hu Shi, too, under the influence of Fu, said in 1929 that he would change the title of his book to “a history of Chinese *thought*” (not *philosophy*). Later, Tang Junyi also claimed that “The term ‘philosophy’ never existed in China. Chinese terms like *Daoshu* (Daoist learning), *lixue* (learning of principles), *xinxue* (learning of the heart/mind) and *xuanxue* (metaphysical learning) are all different from it”. In fact, the difference is not just in name, for there has never been anything like “philosophy” in Chinese thinking and scholarship. “Intellectual history” or “history of thought” is better suited when we deal with the various branches of learning in traditional China. The term “thought” is more encompassing than that of “philosophy”.

Whether in actual writing, in the formation of academic disciplines, or even in general understanding, the concept of an intellectual history remains unclear. Several problems still exist. First, is the aim of this history to legitimize the much acclaimed orthodoxy and establish a “genealogy

of thought”? Does it describe the development of thought over time? In other words, in a history of thought, is “thought” or “history” the focus? Second, if the latter, should it reconfirm the object of its narration? Not only elitist thought, but also popular views and beliefs, enlighten social life. Since there are inspired eras as well as undistinguished times, should popular views and beliefs be admitted into our history of thought? Third, in the attempt to present a broader view, how can an intellectual history avoid excesses? How can its underlying relationships with social and political histories be adequately dealt with? Fourth, how can it tackle the territorial conflicts it has with the histories of society, culture and scholarship? In other words, should it therefore set explicit boundaries to avoid overlapping with other histories?

General Knowledge, Thought and Beliefs

I

Generally speaking, the histories of thought or philosophy widely circulated today often list philosophers alongside classics of philosophy. Beginning with Confucius and the *Shijing* (Book of Songs), these accounts conclude with Kang Youwei and the *Datongshu* (Book of Great Unity), devoting chapters to an eminent thinker and sections to lesser ones, several of whom may be grouped together in one section. This kind of history ends up presenting a museum of thinkers and a library of classics. The approach may have originated in the traditional chronicling and library cataloging of China. It also brings together the traditional Chinese philosophers-and-classics method and the modern style of historiography of the West. It constitutes a “neo-classical discursive system”.

I have some questions about such an approach. The first issue is

regarding the time sequence of intellectual histories which are not strictly chronological. Some talents may have an impact on later eras while others vanish like fleeting meteors. Some ideas flourish in their own time while other potent ideas lie buried and are unearthed and spread centuries later. Brilliant ideas often confront the limits of our understanding and cause “historical ruptures”. I believe that an intellectual history dealing only with the elite and the classics does not necessarily show clearly traceable patterns. Such patterns figure, instead, in the gradual evolution of knowledge and in the ideas that live in our everyday lives. The second question is that elitist ideas transcend everyday thinking and are unlikely to create an impact on social life. What sustains the ordinary folk is not the leading thinkers or the prominent classics—both are far removed from daily living—but rather, general knowledge. The third question is that the objectives of intellectual histories are to “search for origins”, “confirm core values”, and “highlight significance”. Intellectual histories are the interpretations given by historians after the event. It is, in fact, doubtful whether the outstanding thinkers and the classics exerted the profound impact that the historians have ascribed to them, and whether they should figure so prominently in the histories. For instance, the position that Wang Fuzhi now occupies in late-Ming, early-Qing intellectual history is the result of a retrospective view. On the contrary, some people (like Huangpu Mi of the Three Kingdoms Period) who may have left a mark in their own time are described in half a page or a section in the histories. Again, the late Qing translation by Timothy Richard of Robert Mackenzie’s *History of the Nineteenth Century* and John Fryer’s translation of Henry Wood’s *Ideal Suggestion through Mental Photography* do not appear in these histories because there has not been any contemporary updating. Their impact on their contemporaries was in fact enormous, although neither work was highly valued in the West. A million copies of the former were sold in the late Qing period, and for

the first-ranked historian Liang Qichao it was “the best book in Western history”. The latter, a sweeping exploration of psychological ailments, mental health and religious beliefs, left its imprint in the diaries, letters and essays of leading thinkers of the late Qing. It was listed by Song Xu as a textbook in his academy, and even deeply influenced Tan Sitong’s *Renxue* (On Benevolence). To focus on the talents and the classics without paying attention to normal, everyday life has led to many ideas being covered up or distorted. The neatly continuous patterns only embody the historian’s belief in an “orthodoxy” or a subsequently constructed “genealogy”.

This is not to say that I am not prepared to write a history of elite thought. I am simply suggesting that we pay attention to the background to elite thought and the classics. Put more bluntly, histories have so far been written on thinkers and classics, while simultaneously recognizing the “ordinary” knowledge and belief that provided the backdrop, or background coloring, for elitist thought and ideas contained in the classics. It therefore appears that between the world of the elite and that of ordinary social experience, “a realm of general knowledge and beliefs” does exist. Its prolonged evolution reveals an historical process that should not be neglected by our histories.

II

The “general knowledge, thought and beliefs” are not what anthropologists call the Little Tradition, nor should they be taken by readers to mean the Little Tradition or “popular thinking”. I am referring to the most general, common-sense, interpretation of circumstances and events in the cosmos that those with a certain amount of knowledge can assimilate. They are not the creations of talented individuals nor are they

the product of careful consideration. They are also not what the uninformed would call a “collective consciousness”. They are “what we use on a daily basis, unthinkingly”. Through the most basic education such knowledge and beliefs give the fundamental coloring to a national culture. Unlike classical knowledge, they are not spread through outstanding thinkers’ reading of the classics, the exchange of letters, or joint discussion. They are not transmitted through various writings, or even through education at the higher levels. Rather, they spread through the most ordinary channels, like entertainments (religious rituals, operas, and performances at public fairs), basic education (at private academies and primary schools, from parents and relatives who give the classics a secular interpretation), and mass reading and oral storytelling (novels, anthologies, morality books and promptbooks). Such channels of transmission far surpass the system of classics. However, such channels are also used by the elite. They can provide the background and breeding ground for elitist thought. Surprisingly, our intellectual histories seldom recover, describe or speculate about this direct and effective “background” for the dissemination of ideas, highlighting only political events and economic changes that have a remote impact on the common man.

This is not to say that, in my history, I do not care about elitist thought and the classics; they do make up a greater part of it. My wish is to emphasize that intellectual talents are in the minority. The intellectually gifted have, from my point of view, progressed beyond their times with their wondrous ideas. They obey neither time nor fashion. With these ideas, they “depart from”, even “revolt against”, a general history. Undoubtedly I want to write about them, for only by so doing can I capture the turbulent events in the intellectual history of China. By contrast, there may not be the same level of changes in the “general knowledge, thought and beliefs” over a long time-span, but these are the background that informs a general history. For example, making use of

materials from the fifth century to the third century B.C., I summarize the ideas and aspirations governing the ancient Chinese world. These did not change much in the Qin and Han. From the second to the sixth century, after the introduction of Buddhism into China, they still dominated the Chinese way of life. They only added concepts like those of life and death, suffering and happiness, and *samsara* and retribution. Thus we often need “longer time-spans” as yardsticks of measurement. In this regard, I would like to note the influence which the French Annals School has had on me, particularly its concept of *la longue durée*, which can be used to understand general knowledge, thought and beliefs. These evolve slowly but surely, forming the cornerstone for an intellectual history.

I have thought long and hard about such ideas, and am aware of certain problems. One might ask how one can reconstruct the world of general knowledge and beliefs from extant material, since little is usually left of the unchronicled world of general thought and beliefs. Consequently what is needed is a new, workable method of writing history.

III

Frequently, conventional intellectual histories are based on extant writings of the elite, which may not reflect general knowledge, thought and beliefs. In all the archives or histories there exist “structured historical narration” and “preconceived value judgments”. These have been repeatedly shaped and simplified by ideological perspectives. In these records, the thinkers and their views have been thoroughly discussed and confirmed. Certain figures were of symbolic significance; certain significant ideas that appeared were raised at such and such a time; certain

people have inherited ideas from their predecessors. In this way the threads of history have been disentangled. But what has had a continued impact in social life is often not the brilliant ideas, but general knowledge and thought. Where do we seek such materials for our history?

Let us suppose, a hundred years hence, that someone were to write an intellectual history of the 1990s. He only has the public speeches of political leaders, works by writers, editorials in the official newspapers, endorsed archival records, and draft speeches prepared by speechwriters. The world he depicts would be completely different from the one we now live in and know. However, if he also references popular reading matter currently sold at newsstands, popular songs played at discos and topics of conversation at restaurants, the world of thought that he writes about might bear a closer relationship to living reality. Thus, when part of our attention is focused on so-called general knowledge, thought and beliefs, the scope of historical sources is widened. History will not be based only on written documents. Many-faceted historical data will be used. This is just as Jacques Le Goff has mentioned in his *La nouvelle histoire* (1978). I will cite two examples. First, in discussing Han thought, besides the works of figures who “perused the written records” like Jia Yi, Dong Zhongshu and Wang Chong, we can also use evidence not especially referred to by these historians. We can use the silk manuscripts at Mawangdui, with their hidden meanings; the epitaphs on the back of Han bronze mirrors, which convey in a condensed manner Han thoughts and feelings; and bamboo records, which inadvertently reveal the worldview at the time. These materials may only contain crude information, but they also make manifest the general aspirations of people at the time. They reveal their concrete strategies for achieving them, as well as the way they were unconsciously controlled by the world of thought. Second, outstanding figures like Dao’an, Huiyuan, Kumarajiva and Zengzhao are often mentioned in connection with Buddhist thought

in the Northern and Southern Dynasties. But how many ordinary people would have thought through concepts like Buddha-nature, *sunyata*, instant enlightenment, “the eight negations” and “the Middle Path”? We cannot but be skeptical about the impact of elitist Buddhist thinking on the ordinary folk when we come across other accidentally transmitted evidence. First, there are Buddhist stone inscriptions of the Northern and Southern Dynasties. Then, there are prefatory remarks in Dunhuang documents unearthed in Turfan, which, though neither classified nor interpreted at length, display the general beliefs of these times.

This is not to say we must focus attention on marginal historical materials. What I call “general knowledge, thought and beliefs” does not refer to those occurring at the lowest levels of society. Family instructions, clan regulations, morality books, children’s textbooks and precious scrolls are all excellent materials. In the United States, the *Taishang ganying pian* (Folios on the Vibrant Responses of the Most High Lord Lao) and the *Yiguan daoli wenda* (Questions and Answers Pertaining to General Truths) are included in *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, an introductory reader on Chinese intellectual history. Such materials do not seek to inform their readers; they only display the facts. It is a pity that, in the past, such accidental historical materials have been discarded, making our intellectual history unrealistic. I know that the influence of earlier methods of history-writing is passed on from one generation to another. Because of this, conventions may also have restricted the choice of materials used in writing a history. Let me cite two examples. First, many extant encyclopedias (like the *Taiping yulan* [Imperial Digest of the Taiping Reign]) are excellent documents for the history of thought. Systems of classifying essential knowledge can allow us to recover the general knowledge, thought and beliefs at a particular historical juncture. Buddhist and Daoist encyclopedias (like the *Fayuan zhubin* [A Grove of Pearls in the Dharma Garden]) can also help us speculate on the “popular” understanding of

the two faiths. Second, there is the renowned song text, the *Zhuzi jiali* (Family Rituals of Master Zhu). When historians discuss Song thought, they invariably refer to Zhu Xi, but only on the basis of neo-Confucian documents. Few study the *Zhuzi jiali* seriously. As a manual on rituals, this text affected the lives of the Ming people. Even in early Republican times, it was a source of information on social rituals in general. Embodied in the rituals is the world of general knowledge, thought and beliefs. But, have the encyclopedias (like the *Chuxue ji* [Records for Early Learning] and the *Yimen leiju* [A Categorized Collection of Literary Writings]) and ritual books (like the *Jiali* and the *Jiali yijie* [Family Rituals and Etiquette]) been given the recognition they deserve?

IV

When writing this book, I faced some theoretical and methodological difficulties. While benefiting from anthropology, sociology, religious studies and documentary studies, I think they only provide circuitous and peripheral assistance and are not directly relevant to historiography. I have painstakingly incorporated sections on “general knowledge, thought and beliefs” into the conventional history. For example, in Chapter 3, I utilize the discussions on the content of the Mawangdui silk books and paintings to explain the intellectual background to the Qin-Han period as it was revealed by an archaeological researcher. I also use the silk scrolls and bricks paintings to illuminate the three worlds of the Qin-Han people. Then, with reference to the epitaphs on bronze mirrors, I discuss their conceptualizations of life, happiness and progeny, as well as their ethnic consciousness as it evolved and was confirmed. In Chapter 4, I devote one section to discussing how, when Buddhism entered China, the general world of thought was affected. I

note the Buddhist books, statues and rituals of confession, which exemplify a religious consciousness. I also analyze certain mid-third-century to mid-sixth-century discourses to show people's basic understanding of Buddhism.

Nevertheless, this is by no means sufficient. To depict the world of knowledge, thought and beliefs, I believe we need to look at the following:

- (a) The content of early education: Such an education was part of every literate person's experience, an integral part of his mental development. Thus an analysis of the thought content of children's textbooks and officially endorsed elementary readers used in private academies is of paramount importance.
- (b) The sources of basic knowledge: This includes all kinds of informal material that provide knowledge to the average person. There are non-verbal materials like portraits on stone, bronze mirrors, religious paintings, sculpture and architecture. Materials in print include: divination bamboo slips and accompanying explanatory manuals; instructions on family, clan and community behavior; and official almanacs.
- (c) The channels for spreading knowledge: Elite thought cannot be directly transformed into general thought, so we should look at the means whereby they were popularized. Sermons in the earliest period, Buddhist transformation texts and books exhorting moral behavior, written lyrics for recitation by entertainers, storytelling at designated venues, public performances associated with clan or community functions—these are materials of a literary nature often neglected by historians.

But, there are difficulties in using such a research method. The materials are too voluminous to be read closely. At times there may not be enough of them for our analysis. It is hard to avoid subjectivity in interpreting them, for we are no longer living in the same environment as our predecessors. We can only explain as best we are able. At times our interpretation turns out to be contradictory, because living realities simply cannot be straitjacketed. Yet we cannot display historical materials without attempting to interpret them.

About the Author / Translator

Leo Tak-hung Chan is Professor of Translation at Lingnan University. His articles have appeared in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, *TTR*, *Babel*, *Across Languages and Cultures*, *The Translator*, *Comparative Literature Studies*, *META*, *Journal of Oriental Studies* and *Asian Folklore Studies*. His recent books include *The Discourse on Foxes and Ghosts* (University of Hawaii Press, 1998), *Masterpieces in Western Translation Theory* (co-edited, City University of HK Press, 2000), *One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature* (Rodopi, 2003) and *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory: Modes, Issues and Debates* (John Benjamins, 2004).

BOOK REVIEW



Shall I Compare Thee to a “Femme Fidèle”?

Lie Jianxi

Wang Aixue. *Complete Translation into Chinese of William Wordsworth's The Prelude* (1850). Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2004. 601 pp.

“Is it a good translation?” I intuitively asked myself when I received this volume for review. Yet the question, like so many interesting ones about totalities, is relevant but unanswerable. Not because there are no final answers, but because as a question, it is “ill-phrased”. Given that the modern view of translation as a complex issue can be further complicated when it comes to the translation of poetry, there is at least this necessary prior question: What criteria shall we assume to judge the value of this volume? In other words, is it to be judged as a poet’s version of a classic or as a scholarly rendering of a difficult text? If the former, then the criterion of judgment is originality and liveliness; if the latter, then questions of research and interpretation become apposite. It is my belief that a translation of a classic should be commended for either poetic vigour or scholarship or, fortunately, both.

No Wordsworth “expert” himself, Wang clearly did not intend to give a scholarly rendering of this difficult text when he assigned himself the task to “recreate the original English poetry into the Chinese translation” (p. 7). Academically, he claims no definitive idea of what

Wordsworth is about, and his is far less ambitious and meticulous than Ding Hong-wei's version that came out five years before.^[1] Otherwise as a usual practice some prefatory remarks should have been made about the autobiographical significance and relative stylistic purity of the 1805 *Prelude*. Wang makes no bones about these issues and sticks to the 1850 version without even an apology. It is not known whether this has been the result of ignorance or speculation, but we certainly cannot undervalue a translator's work for his negligence on such bibliographical matters when he has placed himself in the healthy company of poet-translators like Pope, Dryden, and Pound, who remind us that some of the most significant translations were not always composed by those most knowledgeable with the original.

In an Introduction that speaks more truth about poetry translation than the translation itself, Wang dismisses Robert Frost's notorious defeatism and hails Sir John Denham who held that a translator's task is not to translate one language into another, but to translate one poetry into another (p. 7). This is good spirit in which the best verse translators seem to have worked, yet the immediate problem that faces the translator is whether he is ready to produce a text for rigorous poetic scrutiny. This is a problem directly related to his engagement with the act and art of verse-making. When Dryden says that the translator of poetry must be a poet, he poses a difficulty for his sympathetic critic, in that some translators, having shown no particular poetic capacity elsewhere, are famous for only one or a handful of works of translation—Arthur Golding for his Ovid and Wu Ning-kun for his Dylan Thomas. To the best of my knowledge, Wang Ai-xue is not known for his poetic lines, if he has composed any. While this cannot serve as a criterion for our judgment of his translation, one thing we can say for certain is that he has essentially failed in compromising the original and his capacities as a “poet”:

Shall I Compare Thee to a “Femme Fidèle”?

With trembling oars I turned,
And through the silent water stole my way
Back to the covert of the willow tree;
There in her mooring-place I left my bark,—
And through the meadows homeward went, in grave
And serious mood; but after I had seen
That spectacle, for many days, my brain
Worked with a dim and undetermined sense
Of unknown modes of being; o'er my thoughts
There hung a darkness, call it solitude
Or blank desertion.

我顫抖着劃槳
轉彎，在寂靜的水中悄悄
劃回到那棵柳樹洞裏面；
再在它的停泊之地下船，——
情緒緊張又嚴肅地穿過
草地把家還；自我看到
了那景象，好多天腦子裏
有隱約不定之感總感到
有未知生命存在；腦海中
懸掛着一片黑暗，管你叫
它荒涼或孤單。 (Book I, 385-395)

If beauty in art is the highest form of truth as Keats famously says of the Grecian urn, the translation of poetry should then be measured by Rossetti's rule that no good poem shall be turned into a bad one. Wang's translation is certainly poetry of some kind, yet it comes out wordy (“有隱約不定之感總感到”) and woolly (“柳樹洞”，“管你叫 / 它荒涼或孤單”) where the original is hard and clear, and there is a trace of preciosity

(“穿過 / 草地把家還”) that marks all bad poetry. Sometimes such flaws amount to sheer poetic impurity, a drollery of insincere feelings:

The days gone by
Return upon me almost from the dawn
Of life: the hiding-places of man's power
Open; I would approach them, but they close.
I see by glimpses now; when age comes on,
May scarcely see at all; ...

已逝之日幾乎從生之初
回到身旁；蘊藏人的力量
之地已開放；想靠近，卻又
關上。現能瞅幾眼，老了啥
也看不上；…… (Book XII, 277-282)

This is one of Wordsworth's most celebrated passages on the “spots of time”, i.e. luminous moments to which poetic imagination is anchored. Rather in contrast to the composure of the original “spontaneous overflow”, the translated text stammers in panting dishonesty when its worn-out phraseology (“已逝之日” and “生之初”) lapses into the casual slangy tone of “老了啥也看不上”. In reading the original, we cannot help being moved by Wordsworth's undefended sincerity about the death of restored imagination, and would perhaps rather that the poem had ended with this sublime revelation of its failure. The translation too invites a wish for an end, but this time in the goodwill that the drollery would soon stop breathing so it could avoid choking itself in stuttering. One may argue that even the best of poets have been prone to pitfalls in diction. Indeed, but when inappropriate diction comes hand in hand with a wrong poetic form, the result will be nothing more than a cancer

Shall I Compare Thee to a “Femme Fidèle”?

of a poem:

Silence touched me here
No less than sound had done before; the child
Of Summer, lingering, shining, by herself,
The voiceless worm on the unfrequented hills,
Seemed sent on the same errand with the choir
Of Winter that had warbled at my door,
And the whole year breathed tenderness and love.

此地的寂靜和
先前歌聲把我同樣打動；
荒山中無語的螢火蟲，夏
天之子，閃閃徘徊孤獨中，
似和門邊婉轉的冬之合
唱團有任務相同，整整一
年都吞吐了愛情和溫柔。

(Book VII, 36-42)

Despite his contempt for Frost's defeatism, Wang is intimidated by its outwardly bullying, inwardly fearful child—the preference for an “accurate” rendering of the original iambic pentameter. Painstakingly, he renders each line of ten syllables into ten Chinese characters so that the translation, as the book description has it, remains “faithful to the original in morphology and syntax”. And thus he writes in his own defense: “[A]lthough tonal, the Chinese language, like the English language, has its own rhythmic patterns for most of its poetic compositions. The predominant pattern in most Chinese poetry from ancient times is made of phrases of two characters and syllables in which one is free to put the accent on the second syllable for the sake of emphasis” (p. 8). There are in this statement two fallacies. First, rather

than depending on character-syllables for rhythm as did classical Chinese verse, modern Chinese verse relies largely on “pauses” established by sense units that may not consist of two characters. Second, Chinese characters are not equivalent to English syllables, and even when they were, they would not evoke an equivalent emotional intensity even in an identical combination. Wang’s choice of the closed, contained form of ten-character lines has proven perilous because, to suit the number of words, not only diction has been sacrificed but lines arbitrarily truncated, as in “無語的螢火蟲, 夏 / 天之子” and “婉轉的冬之合 / 唱團”. Such grotesque line breaks pervade the translation and have seriously ruined the slight but beautiful hesitations between word and word that are characteristic of the dance of Wordsworth’s mind among perceptions.

If we agree with the famous aesthete who maintains that the beautiful has in each case a mode at once universal and unique, then we should have no problem accepting that a successful translation can be only a “metamorphosis”. Borne out of a compromise between the original and the translator’s capacities, such a metamorphosis must be guided by a poetics of alterity which, in the words of Maurice Blanchot, allows the translator to become “the secret master of the difference of language”, as he throws himself up against a new scale of linguistic possibilities, adding to his awareness of alternatives in literary expression, an awareness that carries over to his reader in a flame of genius. It is, however, not his task to abolish the difference but to use it to “awaken in his own language, through the violence or subtle changes he brings to it, a presence of what is different, originally, in the original”^[2] And it is only in this sense that the translator can truly take up the burden of double responsibilities towards both languages and poetics, as Wang has wished.

In a candidly well-meaning preface, Yenna Wu has the following to say about the translation: “On the whole, [it] is quite smooth and relatively faithful to the original. The translator has tried to render the poem into

Shall I Compare Thee to a “Femme Fidèle”?

Chinese as elegantly and artistically as he possibly can”. I trust this is the best possible compliment that Wu had to offer in lieu of saying, “It is correctly done and yet lacking in stylistic flair, hard as he has tried”. But is it a “good” translation after all? At the beginning I wrote that this is an “unanswerable” question about the totality of a translation. Now, I can only go as far as saying that this version stands or falls by its very fidelity to Wordsworth’s form; and like most of our popular wisdom about totalities, I shall turn to a metaphor as I recall the famous French gibe which says, “La traduction ressemble à la femme: si elle est belle, elle est infidèle, si elle est fidèle, elle est laide”. A *femme fidèle* may well be said to embody a poetics of sameness, whereas a *femme infidèle*, one of alterity. While I have reservations about a *femme fidèle* not being beautiful, this lady of a translation is, for better or worse, an unwilling *femme fidèle* who has been hankering to exhibit some charm beyond her Master’s parlour but ends up being as homely as she is faithful.

Loveable but not lovely, she lacks the tantalising coquettishness that propels the onlooker to fantasise.

Notes

- [1] Ding Hong-wei, trans. (1999). *The Prelude*. Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation. The official book description for Wang’s version, however, claims that it is the first Chinese translation of the work.
- [2] Maurice Blanchot (1997). “Translating”. In *Friendship*. Trans. Elizabeth Rottenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press, p. 59.

About the Author

Lie Jianxi recently obtained his Ph.D. from the Department of English, Lingnan University. He has published literary translations

Translation Quarterly No. 43

as well as articles on the British cinema and Chinese avant-garde fiction.

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》主編陳德鴻教授。

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. Submissions written in a language which is not the author's mother-tongue should preferably be checked by a native speaker before submission.
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 Professor 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.

《翻譯季刊》徵求訂戶啟事

香港翻譯學會出版的《翻譯季刊》是探討翻譯理論與實踐的大型國際性學術刊物，學會副會長陳德鴻教授出任主編，學術顧問委員會由多名國際著名翻譯理論家組成。資深學者，如瑞典諾貝爾獎評委馬悅然教授、美國學者奈達博士及英國翻譯家霍克思教授都曾為本刊撰稿。《翻譯季刊》發表中、英文稿件，論文摘要（英文）收入由英國曼徹斯特大學編輯的半年刊《翻譯學摘要》。欲訂購的單位或個人，請與

中文大學出版社聯絡

地 址：中文大學出版社

香港 沙田 香港中文大學

電 話：+852 2609 6508

傳 真：+852 2603 6692 / 2603 7355

電 郵：cup@cuhk.edu.hk

網 址：<http://www.chineseupress.com>

Subscribing to *Translation Quarterly*

Translation Quarterly is published by the Hong Kong Translation Society, and is a major international scholarly publication. Its Chief Editor is the Society's Vice-President, Professor Leo Tak-hung Chan, and its Academic Advisory Board is composed of numerous internationally renowned specialists in the translation studies field. The journal has previously included contributions from such distinguished scholars as the Swedish Nobel Prize committee judge Professor Göran Malmqvist, the American translation theorist Dr. Eugene A. Nida, and the English translator Professor David Hawkes. *Translation Quarterly* publishes contributions in both Chinese and English, and English abstracts of its articles are included in *Translation Studies Abstracts*, edited by UMIST, UK. Institutions or individuals who wish to subscribe to the journal please contact:

The Chinese University Press

Address: The Chinese University Press
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Sha Tin, Hong Kong

Tel: +852 2609 6508

Fax: +852 2603 6692 / 2603 7355

Email: cup@cuhk.edu.hk

Website: <http://www.chineseupress.com>

Translation Quarterly 《翻譯季刊》

Subscription and Order Form

To: **The Chinese University Press** Fax: (852) 2603 7355

Please enter my subscription to *Translation Quarterly*, beginning with No. _____

| Subscription (complete volume) | Price |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> HK\$624 / US\$80 |
| 2 years* | <input type="checkbox"/> HK\$1,123 / US\$144 |
| 3 years** | <input type="checkbox"/> HK\$1,498 / US\$192 |
| Back issues | <input type="checkbox"/> HK\$180 / US\$23 each (Please list issue no.) _____ |

(please tick your choice)

Prices are at discount rate, delivery charge by surface post included.

* 10% discount.

** 20% discount.

Method of Payment:

Attached is a cheque/bank draft* for HK\$ / US\$* _____ made payable to
“**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**” (* circle where appropriate)

Please debit my credit card account for HK\$ _____. (please convert at
US\$1 = HK\$7.8)

I would like to pay my order(s) by: AMEX VISA MASTERCARD

Card No. _____ Cardholder's Name _____

Cardholder's Signature _____ Expiry Date _____

Please send my journal to:

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone _____ Fax _____ E-mail _____

Subscription Information

- ❖ Prepayment is required for all orders.
- ❖ Orders may be paid by cheque/bank draft (made payable to “The Chinese University of Hong Kong”) in US dollars, or by Visa, MasterCard or American Express in Hong Kong dollars.
- ❖ Orders are regarded as firm and payments are not refundable.
- ❖ Rates are subject to alteration without notice.



中文大學出版社
THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY PRESS
www.chineseupress.com

The Chinese University Press
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, N.T., Hong Kong
Tel.: (852) 2609 6508 Fax: (852) 2603 6692 / 2603 7355 E-mail: cup@cuhk.edu.hk

