

Translation Quarterly No. 30

目錄 CONTENTS

vi Chief Editor's Note

論文 Articles

- 1 The Translation of Generic Designations: The Case of the *Fu* Genre Robert Neather
- 27 Lu Xun's Translation: An Examination of Language and Style Li Yongyan
- 56 翻譯名義：語言與文化——佛經術語的翻譯 朱志瑜
- 75 從語篇分析角度看翻譯單位的確定 黃國文、張美芳

書評 Book Review

- 94 廣角鏡下翻譯名家新觀點 曾家輝

書話 Book News

- 99 Recent Asian Perspectives on Translation: The View from Hong Kong and India
- 102 進口洋貨 本土包裝
- 104 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors
- 108 徵求訂戶啟事 Subscribing to *Translation Quarterly*
- 110 訂閱表格 Subscription Order Form

ISSN 1027855930



9 771027 855003

Translation Quarterly

No. 30 2003

香港翻譯學會出版

翻譯季刊

二〇〇三年
第三十期

Published by
the Hong Kong Translation Society

Translation Quarterly

No. 30 2003

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇三年
第三十期

《翻譯季刊》

二〇〇三年十二月 第三十期

版權所有，未經許可，不得轉載。

Translation Quarterly

No. 30, December 2003

All Rights Reserved

Copyright © 2003 THE HONG KONG TRANSLATION SOCIETY

ISSN 1027-8559-30

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

翻譯季刊
Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會
The Hong Kong Translation Society

主編 Chief Editor

劉靖之 Liu Ching-chih

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

倪若誠 Robert Neather 潘漢光 Joseph Poon

編輯委員會 Editorial Board

劉靖之 (主席) Liu Ching-chih (Chairman)
黎翠珍 Jane Lai 黃國彬 Laurence Wong
金聖華 Serena Jin 羅志雄 Lo Chi-hong

顧問委員會 Advisory Board

鄭仰平	Cheng Yang-ping	Mona Baker
高克毅	George Kao	Cay Dollerup
賴恬昌	Lai Tim-cheong	葛浩文 Howard Goldblatt
林文月	Lin Wen-yueh	Wolfgang Iörscher
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 Chief Editor's Note

論文 Articles

- 1 The Translation of Generic Designations: *Robert Neather*
The Case of the *Fu* Genre
- 27 Lu Xun's Translation: *Li Yongyan*
An Examination of Language and
Style
- 56 翻譯名義：語言與文化 朱志瑜
——佛經術語的翻譯
- 75 從語篇分析角度看翻譯單位的確定 黃國文、張美芳

書評 Book Review

- 94 廣角鏡下翻譯名家新觀點 曾家輝

書話 Book News

- 99 Recent Asian Perspectives on Translation:
The View from Hong Kong and India
- 102 進口洋貨 本土包裝
- 104 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors
- 108 徵求訂戶啟事 Subscribing to
Translation Quarterly
- 110 訂閱表格 Subscription Order Form

Chief Editor's Note

This issue, no. 30 of the *Translation Quarterly*, is back to "normal" after the publication of the seven special issues 23 to 29, containing the selected papers presented at the Third Asian Translators' Forum under the auspices of the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs [FIT] in December 2001. As announced in issue number 29, Dr. Robert Neather of City University of Hong Kong and Dr. Chu Chi-yu of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University will assume the Executive Editorships for the English and Chinese sections respectively of this Journal from issue 31 in 2004.

In this issue, we publish two articles in English and two in Chinese. "The Translation of Generic Designations: The Case of the *Fu* Genre", by Dr. Robert Neather, draws on previous research examining early and medieval *fu* writing, an area of literature with which he has been engaged for some time. Miss Li Yongyan's "Lu Xun's Translation: An Examination of Language and Style" will refresh those who are keen observers of Yan Fu's motto *xin* 信, *da* 達, *ya* 雅.

I would like to take this opportunity to offer my apologies to Dr. Chu Chi-yu and Professors Huang Guowen and Zhang Meifang, for the belated publication of their articles "Chinese Translation of Buddhist Terminology: Language and Culture" (翻譯名義：語言與文化——佛經術語的翻譯) and "Unit of Translation: A Text

Linguistic Approach" (從語篇分析角度看翻譯單位的確定), which were submitted for publication in Spring 2002. The seven special issues of the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum published as nos. 23-29 have inevitably delayed the non-forum articles, unfortunately.

It has been suggested that email addresses of the authors of each issue be included in the articles published so as to facilitate communication between the authors and the readers. We think that this is a good idea if authors have no objection. Those authors who do not wish to release their email addresses, please indicate in their manuscripts and we will respect their decision.

From issue 31, we will publish topical issues for discussion, such as commentaries on current debates, correspondence between translation scholars and practising translators *etc.* Readers are welcome to put forward their views.

Chief Editor

November 2003

The Translation of Generic Designations: The Case of the *Fu* Genre

Robert Neather

Abstract

This paper addresses problems in the translation of literary genre designations, taking as a focus the classical Chinese genre of "fu". Drawing on aspects of literary genre theory, it examines a range of possible renderings of the term "fu" as a means to assess the ways in which issues of genericity and cultural appropriacy may affect translation of genre designations.

The problem of translating generic designations – the labels which denote particular genres – is of crucial importance in the translation of literature. For if genres constitute "models of writing for authors" (Todorov 1978: 51), ^[1] then they may also be said to provide models of reading for readers, sets of established conventions around which we shape our interpretation of a given literary work. In this regard, the generic designation is crucial: just as with the title of a literary work, the designation chosen by its author provides a signal as to how that work might be read, setting up "generic horizons of expectation" (Jauss 1982: 23, 79; see also Schaeffer 1989: 151). If, for example, a poem is labeled as a "sonnet", then we expect it to exhibit a particular set of structural and

rhétorical features. However, as we shall discuss in more detail below, the precise way in which a generic designation relates to a given work is highly complex. Genres are in a constant state of flux: conventions are broken by new variations which themselves then become conventionalized (Todorov 1978: 46). Such change presents real epistemological difficulties as to how exactly a given genre designation should be understood, a situation particularly acute where a genre has a long developmental history and thus a wide variety of different forms. Moreover, a writer may deliberately seek to manipulate or shatter the reader's interpretive expectations by using a generic model that does not correspond to the designation. Thus works may read as members of one genre, yet may be labeled with a contradictory designation that suggests an alternative angle of interpretation (Ferry 1996: Chapter 5 – see further below).^[2]

The handling of such genre terms in the context of translation becomes especially problematic. The translated generic designation must serve to inform the reader as to the nature of a source culture genre which may be wholly unfamiliar in the target culture, without misrepresenting that nature through the choice of a term that is only valid for certain instances of the genre. Equally, it must avoid giving rise to wholly erroneous expectations by the possible use of target language (TL) terms whose own generic connotations are too culturally loaded. And again, if the relationship between the designation and the work to which it is attached is consciously manipulated in the source text (ST), then how should such manipulation be approached in the target text (TT)?

The present paper aims to examine some of these issues by focusing on a genre in which they become particularly problematic, the classical Chinese *fu* 賦 genre. The *fu* genre is chosen because of its particular cultural and historical grounding: it has no counterpart in other literary traditions, and indeed has occupied a somewhat ambiguous position even

within the Chinese tradition. Moreover it has a particularly complex history, developing from ancient beginnings to become a genre of central importance in the intellectual life of early and medieval China.^[3] The paper begins with a discussion of broad questions in the study of literary genres, before considering the implications of such issues for the translation of the term *fu*, and ultimately for the translation of generic designations in general.

1. Genres and their Designations: Some Theoretical Considerations

Before considering the ways in which we might approach the translation of the generic designation “*fu*”, we should begin by outlining how such designations themselves should be interpreted. In doing so, we need first to clarify our understanding of the term “genre”, and then to examine the ways in which given members of a particular genre may be said to relate to their particular generic designation.

The term “genre” has been used in a considerable variety of ways, and is often found in the translation studies field in the sense developed by J. R. Martin and other linguists in the “systemic functional” tradition (see *e.g.* Martin 1997). However, the present study starts from Tzvetan Todorov's assertion that a genre is “a codification of discursive properties” (Todorov 1978: 49) found at a variety of possible discourse levels, both textual and non-textual (or “verbal”,^[4] to use Todorov's term) (Todorov 1978: 50). To this basic and broad-ranging definition a further distinction is often added: a genre may more specifically be understood as a set of properties that is “historically attested” (“historiquement attestée” – Todorov 1978: 51; *cf.* Schaeffer 2001: 354). This “historical” element is used to distinguish the idea of genres (*e.g.*

the sonnet or the *lun* 論) from other more abstract categories such as so-called “simple forms” (e.g. fable, myth) and “modes” (e.g. lyric, narrative), which imply something altogether more universalised, something which transcends historical and generic specificity (see e.g. Fowler 1982: 111). Whilst such a conceptualisation is useful, it should be noted that the distinctions between these two broad groupings – the historically grounded and the universalised – are not always so clear-cut. As the French theorist Jean-Marie Schaeffer notes (2001: 354), certain genre terms may be used in differing contexts to refer to different levels of abstraction: the French term *récit*, for instance, may variously refer to both an abstract mode of presentation (“narration”) or to a more specific historically instantiated form (“story”). As we shall develop further below, such ambiguity is present in the term *fu*, and forms a major obstacle to the translation of the term.

Schaeffer’s observation regarding the term *récit* reveals the variety of referential levels at which generic labels function. For Schaeffer, this variety has to do with the complexity of the “communicational act” which a given genre embodies. Such an act comprises both a broad “verbal” aspect (subdivided into levels of “articulation”, ^[5] “destination” and “function”) and a textual aspect (subdivided into semantic and syntactic levels). Differing genre labels may refer to any of these five differing levels, and sometimes to more than one of them simultaneously: for example, a genre such as the “pastoral” is “a dialogic song (level of articulation) involving a knight and a shepherdess (semantic level)” (Schaeffer 1989: 122).

Despite this multi-layered complexity, a central distinction can nevertheless be made between genre labels which stress the primacy of the genre’s verbal aspect, and those which stress text structure. The distinction is well illustrated by two such genres: the “sermon” and the “sonnet” (Schaeffer 1989: 129). The designation “sermon” refers to a

communicational act, and hence to the genre’s verbal aspect. In such a case, a relation of “exemplification” (Schaeffer 1989: 156-164) is said to exist between the text and its designation: however much variation may exist at the textual level, all members of the genre of “sermon” may be said to embody or “exemplify” the unitary “verbal” act which that label implies. The interpretation of a generic designation as pertaining to an underlying communicational act, then, will involve the search for a universal verbal dimension common to all instances of the genre. In the case of the “sonnet”, however, the designation clearly indicates text structure, in this case a set of clearly defined prosodic rules and conventions; and as Todorov (1978: 53) reminds us, “there is no verbal activity known as ‘sonnetting’”. In such a case, the relationship between given texts and their designation is said to be one of “modulation”. Here, actual textual instances of a given genre are not interpreted as exemplars of some more universal communicational act. Rather, since the designation relates to text structure, they can only *approximate* to that designation, since they function on the same level of discourse. Put more simply, a possible set of textual qualities posited by a generic label must remain an ideal only. With modulating genericity, then, we are concerned not with trying to define the communicational act that all instances of the genre have in common, but rather with generic variety and change, and with the interplay between members of a given genre. The attempt to arrive at a comprehensive list of features exhibited by all members of the genre is thus something of a chimera, as genre theorists have pointed out (e.g. Fowler 1982: 58; Schaeffer 1989: 178), although as we shall see later below, such attempts may be more successful where the genre label works at a highly specific level of reference.

2. Problems of Genericity in the Translation of the Genre Designation “*fu*”

Let us now turn to consider such issues in the case of the *fu* genre. The way in which we understand the genericity of the *fu* will have a direct bearing on how we interpret – and hence translate – the designation *fu* itself, and in the light of the above discussion, two main approaches present themselves. The first is to consider “*fu*” as a designation of a “verbal” aspect which all instances of the genre “exemplify”. The second is to approach “*fu*” as a textually-oriented designation.

The first of these opposing strategies will require us to try and form as clear a picture as possible of what “verbal” act might be common to all *fu*, and then to find a suitable English equivalent that accurately reflects this act. The task of identifying the expressive nature of the *fu* has long preoccupied scholars, who have sought to wrestle with the communicative nature of a genre of which the origins are highly uncertain. Early Chinese writers, such as Ban Gu 班固 (32-92 AD), and later Liu Xie 劉勰 (c. 465 - c. 522 AD), both attempt to give “definitions” of the genre that provide insights into its expressive character: Liu Xie, for example, writes of the term *fu* as an act that means “to embody objects and set down one’s will” (*ti wu xie zhi* 體物寫志),^[6] a description that was to be alluded to and variously interpreted in many subsequent works of criticism and *fu*-writing. Later writers, such as the Yuan dynasty critic Zhu Yao 祝堯 (*jinsbi* 1318 AD), likewise come up with definitions or descriptions of the genre that seek to identify not shared formal or stylistic traits, but a broader aspect of the type that we have referred to as “verbal”: in part of his argument, for example, Zhu discusses the expressive nature of the *fu* in terms of the relationship of “*qing*” 情 (emotion), “*ci*” 辭 (fine diction) and “*li*” 理, which might in this context be translated as “discursive reasoning”.^[7]

The apparent vagueness of these definitions highlights the very real difficulty of understanding the notion of *fu* in terms of an underlying communicational act which all its members exemplify. The diversity of forms within the genre, and the corresponding diversity of expressive functions, is such that there sometimes seems little, if anything, that binds given members of the genre together, and any common communicational act that we might describe as “*fu*-ing” is simply too deeply embedded to be of meaningful use. By the Ming and Qing dynasties, the sense of this generic diversity had become so pronounced that some commentators would even dismiss later manifestations of the genre as invalid. In the words of one Qing critic: “for the Tang and after, there are no *fu*: what they call *fu* are not *fu*” (“*Tang yibou wu fu. Qi suo wei fu zhe, fei fu ye*” 唐以後無賦。其所謂賦者非賦也).^[8] Thus the “verbal” quality that can be extrapolated from one group of *fu* will not be obviously present in another group of *fu*. This problem characterises modern discussions of the genre, such as Friedrich Bischoff’s famous study. Bischoff focuses on highly selective examples from the Tang and Song dynasties, to show that the *fu* is, in essence, “a wily [form of] composition” (Bischoff 1976: 1) which aims at delivering a critical message (usually political) in a superficially innocuous way. Bischoff cites a wealth of textual evidence to support his claim, yet the weakness of his approach becomes self-evident as soon as one attempts to apply it to other examples not of his choosing.

This problem of focusing on a particular stratum of a given genre as a means to pinpoint its unifying expressive characteristics – and hence suggest possible translations of its designation – is also evident in studies which deal with the early development of the *fu* genre. The American sinologist David Knechtges, for instance, has analysed early etymological explanations of the term, to suggest that *fu* were originally a genre associated with public chanting and rhetorical display (Knechtges 1976:

13; 1988), a view that has come to gain wide acceptance. Knechtges thus proposes “rhapsody” as the English equivalent which perhaps best mirrors this original understanding of “*fu*”, on the basis that it shares a parallel etymology. The term rhapsody as commonly understood today has a range of differing usages, all of which centre around the idea of ecstatic composition. The *Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, for example, defines “rhapsody” as: “(1) an enthusiastic, ecstatic, or extravagant utterance or composition. (2) *Mus.* a piece of music in one extended movement, usu. emotional in character. (3) *Gk Hist.* an epic poem, or part of it, of a length for one recitation.” Knechtges elaborates:

One could translate *fu* as “declamation”, but declamation is not a literary term. For this reason, I have chosen to translate *fu* as “rhapsody”. The rhapsody in ancient Greece was an epic poem recited or extemporised by a minstrel or court poet, known as a rhapsode. ... The *fu* poet in many ways is a kind of rhapsode, and the poems he composed often display the ecstasy, grandeur, and emotional intensity associated with the rhapsody (1976: 13-14).

Such an approach has clear limitations, if the translated term is to stand as an adequate descriptive equivalent for the genre as a whole. Quite apart from the issue of the cultural appropriacy of such a translation strategy, which will be dealt with in the final section of this paper, in generic terms “rhapsody” does not denote the underlying communicational act present in all *fu*, any more than the verbal quality (*e.g.* chanting) identified in early forms of the genre can easily be discerned in later examples. Knechtges himself is keenly aware of this: “calling the *fu* rhapsody, however, does not completely define the genre that existed in the Han dynasty” (1976: 14), much less in other dynasties. If, for example, one focuses on the Six Dynasties, many of the short, lyrical

shuqing xiao fu 抒情小賦 characteristic of the period are not characterised by any communicational element that might be referred to as “rhapsodising”. Thus, whilst a translation of the genre designation made on the basis of a single synchronic slice in the genre’s development may be of use in a historically confined study such as that of Knechtges, if such a translation is applied more diachronically, *i.e.* to describe the entire range of historical variations within the genre, it may shape TT readers’ reception of the ST genre in ways which can obscure interpretation.^[9] It may of course be argued that just as “*fu*” initially designated a particular type of composition that then subsequently developed into very different and seemingly unrelated forms, so “rhapsody” will suffice as a translation, since it shares the same etymological range as that initial or early use of the term *fu*. However, the translator is, so to speak, working from the opposite end of the evolutionary process. Whereas the source language (SL) designation is part of an organic development, the TL “equivalent” is artificially imposed from outside. Thus the translator must look back on the whole range of works in the genre, all of which, however different they may be, carry the same generic designation, and therefore must have some conceptual binding force; and s/he must from this find a term which is appropriate to all examples, a term which is, in short, diachronically valid.

Let us now consider the second option for translation, namely that we examine the term “*fu*” not as a verbal designation, but as a designation of text structure. Here, we will discuss two of the most influential such translations of the term: “prose-poetry” and “rhymeprose”.^[10] As with “rhapsody”, we will set aside the question of how culturally appropriate these terms are until later, and will focus here solely on their appropriacy in terms of genericity. Both terms may be seen as designations of text structure, for “prose” and “poetry”, though wide-ranging, are at least in part indicative of fundamentally different

structuring at the textual level. "Rhymeprose" is a similar case, though one that is perhaps more sharply defined than "prose-poetry". Here, "poetry" has been deleted, and we are left in no doubt that we are in the presence of "prose"; the poetic element within this prose structure is then more specifically stated as that of "rhyme".

Both these attempts at rendering "*fu*" on textual grounds are worthwhile; however, they again can only provide us with a partial picture. A crucial problem here is the level of textual generality to which the genre designation relates. As Steven Mailloux (1982: 132) reminds us, the (textual) conventions designated by genre labels may be "as general as those comprising all narratives, ... [or] as specific as those constituting the many subgenres or formula fictions". In the case of the *fu*, the level of generality is extreme: the modulation of the genre over time has led to such a breadth of textual variation that it proves almost impossible to extrapolate a set of similar conventions which individual works in the genre share in common. The subsequent difficulty of finding a textually-oriented translation of the designation that is generalised enough to apply to all *fu* is particularly acute: even the terms "prose" and "poetry", for instance, though they already seem to indicate highly generalised aspects of text structure, may be too specific in regard to categorising the textual nature of the *fu* genre. Take "prose-poem" as an example. Many of the best-known *fu*, the so-called "*da fu*" 大賦 or "grand *fu*" of the Han dynasty, do exhibit a structure in which passages of straight prose are interspersed with long and ornate rhymed poetic descriptions. Likewise, the term might be applied to the strain of *fu* that emerged a thousand years later in the Song dynasty, the so-called "*wen fu*" 文賦, or "prose *fu*", though the structure of these two different sub-groups is markedly different, the Song *wen fu* representing a more genuine *fusion* of prose and poetic elements into a single form (Xu 2001: 253 ff.). But many other *fu*, such as the Tang regulated *fu*, or the miniscule *shuqing xiao fu* of the preceding Six

Dynasties period, seem to contain no element of "prose" whatsoever. Similar remarks pertain to the translation "rhymeprose", though this term is less easily dismissed: it might be possible, in the most extreme case, to conceive of a piece of "prose" that was entirely "rhymed". But then, in what way could this be said to differ from a piece of "poetry"? In any case, the rationale behind the term "rhymeprose" is essentially the same as "prose-poetry". In the words of Birch, "typically, the *fu* presents an essay in varied verse with prose introduction and interludes: 'rhyme-prose' is a fair representation of the generic name" (Birch 1965/67: 157).

The extent to which the specificity of reference of a genre designation affects translation is powerfully illustrated when one contrasts the *fu* with other classical Chinese genres such as the "*jueju*" 絕句 or the "*qi*" 七. Whereas the *fu*, if conceived of as a text-oriented designation, operates at a highly generalised level, the *jueju* is a far more narrowly defined genre (indeed it might even be analysed as a "subgenre" depending on how that term is understood ^[11]), which denotes far more specific textual characteristics. Even the name itself, which translates literally as "cut-off lines", is far more strongly suggestive of textual reference, and given members of the genre all share the common structural characteristic of having four equal lines. Consequently, the commonly accepted English rendering, "Quatrain", would seem to fit far better than the translations offered for the *fu* genre. To take a second example, the designation "*qi*" (literally "seven") refers to a genre prominent in the Han dynasty (Mei Sheng's 枚乘 (d. 140 BC) "Seven Stimuli" or "*Qi Fu*" 七發 is perhaps the best-known example), in which each piece is composed of seven different portions working to a rhetorical climax. Here too, we have a narrowly defined genre (again, it has sometimes been considered a subgenre ^[12]) whose designation includes an explicitly textual reference. The translation "Sevens" (Knechtges 1982: 34) would seem appropriate. Here, then, we see that for a genre whose designation is (a) clearly textual, and (b) referring

to perhaps as little as one highly specific textual feature, the translation even of genre designations for which no cognate exists in the Target Culture is relatively easily accomplished.

Whilst seemingly impossible to negotiate successfully in the case of the *fu*, the above problems of genericity, including the various distinctions between “verbal” and “textual” designations, have however sometimes been more successfully addressed. For Stephen Owen, the *fu* is less “prose-poem” than “poetic exposition” (Owen 1996: 7). In this rendering, we are still given an indication of text structure, with the term “poetic” conjuring up rhyme, alliteration and the various other “poetic” devices at a writer’s disposal. Yet at the same time, Owen avoids the pitfall of any reference to “prose”. Moreover his use of “exposition” is something which, though it refers to text structure, relates more to what Jean-Marie Schaeffer has called “macrodiscursive” features (Schaeffer 1989: 115), and which we might also refer to as the “internal rhetoric” of a piece. Such macrodiscursive features differ significantly from more explicit formal features, and are such that they may be seen as the textual correlatives of “mode”, or of a “communicational act” (Neather 1995: 7). The term “exposition” picks up on the idea of the relation between the *fu* genre and the rhetorical trope of the same name, which was said to have been present in some of the earliest extant Chinese poetry, the *Shi Jing* 詩經. This trope has been extensively researched, particularly by Dore Levy, who styles it “enumeration” (Levy 1988: 34-46), opining that it is used for “constructing sequences” in which three or more elements may be involved. The sequences may be of any variety, most obviously spatial or temporal. In many *fu* there is a sense that the poetic voice is structured around such sequential patterns; many *fu* might be said to provide a “working through” of a given situation or mental state, that is formed by such sequences even in shorter pieces. Owen’s “poetic exposition”, then, is perhaps the most subtle and ingenious of the

renderings on offer at present, not least because it partially straddles the divide between the textual and verbal levels of the genre, and because the elements of text structure that it suggests do not mislead the TT reader in the way that other renderings may.

3. Cultural Appropriacy and the Translation of the Designation “*fu*”

So far we have focused on the way in which we interpret the generic designation *fu*, and the problems which either of two alternative readings of *fu* genericity will involve for the translation process. Let us now turn to the other area of consideration mentioned in our introduction to this paper, namely, the issue of cultural appropriacy in the translation of genre designations. Again, we shall focus on *fu*, assessing renderings such as those discussed above. Do they set up false comparisons between SL and TL genres, or do they help to mediate difference?

Let us take the first of our “textual” examples as a starting point. “Prose-poem” is a term which may be regarded as a direct attempt to map an existing TL generic label onto the SL genre, in this case *fu*. In some senses, this mapping can help to signal a key problem of the genre, namely its rather hybrid status. For the generic status of *fu* has been recognised as problematic even in some traditional Chinese categorisations of *fu* writings, in which a prose/poetry dichotomy is already evident. In later anthologies in particular (of which the Qing dynasty collection, the *Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文 or *Complete Tang Prose*, is the most obvious example), the *fu* is clearly regarded as belonging, however uneasily, to the realm of prose, despite long-standing recognition of its poetic properties. These views have persisted in the works of various modern scholars, who have continued to downplay the *fu*, in sometimes quite disparaging

terms, as somehow “not true poetry”, especially when compared to the supposedly lyrically superior *shi* genre (e.g. Liu 1956: 278). In the Western tradition, the term “prose-poem” conjures up a similar image of generic hybridity, and with it a similar degree of scholarly mistrust. Yet this is perhaps the only such analogical link that can be made between the two genres. For the Western “prose-poem” has evolved from very different roots. Developed in the nineteenth century, especially in the hands of Baudelaire, whose *Petits Poèmes en Prose* are often seen as the first serious examples of such a form, the “prose-poem” is a far more recent arrival on the literary scene than the archaically-rooted *fu*; indeed, its usage by Baudelaire can be seen as very much an avant-garde act which aimed to break new literary ground. These connotations are so strong that for some scholars, the term “prose-poem” is problematic even for the description of newer, avant-garde works of poetry which might normally be considered as examples of that genre. Stephen Fredman, for instance, in his study of the shift from poetry to prose in the writings of twentieth century American poets, has suggested the term “poet’s prose” as a way of breaking out of what he calls “the terminological nightmare surrounding non-versified poetry”. For Fredman (1983/90: xv), “the more common ‘prose poem’ is unsatisfactory for two reasons: it is an oxymoron aimed at defamiliarising lyric poetry, and it remains redolent with the atmospheric sentiment of French Symbolism”.

Of the alternative translations of “*fu*” on offer, “rhymeprose”, whilst problematic when analysed in terms of genericity, does at least work rather more successfully in regard to cultural appropriacy. Unlike “prose-poem”, it does not represent a direct “mapping” onto an existing TL genre, for there would seem to be no established genre of “rhymeprose” in the Western tradition. It therefore avoids excessive domestication, retaining a degree of otherness in the translation which is more acceptable than the more “comfortable” though culturally loaded

“prose-poem”. (In this regard, one wonders if the original coinage of the term may have been influenced by a traditional Chinese categorisation, “*yun-wen*” 韻文 or “rhymed literature”, to which the *fu* was often seen as belonging). Nevertheless, as with “prose-poem”, the inclusion of the word “prose” in this formula is potentially problematic to the modern reader. “Prose” is one step away from “prosaic”, the connotations of which term are now such that it is almost impossible to use it in its literal meaning as an adjective denoting “prose-like”. Fredman’s later discussion of “poet’s prose” would seem to acknowledge this:

The terms “poetry” and “prose” usually take their definitions from the ideal opposition of one to the other: we think of poetry as succinct, essential, transcendental; we think of prose as prolix, descriptive, mundane (1983/90: 2).

In addition to these connotations of mundanity, Fredman’s assertion of the opposition between poetry and prose here is also worth taking up. For except in the field of literary criticism, it may be argued that the term “prose” is fast disappearing as a counterpart to “poetry”. Instead, whilst “poetry” continues to be conceived of as a single, relatively discrete unit, “prose” has come to seem impossibly broad, such that one now speaks instead in terms of more specific prose genres: fiction, the novel, biography, autobiography, and so forth. Thus a somewhat paradoxical situation exists in which prose has come to be seen as the predominant medium of literary expression in the contemporary era, yet the use of the term “prose” in non-specialist circles is becoming obsolete. The precise socio-cultural factors influencing this trend are too complex to unravel here. What can be said, at least, is that for a contemporary TL audience, the inclusion of the element “prose” in the terms “rhymeprose” and “prose-poem” carries connotations of obsolescence that are perhaps

best avoided. In this regard, Owen's "poetic exposition" again strikes us as a more satisfactory rendering – the unfortunate connotations of "prose" are carefully avoided. Whilst one recalls Knechtges's hesitation over a similar term, "declamation", cited earlier – "'declamation' is not a literary term" – culturally loaded possibilities have at least been eschewed in favour of a term which is neither excessively domesticated nor unpalatably foreignised.

Having considered the cultural appropriacy of these text-oriented renderings, let us turn finally to consider appropriacy in the case of the term "rhapsody", which as we discussed above, interprets "*fu*" as a "verbal" designation. Earlier, we alluded to the fact that this translation attempts to find an etymological parallel between Western and Chinese traditions. As with the "text-oriented" renderings discussed above, here too we see an attempt to map a TL term onto an SL term by analogical means. However, the recourse to etymological enquiry is an inherently different kind of mapping, since it seeks to establish the authority of analogical links by careful extrapolation of word derivations that go back to the ancient classical empires. Such cross-cultural analysis can provide important insights into hitherto problematic areas. Nevertheless, as a tool for translation, the search for etymological parallelism can lead to unsatisfactory results. Eugene Chen Eoyang is one scholar who has argued convincingly against the obsessive use of such a translation methodology. Citing extensive examples from the work of the late Berkeley sinologist Peter Boodberg, such as the term "Argibasilic Diarch" as an etymological "equivalent" for the Chinese "*Huang di*" 皇帝, Eoyang demonstrates that such terms are inappropriate, both on grounds of epistemology and intelligibility (Eoyang 1995: 302-3). Put simply, the translation obscures rather than elucidates. Here, Eoyang further raises the related "principle of familiarity": "should the reader of a translation not be as familiar with a term in translation as the reader of the original with its counterpart

in the original?" Boodberg's work is perhaps now dated, but the influence of his approach is still seen in the works of scholars today. Stephen Bokenkamp's excellent analysis of a ninth-century manual of regulated *fu* writing, the "*Fu Pu*" 賦譜, provides one example of how the search for parallel etymologies can prove tempting but ultimately inappropriate. Bokenkamp (1986) translates the term "*pu*" 譜 in the title of the work as "ledger" (thus "*Fu Pu*" is "The Ledger on the Rhapsody"). "Ledger", he argues at length, has a directly parallel etymology, for like "*pu*", it derives from the idea of listing up a set of items. Whilst this exegesis is genuinely fascinating, one is left wondering whether "Ledger", now almost purely confined to the field of accountancy, can really, in practical terms, convey the correct sense of the Chinese "*pu*". It is therefore of significant note that in later work (1989: 211), Bokenkamp explicitly refers to his change of heart in employing this translation strategy, preferring instead the more natural and culturally meaningful (though as some would see it, etymologically flawed) term "manual".

"Rhapsody", it might be suggested, is a more successful example of cross-cultural mapping on the basis of etymological roots. But there is a further point to be made here, which is already evident in the above example of Bokenkamp's uneasiness about his original use of "ledger" for *pu* 譜: etymologies change. If "rhapsody" once meant, to recall our earlier definition, "an enthusiastic, ecstatic, or extravagant utterance or composition" of the kind recited by a Greek rhapsode, it had come to mean something very different by the seventeenth century, and was to take on still different connotations in subsequent periods. In her work exploring the relation of poetic works to their titles, Anne Ferry (1996: 167) has a detailed discussion of the term "rhapsody" and its use as a generic label, which as she suggests, presents us with "a long and mixed history":

In English critical vocabulary before the nineteenth century – when many formal terms began to be loosened from their roots – *rhapsody* started out as a neutral term to describe a collection of poetic pieces gathered together... In the seventeenth century it crops up somewhat more in titles for single poems... Unsurprisingly, earlier eighteenth century writers stress the ancient root meaning, which they find useful to sanction critical attacks like those of John Dennis on Pope. ... The abusive sense of the term in these attacks is as Elisha Coles's dictionary of 1717 succinctly defines it: "a confused Collection". It does not yet have to do with meanings accumulated around the term in the nineteenth century.

I have quoted this exegesis at some length to show just how intricate the later semantic development of a term may be. The cultural connotations of a generic label are, like the genre itself, in a state of continual flux, as the genre changes and develops. Thus even supposing that mapping a TL generic designation onto an "ur-form" of the SL genre on the basis of parallel etymological roots were a valid strategy, the subsequent "meanings accumulated around the term", to use Ferry's phrase, present a tangle of SL associations that set up wholly erroneous reader expectations, just as we saw with more "modern" or recently-coined genre designations such as "prose-poem".

This situation is true even when the writer of the source text uses the genre designation in a wholly unoriginal way. Yet the problem is still more acute where a writer may have deliberately interpreted the given designation more creatively, in order to manipulate reader expectations, or to expand the existing parameters of accepted expression in the genre. Ferry (1996: 166), for instance, cites T. S. Eliot's *Rhapsody on a Windy Night* as one example of how an author appropriates an established generic label to designate a quite different form of poetic discourse. From the

classical Chinese field, we might cite the Mid-Tang writer, Li Guan 李觀 (766-794), whose "Fu on Suffering the Rains" ("Ku yu fu" 苦雨賦) is a virtuoso example of a piece entitled "fu" with a text structure that is heavily influenced by importations from other generic repertoires, to the extent that the work sometimes seems to share more in common with discursive prose genres such as the *lun* 論 or *shuo* 說 than with the *fu* genre as it was understood at the time (Neather 1995: 159-197). In such a case, there is a still more confused web of cultural associations to negotiate: the use of "rhapsody" (or whatever the term in question) as a means to translate "fu" may be seen as an appropriation of a TL designation to suggest an SL designation that has itself been appropriated and manipulated for other ends, a situation in which translation would therefore seem doubly problematic.

Many of these problems of attempting to map a culturally unique genre onto an existing English equivalent have to do with the way in which generic links operate in a cross-cultural context. Schaeffer (1989: 173 ff.), discussing "modulating genericity", has suggested that two different relationships exist between texts within given genres. Where differing members of a genre share hypertextual links, they may be said to belong to a "genealogical class" ("classe généalogique"), *i.e.* they are genealogically connected, for instance where genre development has taken place within a shared cultural tradition. Where differing genre members do not share hypertextual links, however, as is the case between culturally unconnected traditions, "analogical" links are what binds differing members together. Thus, Schaeffer suggests that a genre such as the "conte philosophique", or "philosophical tale", will incorporate both Western tales in the tradition of Lucian and Buddhist philosophical tales from various Eastern traditions. Such a broad grouping may be acceptable for Schaeffer's example. In the case of the *fu*, however, translations such as "prose-poem" set up a connection that suggests a single "classe

analogique”: they imply, fallaciously, that works of *fu* may be incorporated in a single analogically related class of works that share broadly similar generic traits.

Another alternative suggested by such difficulties is of course transliteration, an approach which would bypass such problems and preserve the sense of “otherness” inherent in what is a culturally unique term. It is interesting, however, to note a certain reluctance on the part of translators and anthologists to adopt this strategy for the term “*fu*”, a phenomenon which must await further research elsewhere. However, it is perhaps significant that new hybrids are emerging in which transliteration plays a part: Strassberg’s study of Chinese travel writing, for instance, which contains translations of *fu* amongst other genres, uses the term “*fu* rhapsody” throughout (Strassberg 1994: 23, *et passim*), a coinage which would seem to reflect unease both over using a purely English “equivalent” without qualification and over using a pure transliteration. Such a usage may be read as an attempt to take the now well-established and domesticated term “rhapsody” and “re-other” it by labeling it as a subgenre of rhapsody that is at the same time unique to the Chinese context.

4. Conclusion

The above discussion has examined issues in the translation of genre designations, taking the *fu* genre as a case study. Firstly, we examined questions of genericity, noting that genre designations may be interpreted either as “verbally” oriented or as “textually” oriented (with a further set of sub-distinctions existing within each of these two categories). The reading of a genre’s genericity will be one key factor influencing the translation of the genre label. In the case of the *fu*, we saw that the

genericity of this genre is extremely difficult to pinpoint: the term *fu* might be understood as a designation of “verbal” significance that is exemplified by all its genre members, or as a “textual” designation whose members relate to it only in terms of “modulation”. Most of the translations reviewed here choose between one or other of these two possibilities – verbal or textual – and in the process run the risk of misrepresenting the genericity of the genre.

Secondly, we also noted that the genre designation’s level of reference affects translation. For genres which have a highly specific designation, such as the *jueju*, translation may be more straightforward. For *fu*, however, the high level of generality implied in the term impedes translation. If *fu* is regarded as a verbal-oriented designation, one is faced with the problem of finding a term denoting a communicational act which holds for all exemplars of that act, *i.e.* for all members of the genre. If one focuses on *fu* as a designation of text-structure, one must negotiate an array of formally diffuse subgenres, all known as “*fu*”, which contain no obvious textual thread that binds them. Nevertheless, Owen’s rendering, “poetic exposition”, does stand out as a more effective attempt at compromise, since it addresses, to some degree at least, the possibilities of both a “verbal” and “textual” reading of the designation *fu*.

Thirdly, we examined translations of the term “*fu*” in the light of their cultural appropriacy. We have seen how translations have sought to map the *fu* genre onto existing TL genres that are superficially analogous, or onto etymological equivalents which are questionable on grounds of intelligibility as well as epistemology. We also touched on the question of transliteration as a possible alternative to translation.

Other issues in the translation of genre designations also merit attention. For instance, why a term such as “*haiku*” – a transliteration – should become the established rendering of the Japanese genre, where the transliteration “*fu*” has not gained prominence in the Chinese case, is

an issue which would require a consideration of the ideological and historical motivations for the choice of one rendering over another. Such issues, however, must await further research.

Notes

- [1] All English translations from French works cited are my own. The original French has not been cited unless it is felt that further clarification is required.
- [2] To cite a well-known example from the Chinese context, Han Yu's 韓愈 *Jin xue jie* 進學解 has often been read and interpreted as an example of *fu*, since its generic features show marked similarities to those of a *fu*. (For one such interpretation, see Spring 1986). Yet it is generically labeled as a "jie" or "Explanation", a label which is of crucial significance. For as Nishigami Masaru (1986: 31) points out, when considered against the background of Han Yu's career, its demarcation as a "jie" signals a clear break from his earlier period of composition, in which all his *fu* were composed. Spring's characterization of Han Yu's piece as a "rhapsody" might thus be viewed as an instance of manipulative translation which fails to take account of the importance of switching the genre label.
- [3] One measure of this importance is the role of *fu* writing in the state examination system by which scholars were appointed to high-level positions in the bureaucracy: *fu* composition was introduced as a requirement for the *jinsbi* 進士 or "Advanced Scholar" exam as early as the latter half of the 7th Century, and gained a central importance in the exam during the 8th century. Neather 1995: 21; cf. McMullen 1988: 230.
- [4] Todorov uses the term "verbal" in opposition to "syntactic" and "semantic", to refer to broader communicational aspects beyond the text level. In its broadest understanding, the term may "serve to encompass everything which has to do with the very materiality of signs themselves" (1978: 50).

- [5] The original French term here is "énonciation", literally "enunciation". The term can encompass various related meanings including "utterance" and "statement". "Articulation" is used here to indicate that the term refers to the speaker or speakers involved in "articulating" the text.
- [6] "Quan Fu" 詮賦, *Wen Xin Diaolong Zhu* 2/134.
- [7] These terms occur at various points in Zhu Yao's work. For one particularly interesting discussion, in which Du Mu's famous "*Fu* on the Afang Palace" (*Afang Gong Fu* 阿房宮賦) is assessed as having an "excess of *li*", see *Gu Fu Bianti*, 7/3a.
- [8] Cheng Tingzuo 程廷祚, *Sao Fu Lun San Pian* 騷賦論三篇, in *Qing Qi Ji* 3/13a. Cheng's remarks, which seem to dismiss all *fu* from the Tang and subsequent dynasties, may be seen in the context of an earlier emerging Ming critique which focused more specifically on invalidating the *fu* of the Tang. For a full discussion of this critique, see Xu 2001: Chapter 8.
- [9] This problem notwithstanding, it is interesting to note that the term "rhapsody" has been influential in the presentation of *fu* pieces to a general audience: Lai and Lai's (1979) coinage, "rhapsodic essay", shows a clear attempt to draw on and rework the term, whilst "rhapsody" continues to be seen in recent anthologies such as Minford and Lau (2000).
- [10] For an early example of the use of "prose poetry", see Le Gros Clark 1935/1964. For an example of "rhymeprose", see e.g. Watson 1971.
- [11] The notion of "subgenre" is also problematic and subject to considerable differences in interpretation. Alastair Fowler (1982: 111 ff.), for instance, regards it as indicating a generic subgrouping along thematic lines. Yet it might also be understood as relating to formal or prosodic properties.
- [12] Knechtges (1982: 34) has argued that, whilst listed as a separate genre in early anthologies such as the *Wen Xuan*, its similarities to the *fu* genre suggest that it may be read as a subgenre of *fu*.

References

(a) Pre-Modern Works

- Gu Fu Bianti* 古賦辯體, by Zhu Yao 祝堯 (*jinsbi* 1318), *Siku Quanshu Zhenben* edition, series 6 四庫全書珍本六集, 1976.
- Sao Fu Lun San Pian* 騷賦論三篇, by Cheng Tingzuo 程廷祚 (Qing dynasty), collected in his *Qing Qi Ji* 青溪集, chapter 3, pp. 10-14, and published in *Jinling Conggshu (yi ji zhi shi)* 金陵叢書 (乙集之十), Taipei: Li Xing Shuju 力行書局, 1970.
- Wen Xin Diaolong Zhu* 文心雕龍注, by Liu Xie 劉勰 (c. 465 - c. 522), with annotation by Fan Wenlan 范文瀾, Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe, 1958.

(b) Modern Sources

- Birch, Cyril, ed. (1965/67). *Anthology of Chinese Literature*. New York: Grove Press 1965; reprinted London: Penguin books, 1967.
- Bischoff, Friedrich (1976). *Interpreting the Fu: A Study in Chinese Literary Rhetoric*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Bokenkamp, Stephen R. (1986). "The 'Ledger on the Rhapsody': Studies in the Art of the Tang *fu*". Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California.
- . (1989). "Chinese Metaphor Again: Reading—and Understanding—Imagery in the Chinese Poetic Tradition". In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 109.2, pp. 211-221.
- Eoyang, Eugene Chen (1995). "Speaking in Tongues: Translating Chinese Literature in a Post-Babelian Age". In *Translating Chinese Literature*. Ed. Eugene Eoyang and Lin Yao-fu. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 292-304.
- Ferry, Anne (1996). *The Title to the Poem*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fowler, Alastair (1982). *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Fredman, Stephen (1983/90). *Poet's Prose: The Crisis in American Verse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983; second edition, 1990.

- Jauss, Hans Robert (1982). *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. from the German by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Knechtges, David (1976). *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 BC - AD 18)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knechtges, David (1982). *Wen Xuan, or Selections of Fine Literature (Vol 1)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Knechtges, David (writing as Kang Dawei 康大維) (1988). "Lun Fu Ti de Yuanliu" 論賦體的源流. In *Wen shi zhe* 文史哲 184 (1988, #1), pp. 40-45.
- Le Gros Clark, Cyril Drummond (1935/1964). *The Prose Poetry of Su Tung-p'o*. Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh, 1935; reprinted New York: Paragon, 1964.
- Levy, Dore J. (1988). *Chinese Narrative Poetry: The Han through Tang Dynasties*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lai, Monica and T. C. Lai, eds. (1979). *Rhapsodic Essays from the Chinese*. Hong Kong: Kelly and Walsh.
- Liu, James J. Y. (1956). "Three 'Worlds' in Chinese Poetry". In *Journal of Oriental Studies* 3.2, pp. 278-290.
- Mailloux, Steven (1982). *Interpretive Conventions: The Reader in the Study of American Fiction*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- McMullen, David (1988). *State and Scholars in T'ang China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1997). "Analysing Genre: Functional Parameters". In *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. Ed. J. R. Martin and Frances Christie. London and Washington: Cassell, pp. 3-39.
- Minford, John and S. M. Lau, eds. (2000). *Classical Chinese Literature: An Anthology of Translations*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- Neather, Robert (1995). "The *Fu* Genre in the Mid-Tang: A Study in Generic Change". Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Nishigami, Masaru 西上勝 (1986). "Kan Yu 'Shingaku Kai' no Johō ni Tsuite" 韓愈進學解の敘法について [On the Descriptive Method of Han Yu's *Jinxue Jie*]. In *Bunka* 文化 49 (3/4), pp. 19-35.

- Owen, Stephen, ed./trans. (1996). *An Anthology of Chinese Literature: Beginnings to 1991*. New York: Norton.
- Schaeffer, Jean-Marie (1989). *Qu'est-ce qu'un Genre Littéraire?*. Paris: Seuil.
- _____. (2001). "Genres Littéraires". In *Dictionnaire des Genres et Notions Littéraires*. Paris: Encyclopaedia Universalis / Albin Michel, 1997, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 353-358.
- Spring, Madeline (1986). "Han Yü's *Chin-hsüeh Chieh*: A Rhapsody on Higher Learning". in *T'ang Studies* 4, pp. 11-27.
- Strassberg, Richard E. (1994). *Inscribed Landscapes: Travel Writing from Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan (1978). *Les Genres du Discours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Watson, Burton (1971). *Chinese Rhyme-prose: Poems in the Fu Form from the Han and Six Dynasties Periods*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Xu, Jie 許結 (2001). *Zhongguo Fuxue: Lishi yu Piping* 中國賦學——歷史與批評 [Chinese Fu Studies: History and Criticism]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Jiaoyu Chubanshe 江蘇教育出版社.

About the Author

Robert Neather graduated from the University of Cambridge with a BA in Chinese, and gained his PhD there (1995) with a thesis focusing on genre change in Tang dynasty literature, in particular the *fu* 賦 genre. He also holds a postgraduate Diploma in translation and interpreting from the University of Bath, UK, where he later returned to teach. He is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics at City University of Hong Kong, and teaches courses including Chinese-to-English translation, and stylistics.

Lu Xun's Translation: An Examination of Language and Style

Li Yongyan

Abstract

This paper surveys Lu Xun's translation practice in terms of language and style. It points out that before 1909, Lu Xun's translations were influenced by several contemporary trends, including the writing style of Yan Fu and the stylistic practice advocated by Liang Qichao; his learning from Zhang Taiyan contributed to his being "archaic", while Chinese classical literature helped further to shape his own style in writing. After 1909 Lu Xun turned to being "literal" in translation as a means to more faithfully reproduce "new voices" from other literary traditions and transplant new approaches to writing into the Chinese literary milieu. After 1919, he continued to pursue a "literal translation" approach in order to adopt foreign linguistic elements and so enrich a Chinese language which was at the time seen as impoverished. Lu Xun remained adamant in his advocacy of "hard translation" and a determined practitioner of "Europeanization". The final portion of the paper presents the findings of a quantitative study which examined Lu Xun's use of complicated Modifier-Head Structures with *de/di* particles, and shows that his translations of literary theory are strongly "Europeanized" and thus have a low readability.

- Owen, Stephen, ed./trans. (1996). *An Anthology of Chinese Literature: Beginnings to 1991*. New York: Norton.
- Schaeffer, Jean-Marie (1989). *Qu'est-ce qu'un Genre Littéraire?*. Paris: Seuil.
- . (2001). "Genres Littéraires". In *Dictionnaire des Genres et Notions Littéraires*. Paris: Encyclopaedia Universalis / Albin Michel, 1997, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 353-358.
- Spring, Madeline (1986). "Han Yü's *Chin-bsüeh Chieh*: A Rhapsody on Higher Learning". in *T'ang Studies* 4, pp. 11-27.
- Strassberg, Richard E. (1994). *Inscribed Landscapes: Travel Writing from Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan (1978). *Les Genres du Discours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Watson, Burton (1971). *Chinese Rhyme-prose: Poems in the Fu Form from the Han and Six Dynasties Periods*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Xu, Jie 許結 (2001). *Zhongguo Fuxue: Lishi yu Piping* 中國賦學——歷史與批評 [Chinese Fu Studies: History and Criticism]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Jiaoyu Chubanshe 江蘇教育出版社.

About the Author

Robert Neather graduated from the University of Cambridge with a BA in Chinese, and gained his PhD there (1995) with a thesis focusing on genre change in Tang dynasty literature, in particular the *fu* 賦 genre. He also holds a postgraduate Diploma in translation and interpreting from the University of Bath, UK, where he later returned to teach. He is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics at City University of Hong Kong, and teaches courses including Chinese-to-English translation, and stylistics.

Lu Xun's Translation: An Examination of Language and Style

Li Yongyan

Abstract

This paper surveys Lu Xun's translation practice in terms of language and style. It points out that before 1909, Lu Xun's translations were influenced by several contemporary trends, including the writing style of Yan Fu and the stylistic practice advocated by Liang Qichao; his learning from Zhang Taiyan contributed to his being "archaic", while Chinese classical literature helped further to shape his own style in writing. After 1909 Lu Xun turned to being "literal" in translation as a means to more faithfully reproduce "new voices" from other literary traditions and transplant new approaches to writing into the Chinese literary milieu. After 1919, he continued to pursue a "literal translation" approach in order to adopt foreign linguistic elements and so enrich a Chinese language which was at the time seen as impoverished. Lu Xun remained adamant in his advocacy of "hard translation" and a determined practitioner of "Europeanization". The final portion of the paper presents the findings of a quantitative study which examined Lu Xun's use of complicated Modifier-Head Structures with *de/di* particles, and shows that his translations of literary theory are strongly "Europeanized" and thus have a low readability.

1. Introduction

Perhaps no other Chinese writer and thinker since 1919 has won as great and lasting respect as Lu Xun 鲁迅 (1881-1936). For over half a century a substantial amount of scholarship has been devoted to the study of Lu Xun's writings and thought, to the point of cultivating a specific branch of study—*Lu Xun Xue* 鲁迅學 or “Lu Xun Studies”. However, whilst there has been considerable discussion on the question of “Lu Xun and foreign literature”, Lu Xun's translation activities (1903-1936), which produced about 2,500,000 characters in total (almost equal to his writing in amount), have received far less attention. Lu Xun's propositions in regard to translation (most prominently his tenet of *zhi yi* 直譯 or “literal translation”) have become an integral part of the history of Chinese translation theory and have been amply documented or critiqued in that context (e.g. Chen 1992; Liu 1981). Yet in-depth research into Lu Xun's work as a translator has begun only recently (Lundberg 1989; Pollard 1993; Wang 1995; Yuan 1990).

The relative dearth of studies on Lu Xun's translation *per se* is perhaps explained by the difficulty of finding or determining the source texts upon which his translations were based. Since his translations were done during the early decades of the twentieth century, with most of them not rendered from their original versions but from Japanese translations (some from German versions), critical efforts to examine Lu Xun's renderings against their source texts can be problematic.

However, looking at Lu Xun's translations themselves without referring to the original versions is also a meaningful undertaking in that it can contribute to a better understanding of Lu Xun's creative efforts as a revolutionary writer, and provide a profile of the Chinese language at a time of transformation. This paper attempts to do partial work in this direction by examining Lu Xun's translations in terms of language

and style. It first considers Lu Xun's early translation practice (pre-1919), then examines developments after 1919, and concludes with an analysis of readability in Lu Xun's later translations.

2. Lu Xun's Translation before 1919

2.1 A *zhang hui* Fiction Style

Between 1902 and 1909, Lu Xun was studying in Japan. His translations were the product of the enthusiasm of a young patriot highly concerned for his country's fate. Insofar as subject matter is concerned, his early translations during this period fall into two categories—science fiction and political fiction, reflecting a trend of the time led by Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929), the prominent revolutionary, and Lin Shu 林紓 (1852-1924), who was enormously popular for his translated fictions.^[1]

Lu Xun's translation during this period displays clear influences of his time. In both form and techniques of writing, his translation draws heavily on the style of *zhang hui* 章回 fiction (full-length fiction in chapters), which had been a major form of fiction since the Ming Dynasty. In conformity with this rhetorical style, translators would restructure and modify the original text to make a rendering look and read like a work of *zhang hui* fiction. This can be illustrated by Lu Xun's translations *Yuejie Lixing* 月界旅行 (“From the Earth to the Moon”) and *Didi Lixing* 地底旅行 (“Journey to the Centre of the Earth”). Interestingly, as in *zhang hui* fiction, classical poems are also found toward the end of individual chapters of Lu Xun's translations, for the purpose of strengthening the plot and creating suspense. The following excerpts have a distinctively *zhang hui* style:

凡讀過世界地理同歷史的，都曉得有個亞美利加的地方。至於亞美利加獨立戰爭一事，連孩子也曉得是驚天動地；應該時時記得，永遠不忘的。今且不說，單說那獨立戰爭時，合眾國中，有一個麥烈蘭國，其首府名曰拔爾祛摩，是個有名街市。真是行人接踵，車馬如雲。這府中有一所會社，壯大是不消說，一見他國旗高挑，隨風飛舞，就令人起一種肅然致敬的光景。

(*Yuejie Lixing* ["From the Earth to the Moon"],
Translations of Lu Xun,^[2] vol. 1, p. 6)

社員看畢，沒一個曉得這啞謎兒，惟有面面相覷。那性急的，恨不能立刻就到初五，一聽社長的報告。正是：

壯士不甘空歲月，秋鴻何事下庭除。

究竟爲着甚事，且聽下回分解。

(*ibid.*, p. 10)

For Lu Xun to translate in a *zhang hui* fiction style at the time was probably a natural choice. For not only did such a style reflect the influence of important contemporary writers such as Liang Qichao, who adopted the *zhang hui* form in writing fiction (Pollard 1993: 30), but also the particular linguistic mix of the *zhang hui* form—a *bai hua* 白話 (vernacular) base interspersed with elements of *wen yan* 文言 (classical Chinese)^[3]—coincides with Lu Xun's intention in regard to language use in these early translations, as will be touched on further below.

2.2 Influence from Yan Fu and Liang Qichao

Other than a *zhang hui* style, Lu Xun's translations before 1909 show characteristics traceable to his advocacy of Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854–1921) and Liang Qichao. Early in Japan, Lu Xun admired the writing style of Yan Fu (Xu 1953: 10), whose translation of Western philosophy and social sciences provided a strong inspiration to the general bourgeois

reformers of the time. Stylistically, Yan Fu's translations were special in two respects: first, with a purpose of expressing his own political thoughts, his translations were aimed at transmitting the original gist and were marked by Yan's own ample analysis of the contemporary status quo in China; second, to win approval from the gentry class, his intended readership, he chose to be "extraordinarily abstruse, elegant, and highly allusive" in his use of "classical Chinese" (Schwartz 1964: 93).

Lu Xun's essay *Zao Ren Shu* 造人術 ("Creating Man") for example, was a close imitation of the writing style of Yan Fu in *Tian Yan Lun* 天演論 (translation of T. H. Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*).^[4] In addition, as Lu Xun himself was to admit later in 1934, his approach to the translation of specialized terms at the time was also influenced by Yan Fu—for instance, his use of the term "*niefu*" 涅伏, meaning "nerve", was a transliteration of the Greek term.^[5] Yan Fu was also known for his tactful adoption of classical Chinese vocabulary to render Western concepts; in 1909 when Lu Xun began to translate biological terms after his return to China, he followed a similar strategy to Yan Fu, appropriating characters from classical Chinese—for instance, he used *yao* 杪 (meaning "tiny") for "cell", *mie* 𦉰 (meaning "thin threads of") for "fiber", and *cou* 腠 (meaning "the grain of muscle") for "tissue".^[6]

During 1903–1904 Lu Xun was also influenced by *xin min ti* 新民國體 or "New Citizens Style", advocated by Liang Qichao. A product in violation of the binding laws of writing that were exemplified by *tongcheng guwen* 桐城古文 (classical writing of the Tongcheng School), which had dominated the literary circle for over a century, *xin min ti* in effect constituted a transition toward the birth of vernacular writings during the May Fourth period, although initially it was born basically as an instrument of the bourgeois reformists to give free expression to their thoughts and ideas (Niu 1989a: 201). Writings of this kind were "clearly structured", "simple and smooth", "often passionate" and "interwoven

with slang, rhymes and foreign grammar" (Niu 1989b: 204), though they also often seemed overloaded with high-sounding phrases. Citing *Sibada zhi Hun* 斯巴達之魂 ("The Soul of Sparta"), a story that he translated with adaptation, Lu Xun admitted that he was then emulating the fashionable practice of being "indignant in words, and cadent in tone".^[7] In addition, in its tendency to use *wen yan* and *bai hua* in combination, Lu Xun's work also shares similarities with that of Liang Qichao during this period. In the "Preface" to *Yuejie Lixing* Lu Xun writes: "I had planned to use *su yu* 俗語 [vernacular] throughout at first to make light reading; then I found it too wordy, so I have mixed in *wen yan* to save space."^[8] Another piece of translation, *Beiji Tanxian Ji* 北極探險記 ("Adventure to the North Pole"), was similarly composed of "narration in *wen yan*, and conversation in *bai hua*".^[9] This attempt of Lu Xun to mix *wen yan* and *bai hua* together in translation appears not to have been well received, for some of his translations adopting this approach were rejected by the publishers as "ridiculous".^[10]

2.3 Influence from Zhang Taiyan and Chinese Classical Literature

Around 1908, Lu Xun came under the influence of Zhang Taiyan 章太炎 (1869-1936). Two developments in Lu Xun's writings indicate this influence: a poignant and ironic style and a tendency to being archaic (Wang 1994: 28-29). Lu Xun's pure *wen yan* translations in *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* 域外小說集 (*Stories from Abroad* [1909]) demonstrate such influence. In particular, his tendency toward being archaic is also shown in his penchant for archaic Chinese characters at that time, largely as a result of studying *xiao xue* 小學 (study of Chinese characters) under the tutorship of Zhang. According to Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885-1967), this inclination represented a kind of *jie pi* 潔癖 or "philia for being clean" in writing.^[11] The following excerpts from *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* (with

archaic characters underlined), illustrate this tendency well:^[12]

吾待彼矣，而彼乃弗至，時思孤焰與我，殆有甚仿佛者，獨吾鑑未虛已耳。前此往來大道，已見行人。往往竊起吾後，漸過吾前，狀巨且黯，次忽沒入白色大宅之隅，旋滅如影。而隅次行人複見，益益密邇，終又入緋色寒空而隱。

(*Mo* 默 ["The Silence"], *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 154)

(*deng* 鐙 used for *deng* 燈 "lamp")

吾欲動，然又不能。胡爲不能耶？而如是者久之。吾第聞阜螽振羽及蜜蠶嚶鳴，舍此更無他事。終而奮力自曳右手，出於身下，乃並兩手抵地，思蹠而興。

(*Si Ri* 四日 ["Four Days"], *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 172)

(*feng* 蠶 used for *feng* 蜂 "bee")

The literal approach combined with the use of pure *wen yan* and archaic characters indeed made the collection as a whole abstruse and classical. Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962) commented that the translators of the stories in *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, being well versed in classical Chinese and having direct access to foreign works, achieved much higher than Lin Shu; in Hu's view, both the content and the language of *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* were "fine". Yet, he concluded, given its pitiable sales, the loss (caused by the abstruse classical Chinese) outweighed the gain (1924: 24-25).

Still further evidence of Lu Xun's propensity for being archaic is his use of the *sao* 騷 style (around 1907) in the rendering of certain poems, and more particularly in his versions of poems by Heine a few years later (around 1914).^[13] The following is an example (with archaic characters underlined):

雄矢浩唱兮聲幽備。玄弧寄語兮弦以音。
鳴骹噉兮胡不續。胡不續發兮饜人肉。
迅其步。焚以飛。予來遙遙兮自遠。……

(Poems in *Hongxing Yishi* 紅星佚史 [“Red Star Anecdotes”], *Translations*, vol. 10, p. 782)

(*ning* 備 used for *ning* 停, meaning “weak”; *xiao* 骹 used for *xiao* 髀, meaning “flying arrow with a loud sound”; *jiao* 噉 used for *jiao* 叫, meaning “shout”)

A less archaic feature of *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* however, was its use of “new-type” punctuation marks, including such tokens as ‘。’!?’ “ ” …… and —. In fact, earlier in *Yuejie Lüxing* and *Didi Lüxing*, which used a mixture of *bai hua* and *wen yan*, Lu Xun was already making use of such marks, and ‘;’ ‘ ’ could also be found therein. Around the beginning of the 20th century, new-type punctuation marks were just being promoted (Gao 1993: Chapter 3). The forefront practitioners of these marks may have been the translators of the time. Lu Xun was certainly among such forerunners.^[14]

Another source of inspiration for Lu Xun's early (and indeed later) language and style, both in respect of writing and translation, came from Chinese classical literature. Lu Xun himself admitted that his writing had the “casualness” of Zhuangzhou 莊周 and the “swiftness” of Hanfei 韓非 (Wang 1994: 32). And in the words of Ye Gongchao 葉公超 (1904-1981), although Lu Xun was an adamant proponent of “Europeanization”, the beauty of his writing was born out of *wen yan* (Ye 1997: 151).

Lu Xun's translations after 1909 but before 1919 (done between 1913 and 1918, mostly essays on art education) show clearly the influence he derived from Chinese classical writings. Those translations were mainly

in *wen yan* and in particular, the sentences were short and the traditional method of punctuating (the use of 。) replaced the “new-type” punctuation marks which Lu Xun had adopted earlier, as the following excerpt shows:

近世繪畫。漸無分明之形。非全無形也。但藉端於形。而形以外之美。皆顯然者。道中人對於如此作品。自知更變其玩賞之態度。故在此輩。實於形以外。別開一美之新世界矣。繪畫至此。形相僅為附著。而作家所發揮其能技者。即在於此附著施以色與光。日本畫所謂無線描法。置形而主於明暗色彩之美者。亦此類也。

(*Yishu Shangwan zhi Jiaoyu* 藝術賞玩之教育 [“Education of Art Appreciation”], *Translations*, vol. 10, p. 13)

The style of the excerpt seems to indicate that Lu Xun was somehow conforming to the style of the tales and fictions of the past dynasties, especially those of the Tang and Song dynasties, which he was collecting and compiling during those years. In addition, the Wei and Jin (3rd-4th century AD) style of writing (typically terse and sharp), with which Lu Xun was familiar as a result of the influence of his teacher, Zhang Taiyan, might have also contributed to the evolvement of his own style (Wang 1994: 28-29).

2.4 Lu Xun's Translation after 1909: Being “Literal” as a Voluntary Choice

Before 1909, Lu Xun had adopted *yi yi* 意譯 (“free translation”).^[15] In doing translations for *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, Lu Xun (and his brother Zhou Zuoren) turned from *yi yi* to *zhi yi* 直譯 (“literal translation”). By reference to Lu Xun's statements in *Mo Luo Shi Li Shuo* 摩羅詩力說 (*On the Demonic Poets* [1906]), and the “Preface” to *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, it can be seen that

the fundamental reason for his adopting a “literal” approach consisted in conveying precisely what he considered as rebellious-spirited “new voices” from other countries (prominently Eastern European countries and Russia) and transmitting new approaches to writing, as a means to enrich China’s literature.^[16]

Lu Xun’s translations in *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* were rendered from a German version and written in classical Chinese. The writings in the collection, “selected with much prudence”, as he says in the “Preface”, were “translated in great caution against losing the mood and style of the original”.^[17] In the following example we see how Lu Xun was stretching classical Chinese to achieve his ideal of literal translation. The structure of classical Chinese was violated, with a split structure created (Semanov 1967/1987: 38). The original put in modern Chinese should be:

因為我倒下了（不過這一點我現在記不起來了，只記得所有的人都朝前沖去，而我卻不能跑了，我的眼前只有一片藍藍的東西），——我倒在山崗上的一片空地上。

(Semanov 1967/1987, p. 38)

Lu Xun’s rendering was:

緣吾仆——吾不知此，惟記眾趨進，而青色物猶留我目前已耳。
——甫田中，在小丘之上。

(*Si Ri, Translations*, vol. 1, p. 172)

The example shows how in 1909, when classical Chinese was still the norm, Lu Xun was striving to achieve his ideal of literal translation. As he admitted later, the translations which resulted were rather hard and abstruse.^[18] And he seemed aware at the time that his literal

translations would not be readily accepted by the readership: as he noted in the “Preface”, the collection was of “plain writing”, “unworthy of comparison with translations by the renowned people of late”.^[19] However, historically, the spirit of “being faithful” embodied in the literally translated version of *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, in the words of Xu Shoushang 許壽裳 (1953: 56), was a “monument” signifying a new era of translation.

3. Lu Xun’s Translation after 1919

3.1 *Ou hua, da zhong yu and ying yi*

If Lu Xun’s literal method started around 1909 was driven by his determination to “faithfully” transplant the tone and style of “new voices”, his persistence in being literal after 1919, more than the earlier intention, was also impelled by a conscientious desire to improve and enrich the expressive potential of the Chinese language.

After 1919, amid the general clamor for adopting *bai hua* as the literary language, the issue of whether *bai hua* was capable of such a mission also came to the fore. There was a consensus that *bai hua* at that historical time was highly insufficient and imprecise; and a natural proposal was to introduce foreign usage into the Chinese language to make up for its deficiency, *i.e.* to adopt *ou hua* 歐化 (“Europeanization”).^[20] Literary pioneers like Mao Dun 茅盾 (1896-1981) and Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸 (1898-1958) were strong proponents for the “experiment” of adopting “Europeanized” linguistic features. Later, however, Europeanization seemed to become far less favored, with the initiation of *da zhong yu* 大眾語 (“Mass Language”) accompanying the campaign for the *da zhong hua* 大眾化 (“Popularization”) of art in the 1930s. In the words of another literary scholar, Chen Wangdao 陳望道 (1891-1977), Mass Language

should meet the criterion of being “speakable by mouth, understandable by hearing, readily usable in writing, and easily comprehensible in reading”.^[21] With this standard, there grew a caution against Europeanization. Nevertheless, Lu Xun, while a champion for Mass Language, endorsed Europeanization consistently and firmly.

Such a position originated from Lu Xun's association of the language of the people with the mind of the people. The “crude” language that the contemporary common people spoke, he observed, was not only destitute, but sloppy in grammar, which was a reflection of the confusion of the people's mind. A muddle-headed people using a sloppy language was no worthy people. To treat this bad condition, he emphasized that the people should take pains to absorb elements that were alien.^[22] In connecting language with mind, Lu Xun showed considerable insight, taking the argument far further than many of his contemporary *bai hua* champions.

In 1935, with decades of experience in translation, Lu Xun remarked that a translator should “take two things into account: to make the rendering easy to understand, and to keep the original spirit (of wording)”.^[23] However, he seemed to be keenly aware that the two principles were more often than not incompatible. When it came to translating works of philosophical literary theory, the difficulty of trying to be both readily intelligible and faithful to the original spirit seemed insurmountable, as the following extracts demonstrate:

這意義，不僅在說，凡觀念形態，是從現實社會受了那唯一可能的材料，而這現實社會的實際形態，則支配着即被組織在它裏面的思想，或觀念者的直觀而已，在這觀念者不能離去一定的社會底興味這一層意義上，觀念形態也便是現實社會的所產。

(*Yishu Lun* 藝術論 [“On Art”], by Lunacharsky,
Translations, vol. 6, p. 12)

問題是關於思想的組織化之際，則直接和觀念形態，以及產生觀念形態的生活上的事實，或把持着這些觀念形態的社會底集團相連系的事，是頗為容易的。

(*ibid.*, p. 15)

These two excerpts were cited by Liang Shiqiu 梁實秋 (1902-1987) as evidence that Lu Xun's translation was near *si yi* 死譯 (“dead translation”) ^[24] that was harder to understand than *tian shu* 天書 (“occult formula”) [1929].^[25] Talking of his translation of Lunacharsky's *Art and Criticism*, Lu Xun himself also expressed dissatisfaction [1929]: “Owing to my inadequacy as a translator and the limitations of the Chinese language, upon reading through my translation I find it obscure and uneven, and in many places very hard to understand.” ^[26]

Despite these reservations, to realize his primary goal of reproducing the original ideas and transmitting foreign linguistic elements, Lu Xun unequivocally opted for being faithful to the original wording over being readily comprehensible, so that when Zhao Jingshen 趙景深 (1902-1984), who severely criticized such hard and abstruse translations, proposed the slogan “better being smooth than faithful”,^[27] Lu Xun declared that he would rather be faithful than smooth, or as he put, adopt *ying yi* 硬譯 or “hard translation”.

It was Lu Xun's hope that at least some of the European-slanted usage that he and others adopted, though it initially appeared hard and “unsmooth”, would eventually become a “smooth” part of the Chinese language, with the unassimilated “residues” being left behind over time. Meanwhile, Lu Xun predicted, better translations that were both faithful and readily comprehensible would emerge and eliminate his “hard” translations. But until then, he would voluntarily undertake to “fill up the gap” from “no translation” to “better translation”.^[28] Such a spirit seems also to be a manifestation of Lu Xun's courage as a voluntary

historical “intermediary” (Qian 1997: 43).

3.2 Being Intelligible after Some “Chewing” and Enriching the Chinese Language

While Europeanization might often mean a hard and abstruse style, Lu Xun defended it on the basis that, to use his own phrase, it became intelligible after some “chewing”.^[29] Comments on Lu Xun's translations of philosophical works of literary theory have not been favorable, in contrast to his literary translations, which are generally regarded as more readable (Yuan 1990). These literary translations are mostly readily comprehensible, some intelligible after some “chewing”, despite widespread detectable traces of Europeanization. Consider, for instance, the following from *Xiao Bide* 小彼得 (“Little Peter”):

於是，忽然，好像聽到在那裏的地板上，有甚麼在竊竊私語。他吃了一嚇，側着耳朵聽。聽到裝着很少的一點煤的煤箱裏，有兩個溫和的低微的聲音。小孩子很吃驚了。吃驚到幾乎透不過氣來了。然而，在寂靜的屋子裏，輕輕的私語聲卻漸漸地大了起來。那是煤塊們在談話。

(*Xiao Bide*, *Translations*, vol. 4, p. 180)

This rendering is smooth, graceful and palatable to children. It has been said that Lu Xun's translation of fairy tales like *Xiao Bide* represented his best translation work (Li 1952: 10). *Gongren Suibulüefu* 工人綏惠略夫 (“The Worker Shevyrjov”) according to Lu Xun was translated “almost word-for-word”,^[30] yet in general it was also agreeable for reading, as the following passage demonstrates:

他的淺黑的銅鐵色的眼睛，冷冰冰的不可測度的看。即使自己十分豁達的人，第一次走到毫不相知的處所，總不免帶些拘謹的新

鮮，但在他並無這痕跡。亞拉借夫一面看，一面想，覺得這綏惠略夫對於自己，以及對於藏在他秘密的精神的深處的特種東西，決不會無端的不忠實的。

(*Gongren Suibulüefu*, *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 197)

It has been commented that although such “word-for-word” translation naturally draws explicit attention to the translated nature of the text, it preserves the delicacy of the original without sounding “excessively detailed” (Li 1952: 10). *Si Hun Ling* 死魂靈 (“The Dead Soul”) was Lu Xun's last major translation work. With its lively and natural language, it has been ranked among Lu Xun's best translations:

……潑留希金給他所有的僕役穿的，就只有一雙長靴，總是放在前廳裏。有誰受主人的屋子裏叫喚，得先在全個前園裏跳舞一番，到得大門，穿上長靴，以這體裁走進屋子去。一走出屋子，又須在大門口脫下他的長靴，蹣起腳後跟走回原路去。假使有人在秋天，尤其是在早晨，如果初霜已降，從窗子裏向外一望，他就能欣賞這美景，看潑留希金家的僕役演着怎樣出色的跳舞的。

“您看這嘴臉，先生，”潑留希金指着潑羅式加，向乞乞科夫說。“這傢夥笨得像一段木頭。但是您只要放下一點甚麼罷，嚇，他已經撈去了。喂，你來幹甚麼的，你這驢子？唔，有甚麼事？”

(*Si Hun Ling*, *Translations*, vol. 9, p. 188)

For Lu Xun, being literal was the primary maxim for translation. Yet the conception of “literal” can be interpreted in terms of a continuum, with extreme literalness at one end and greater “freedom” at the other. In translating literary works, Lu Xun would seem to have veered towards the “freer” end of this continuum.

Lu Xun played a significant role in the creation of new Chinese

expressions, as is evident in both his translations and writings. However, it was his principle “never to create adjectives and other expressions which could not be understood by anyone else but by himself”.^[31] Noticeably, there are a large number of Japanese loan words in Lu Xun's translations, such as *bunka* 文化, *rekishi* 歷史, *bijutsu* 美術, and *shisō* 思想. Some of the loan words Lu Xun employed were already widely used in his time, and some later came to be in common use, whilst still others were quite characteristic of his own initiative and were eventually not assimilated into the Chinese language. Ni (1986) has provided a collection of such loan words, as shown in the following examples (with the loan words underlined and their equivalents in modern Chinese in square brackets):

主觀主義的黴菌，在馬克思學說的健康的氛圍氣【氣氛】裏，極迅速地滅亡。

(*Yishu Lun* 藝術論 [“On Art”], by Plekhanov, *Translations*, vol. 6)

而這跨馬站在巴黎街上的英國的王，乃獨能洞察人性的機微【奧妙】；且又看透了敵手的德國皇帝的性格。

(*Jiu You zhi Di* 舊遊之地 (2) [“Old Place Revisited”], in *Sixiang Shanshui Renwu* 思想・山水・人物 [“Thought, Landscape and People”], *Translations*, vol. 3)

然而我可以毫不躊躇地說，我從他們倆，是受了大大的感銘【深受感動】的。

(*Ai'erlan Wenxue zhi Huigu* 愛爾蘭文學之回顧 [“Retrospect of Irish Literature”], *Translations*, vol. 10)

這也可以說是比俄國革命，比德國革命，有更深的意義的。因爲和穆勒所說的“不知過去而加以蔑視的新機軸【新方法】，都容

易以反動收梢”的話的意義，可以比照。

(*Duan Xiang* 斷想 (19) [“Random Thoughts”], in *Sixiang Shanshui Renwu*, *Translations*, vol. 3)

In bringing these Japanese words into his translation (as well as his writing), Lu Xun sought to further his ideal of enriching the Chinese language.

Finally, it can be recognized that, like his writings, Lu Xun's translated texts constitute of themselves an important source for examining new developments in the Chinese written language of the era. New syntactic phenomena that emerged in the Chinese language after the May Fourth as a result of influence from Western languages can all be found in Lu Xun's translations. Such phenomena include common use of *yige* 一個 and *yizhong* 一種 as indefinite articles, the conjunctions *he* 和, *yu* 與 and *huo* 或, passive *bei* 被, parenthetical phrases such as *ta shuo* 他說 and *ta yiwei* 他以爲, and post-permutation of subordinate clauses (Wang 1990: Chapter 25).

3.3 A Test of the Readability of Lu Xun's Theoretical Translations

As noted above, Lu Xun's translations of literary theory are generally considered less readable than his literary translations. Apart from the fact that the philosophical and abstract concepts involved might add to the difficulty of comprehension, a major reason for this low readability is probably that the sentences they contain are relatively lengthy, the result of a strong tendency toward a “literal” translation approach. One device that Lu Xun employed for making lengthy sentences was the generous use of *de* 的 (and *di* 底)^[32] as the particle to construct complicated Modifier-Head Structures (here defined as phrasal structures containing three or more *de/di*), as illustrated by the following examples

taken from Lu Xun's translations:

生活所系的一切的別的關係和條件
別的一切社會底勢力和事件的參與
我們的文學的Pushkin時代和Gogol時代的關係
出給我國文學的Pushkin時代的歷史底課題
給那時代以特徵的文學底現象的無條件底的價值

Yu Kwang-chung 余光中 (1987) has pointed out that the excessive use of “*de*” in translation is a negative influence of foreign texts, *i.e.* an undesirable feature of Europeanization. A key question arises here: did Lu Xun adopt an especially high rate of complicated Modifier-Head Structures in his theoretical translations, *i.e.* do such translations of Lu Xun exhibit a strong tendency toward Europeanization?

To provide quantitative evidence to answer this question, the present author studied the use of *de/di* in Lu Xun's theoretical translations vis-à-vis that in Qu Qiubai's 瞿秋白 theoretical translations. Here Qu Qiubai's translations are chosen because while Qu agreed that “literal translation” should be adopted to faithfully transplant the original intentions of the source text, he insisted that “absolute *bai hua*” should be used in translation and he also strongly opposed Lu Xun's position of *ning xin er bu shun* 寧信而不順 (“rather being faithful than smooth”).^[33] By examining quantitatively the use of complicated Modifier-Head Structures in the translations of the two, it is anticipated that evidence can be produced showing that Lu Xun's translations contain a higher rate of such structures, *i.e.* demonstrating a stronger tendency toward “Europeanization”. Below is a brief description of the study:

From each of the six theoretical translations (translated around 1930) of Lu Xun,^[34] and from each of the six theoretical translations (translated

around 1930) of Qu Qiubai,^[35] two to three pages were randomly selected and calculated for the approximate number of words (N). Each of the selections was counted respectively for the number of complicated Modifier-Head Structures (M) they contain; then frequencies (F) of such structures were calculated ($F=M/N$) for each selection, as shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Fs of Lu Xun's Translations and F's of Qu Qiubai's Translations

Lu Xun's translation	Fs	Qu Qiubai's translation	F's
車勒芮綏夫斯基 的文學觀	0.00851	論白黨僑民的文學	0.00114
無產階級革命文學論	0.00472	關於現實	0.00094
蘇聯文學理論及 文學批評的現狀	0.00693	再論機械的公民	0.00288
我的文學修養	0.00309	說文化	0.00291
果戈理私觀	0.00114	無恥主義	0.00190
藝術都會的巴黎	0.00324	關於真誠的教育	0.00187

Then the Fs of Lu Xun's translations were compared with the F's of Qu Qiubai's translations by Independent Samples Test, a method of testing which seeks to compare the differences between two groups of numerical data. The results show that the mean Fs score for Lu Xun (0.004605) is higher than the mean F's score for Qu Qiubai (0.001940) at the 0.10 level of significance, which is generally appropriate for studies of this nature ($t=2.299$, $df=5.934$, $p=0.062$; unequal variances).

Thus it can be seen that Lu Xun uses a significantly greater number of complicated Modifier-Head Structures than Qu Qiubai in translations of literary theory. Apart from this statistical evidence, non-statistical checking through the translations of the two writers readily indicates that the individual complicated Modifier-Head Structures used by Lu Xun are on average longer (*i.e.* having more *de/di*) than those by Qu Qiubai. Thus it is concluded that Lu Xun's translations demonstrate a striking tendency toward Europeanization. This in turn partly explains why Lu Xun's theoretical translations are less easily readable.

4. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to examine chronologically Lu Xun's translations in terms of language and style. It shows that before 1909 Lu Xun's translations demonstrated the influence of various factors relating to the historical context in which he was writing. Thus, his translations at the time were strongly reminiscent of *zhang hui* fiction, and suggested that he was trying to imitate the writing style of Yan Fu and follow the stylistic practice of Liang Qichao, which was characterized by *xin min ti* and a mixture of *wen yan* and *bai hua*. Later around 1908, largely as a result of studying under Zhang Taiyan, Lu Xun's translations showed a penchant for being archaic and classical, although he was also adopting new-type punctuation marks; meanwhile Chinese classical literature became an important source which was to exert a continual and lasting influence on Lu Xun's writing style. In 1909, with his translations in *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, Lu Xun voluntarily turned to being "literal" in translation, aiming to realize his ideal of faithfully reproducing "new voices" from other literary traditions and importing new approaches to writing, as a means to further the development of Chinese literature.

After 1919, this adherence to "literal translation" assumed an additional dimension—namely, the absorption of foreign linguistic elements to make up for the perceived inadequacy of the Chinese language. With this spirit, Lu Xun insisted on "hard translation" and was a bold practitioner of "Europeanization". A quantitative study examining Lu Xun's use of complicated Modifier-Head Structures with *de/di* as particles shows that his translations of literary theory tend to be strongly "Europeanized", and therefore have a low readability.

This paper has provided a brief survey of Lu Xun's translation from the perspective of language and style. In future research a more comprehensive analysis could be made in this regard to offer a deeper understanding of the evolvement of Lu Xun's language and style in general, and to provide further insights into the development of the Chinese language during the early decades of the 20th century.

Notes

[1] Later in "The Ties between Chinese and Russian Literatures" (December 1932), Lu Xun described the popularity of (and hence his easy access to) the translations of Liang Qichao and Lin Shu during that time: "In *Modern Affairs*, edited by Liang Qichao, we read mysteries like the adventures of Sherlock Holmes, and in *New Fiction* we read scientific fiction like *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* by Jules Verne. Then Lin Qinnan (Lin Shu) translated many of the novels of Rider Haggard, from which we learned of the romances of young ladies in London and the strange habits of savages in Africa." (*Nan Qiang Bei Diao Ji* 南腔北調集, in *Lu Xun Quan Ji* 魯迅全集 [*Complete Works of Lu Xun*], hereafter *Works*, vol. 5). English translation in Yang & Yang (1959/1980), vol. 3, p. 209.

[2] This refers to *Lu Xun Yiwén Ji* 魯迅譯文集 [*Translations of Lu Xun*]. Hereafter *Translations*.

- [3] Zhang Zhongxing 張中行 (1988: 222-224) has talked of *zhang hui* fiction of the Ming and Qing dynasties, which amounted to almost three hundred works, as a great treasure house of *bai hua*, although they were generally decorated to various degrees by *wen yan*.
- [4] See Niu (1981: 193), cited in Wang (1995: 50). Lu Xun later recalled the impact he received from Yan Fu's *Tian Yan Lun*, see "Miscellaneous Records", in *Zhao Hua Xi Shi* 朝花夕拾 (in *Works*, vol. 2).
- [5] "Preface" (December 1934), *Ji Wai Ji* 集外集 (in *Works*, vol. 7). It might be possible to examine Lu Xun's approach against a background of a heated discussion on the issue of *fanyi mingyi* 翻譯名義 ("the translation of names") around 1911 (see Chu 2003). Here in his "Preface", Lu Xun seemed to imply that he was particularly under the influence of Yan Fu in his use of the transliteration method in translating specialized terms. Later transliteration was also manifested in his *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*, but Semanov (1967/1987: 39) notes that long stretches of foreign names resulting from transliteration appear somewhat ill-matched alongside the concise and archaic-flavored classical Chinese that Lu Xun adopted in the collection. After 1919, Lu Xun tried to instill symbolic meaning into the translated names of people (see "Introduction to Xiao Yuehan 小約翰 'Little John'" [1927], *Translations*, vol. 4 for examples); he also gave careful consideration to translating names of plants and animals (see "About Name Translation in the Play *Taose de Yun* 桃色的雲 'Rosy Cloud'" [1922], *Translations*, vol. 2 for examples).
- [6] *Lu Xun Nianpu* 魯迅年譜, vol. 1, p. 217.
- [7] "Preface" (December 1934), *Ji Wai Ji*.
- [8] "Preface to *Yuejie Liuxing*", *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 4.
- [9] "To Yang Jiyun" (May 1934), *Lu Xun Shuxin Ji* 魯迅書信集, p. 542.
- [10] See note 9.
- [11] Zhi Tang 知堂 (Zhou Zuoren), "About Lu Xun", *Yuzhou Feng* 宇宙風 (December 1936), no. 30. In Yan (1997: 36).
- [12] More examples are found in notes added by Xu Guangping 許廣平 to "Brief Notes to *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji*" (in *Works*, vol. 11, p. 190).
- [13] Xu Shoushang, citing around twenty *sao*-style poems written by Lu Xun, says Lu Xun was familiar with Qu Yuan 屈原's works (1953: 6). However, Lu Xun's choice of the *sao* style in translating poems is probably also in line with the general practice of the time. Discussing the translation of poems in the early decades of the 20th century, Shi Zhecun 施蛰存 (1990: 12) has observed: "Almost invariably poems were translated using the traditional form of Chinese poetry, either in the five-character archaic style, or the four-character style as that of *Shi Jing* 詩經 (*Book of Poetry*), or the style of *Chu Ci* 楚辭 [which is epitomized by Qu Yuan's *li sao* 離騷 style]."
- [14] The use of new-type punctuation marks by *Yuwai Xiaoshuo Ji* was also noted by Gao (1993: 75).
- [15] In adopting *yi yi* (or *yi shu* 譯述 as the practice was also termed at the time), Lu Xun was following the trend of his time. See Wang 1995 for a rationale of the *yi yi* practice in translation during the late Qing.
- [16] The notion of "seeking new voices from other lands" ("*bie qiu xin sheng yu yi bang*" 別求新聲於異邦) was proposed by Lu Xun in his *Mo Luo Shi Li Shuo* 摩羅詩力說; see *Fen* 墳 (in *Works*, vol. 1). In this work, Lu Xun introduced the works of rebellious-spirited foreign poets like Byron and Shelly, and expressed the hope that such works could serve as a model to bring forth a revival of the Chinese literary art (Niu 1991: 56-57).
- [17] *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 149.
- [18] "To Masuda Wataku" (Jan 1932), in *Lu Xun Shuxin Ji*, p. 1090.
- [19] *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 149.
- [20] According to Gunn, prior to 1918 Chinese prose already "shows sporadic but significant adoption of major categories of grammar and rhetorical invention", and such innovations "anticipate several major categories of stylistic innovation from 1918 on", which would mark "a new era of Europeanization" (1991: 36). So Europeanization started before 1918 but

gained momentum after that. Detailed discussion of Europeanizations in the written Chinese language is found in Gunn (1991) and Wang Li 王力 (1985: Chapter 6).

- [21] Chen Wangdao, "About the Construction of Mass Language Literature", *Shen Bao: Ziyou Tan* 申報 • 自由談 (June 1934). In Wen (1987: 212).
- [22] "Correspondence on Translation" (December 1931), *Er Xin Ji* 二心集 (in *Works*, vol. 4).
- [23] "Name Undecided (2)" (1935), *Qiejie Ting Zawen Er Ji* 且介亭雜文二集 (in *Works*, vol. 6).
- [24] Liang Shiqiu, "On Mr. Lu Xun's *ying yu*", *Xin Yue* 新月 (1929), vol. 2, nos. 6-7.
- [25] Liang Shiqiu, "Does Literature Have Class?", *Xin Yue* (1929), vol. 2, nos. 6-7.
- [26] Cited in Lu Xun "'Hard Translation' and the 'Class Character of Literature'" (March 1930), *Er Xin Ji*. English translation in Yang & Yang (1959/1980), vol. 3, p. 75.
- [27] Lu Xun summarized Zhao Jingshen's view as *yuqi xin er bu shun, bu ru shun er bu xin* 與其信而不順，不如順而不信 ("I would rather be smooth but not faithful than being faithful but not smooth"). See Chen (1992: 296).
- [28] See note 22.
- [29] See note 22.
- [30] *Translations*, vol. 1, p. 192.
- [31] "Answer to *Bei Dou*" (December 1931), *Er Xin Ji*.
- [32] In the words of Wang Li, following the May Fourth, as a result of grammatical influence from foreign languages, apart from differentiating between *de* 的 and *di* 地, some writers also distinguish between *de* 的 and *di* 底, so that *kexue di yanjiu* 科學底研究 = the study of science, *kexue de yanjiu* 科學的研究 = scientific research, and *kexue di yanjiu* 科學地研究 = to study scientifically (1994: 178). It can be seen that Lu Xun's use of *de* 的 vs. *di* 底, as noted by Xu Shoushang (1953: 57), conforms to Wang Li's

observation but can supplement it a bit: where words end with -tive or -tic, Lu Xun also uses *di* 底 in translation, as "speculative" would be 思索底, and "romantic" would be 羅曼底.

[33] See note 22.

[34] From *Translations*, vol. 10.

[35] From *Qu Qiubai Wen Ji* 瞿秋白文集, vol. 4.

References

- Chen, Fukang 陳福康 (1992). *Zhongguo Yixue Lilun Shi Gao* 中國譯學理論史稿 [A Historical Documentation of Translation Theories in China]. Shanghai: Shanghai Waiyu Jiaoyu Chubanshe 上海外語教育出版社.
- Chu, Chi-yu 朱志瑜 (2003). "Qing Mo Min Chu Shiqi Guanyu Fanyi Mingyi de Taolun" 清末民初時期關於翻譯名義的討論 ["Discussion on the Issue of the Translation of Names around 1911"]. In *Fanyi Xin Jiaodian* 翻譯新焦點 [Translation: New Focus]. Ed. Liu Ching-chih 劉靖之. Hong Kong: Shangwu Yinshuguan 商務印書館, pp. 249-279.
- Gao, Tianru 高天如 (1993). *Zhongguo Xiandai Yuyan Jibua de Lilun he Shijian* 中國現代語言計劃的理論和實踐 [Language Planning in Modern China: Theories and Practice]. Shanghai: Fudan University Press 復旦大學出版社.
- Gunn, Edward (1991). *Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hu, Shi 胡適 (1924). *Wushi Nian Lai Zhongguo zhi Wenxue* 五十年來中國之文學 [Chinese Literature in the Past 50 Years]. Shanghai: Shenbao Guan 申報館.
- Li, Ji 李季 (1952). "Lu Xun Dui Fanyi Gongzuo de Gongxian" 魯迅對翻譯工作的貢獻 ["Lu Xun's Contribution to Translation Work"]. In *Fanyi Tongbao* 翻譯通報 [Translation Journal], no. 1, pp. 7-11.
- Liu, Ching-chih 劉靖之 (1981). "Zhong Shensi bu Zhong Xingsi: Yan Fu Yilai de Fanyi Lilun 重神似不重形似：嚴復以來的翻譯理論 ["Affinity in Quintessence over Resemblance in Form: The Evolution of Theories of

- Translation since Yen Fu"]. In *Fanyi Lunji* 翻譯論集 [Collection of Essays on Translation]. Ed. Liu Ching-chih. Hong Kong: Sanlian Shudian 三聯書店, pp. 8-20.
- Lundberg, Lennart (1989). *Lu Xun as a Translator: Lu Xun's Translation and Introduction of Literature and Literary Theory, 1903-1936*. Stockholm: Orientaliska Studier, Stockholm University.
- Lu Xun 魯迅 (1976). *Lu Xun Shuxin Ji* 魯迅書信集 (上、下卷) [A Collection of Lu Xun's Letters], vols. 1-2. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- . (1973). *Lu Xun Quan Ji* 魯迅全集 [Complete Works of Lu Xun]. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- . (1958-1959). *Lu Xun Yiwén Ji* 魯迅譯文集 [Translations of Lu Xun], vols. 1-10. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- Lu Xun Bowuguan Lu Xun Yanjiushi 魯迅博物館魯迅研究室 [Lu Xun Research Office of Lu Xun Museum], ed. (1981). *Lu Xun Nianpu* 魯迅年譜 [A Chronology of Lu Xun], vols. 1-4. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- Ni, Limin 倪立民 (1986). "Lu Xun Zhuzuo Zhong de Riyu Wailaici Xuanshi" 魯迅著作中的日語外來詞選釋 ["A Selected Interpretation of Japanese Loan Words in Lu Xun's Works"]. In *Hangzhou Daxue Xuebao* 杭州大學學報 [Journal of Hangzhou University], no. 2, pp. 32-40, 80.
- Niu, Yangshan 牛仰山 (1981). "Lun Zhongguo Jindai Fanyi Wenxue he Lu Xun de Guanxi" 論中國近代翻譯文學和魯迅的關係 ["On the Relationship between Modern Chinese Translatory Literature and Lu Xun"]. In *Lu Xun Yan Jiu* 魯迅研究 [Lu Xun Studies], no. 4.
- . (1989a). "Shi Wu Bao Shiqi de Liang Qichao" 時務報時期的梁啟超 ["Liang Qichao at the Time of Current Affairs"]. In *Zhongguo Jindai Wenxue Baiti* 中國近代文學百題 [One Hundred Issues in Modern Chinese Literature]. Ed. Zhongguo Shehui Kexueyuan Wenxuesuo 中國社會科學院文學所 [Literature Institute of Chinese Social Science Academy], pp. 197-201. Beijing: Zhongguo Guoji Guangbo Chubanshe 中國國際廣播出版社.
- . (1989b). "Liang Qichao He 'Wen Jie Geming'" 梁啟超和 "文界革命" ["Liang Qichao and 'Literary Revolution'"]. In *Zhongguo Jindai Wenxue Baiti* 中國近代文學百題 [One Hundred Issues in Modern Chinese Literature]. Ed. Zhongguo Shehui Kexueyuan Wenxuesuo 中國社會科學院文學所 [Literature Institute of Chinese Social Science Academy], pp. 201-205. Beijing: Zhongguo Guoji Guangbo Chubanshe 中國國際廣播出版社.
- . (1991). *Jindai Wenxue yu Lu Xun* 近代文學與魯迅 [Modern Literature and Lu Xun]. Guilin: Lijiang Chubanshe 灕江出版社.
- Pollard, David 卜立德 (1993). "Lu Xun de Liang Pian Zaoqi Fanyi" 魯迅的兩篇早期翻譯 ["Two Early Translations of Lu Xun"]. In *Lu Xun Yanjiu Yuekan* 魯迅研究月刊 [Lu Xun Studies Monthly], no. 1, pp. 27-34.
- Qian, Liqun 錢理群 (1997). *Ya zai Xin Shang de Fen* 壓在心上的墳 [Tomb on the Heart]. Chengdu: Sichuan Renmin Chubanshe 四川人民出版社.
- Qu, Qiubai 瞿秋白 (1954). *Qu Qiubai Wen Ji* 瞿秋白文集 [Works of Qu Qiubai]. Ed. Qu Qiubai Wen Ji Bianji Weiyuanhui 瞿秋白文集編輯委員會 [Editing Committee for the Works of Qu Qiubai]. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- Schwartz, Benjamin (1964). *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Semanov, Vladimir Ivanovich (1967). *Lu Xun he ta de Qianqu* 魯迅和他的前驅 [Lu Xun and His Forerunners]. Trans. Li Mingbin 李明濱. Changsha: Hunan Wenyi Chubanshe 湖南文藝出版社, 1987.
- Shi, Zhecun 施蛰存 (1990). "Daoyan" 導言 ["Introduction"]. In *Zhongguo Jindai Wenxue Daxi: Fanyi Wenxue Ji (1)* 中國近代文學大系：翻譯文學集 (1) [Modern Chinese Literature: Translated Literature (1)]. Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian 上海書店.
- Wang, Hongzhi 王宏志 (1995). "Minyuan Qian Lu Xun de Fanyi Huodong" 民元前魯迅的翻譯活動 ["Lu Xun's Translation Activities before 1911"]. In *Lu Xun Yanjiu Yuekan* 魯迅研究月刊 [Lu Xun Studies Monthly], no. 3, pp.

47-59.

- Wang, Li 王力 (1985). *Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa* 中國現代語法 [Modern Chinese Grammar]. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan 商務印書館.
- . (1990). *Hanyu Yufa Shi* 漢語語法史 [A History of the Grammar of the Chinese Language]. In *Wang Li Wen Ji* 王力文集 [Works of Wang Li], vol. 11, pp. 1-488. Jinan: Shandong Jiaoyu Chubanshe 山東教育出版社.
- Wang, Yuanhua 王元化 (1994). "Lu Xun yu Taiyan" 魯迅與太炎 ["Lu Xun and Taiyan"], and "Zai Tan Lu Xun yu Taiyan 再談魯迅與太炎 ["On Lu Xun and Taiyan Again"]. In *Si Bian Suibi* 思辨隨筆 [Intellectual Essays], pp. 27-32. Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Chubanshe 上海文藝出版社.
- Wen, Zhenting 文振庭, ed. (1987). *Wenyi Dazhonghua Wenti Taolun Ziliao* 文藝大眾化問題討論資料 [Documents of the Discussions on the Popularization of Art]. Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Chubanshe 上海文藝出版社.
- Xu, Shoushang 許壽裳 (1953). *Wang You Lu Xun Yinxiang Ji* 亡友魯迅印象記 [Memories of My Late Friend Lu Xun]. Beijing: Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe 人民文學出版社.
- Yan, Ting 顏汀, ed. (1997). *Da Xiansheng Lu Xun* 大先生魯迅 [The Great Lu Xun]. Chengdu: Sichuan Wenyi Chubanshe 四川文藝出版社.
- Yang, Xianyi & Gladys Yang (1959/1980). *Lu Xun: Selected Works*, vols. 1-4. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press 外文出版社.
- Ye, Gongchao 葉公超 (1997). "Guanyu Fei Zhanshi de Lu Xun" 關於非戰士的魯迅 ["About Lu Xun as a Non-soldier"]. In *Xin Yue Huaijiu: Ye Gongchao Wenyi Zatan* 新月懷舊：葉公超文藝雜談 [Reminiscence of the Crescent Moon: Literary Essays of Ye Gongchao]. Shanghai: Xuelin Chubanshe 學林出版社, pp. 149-152.
- Yu, Kwang-chung (Yu Guangzhong) 余光中 (1987). "Zhongwen de Changtai yu Biantai 中文的常態與變態 ["The Normal and Abnormal State of Chinese"]. In *Yu Guangzhong Sanwen* 余光中散文 [Essays of Yu Kwang-chung]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Wenyi Chubanshe 浙江文藝出版社, pp. 411-433.
- Yuan, Jinxiang 袁錦翔 (1990). "Lu Xun Yi Bi Xin Tan" 魯迅譯筆新探 ["A

New Exploration of Lu Xun's Translation"]. In *Mingjia Fanyi Yanjiu yu Xinshang* 名家翻譯研究與欣賞 [Study and Appreciation of the Work of Renowned Translators]. Wuhan: Hubei Jiaoyu Chubanshe 湖北教育出版社, pp. 118-134.

Zhang, Zhongxing 張中行 (1988). *Wen Yan he Bai Hua* 文言和白話 [Classical Chinese and Vernacular]. Ha'erbin: Heilongjiang Renmin Chubanshe 黑龍江人民出版社.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Luo Changyan for conscientious guidance and encouragement throughout the research that has motivated the present paper. Special thanks are due to Dr. Robert Neather for insightful and constructive comments and suggestions as well as extensive copy-editing on earlier versions of the paper. I should also like to acknowledge Dr. Roger Rensvold for assistance with the statistical portion of this paper. Responsibility for any weaknesses which remain is, of course, my own.

About the Author

Li Yongyan has taught in the Department of English, Nanjing University, China, and is now studying at the Department of English and Communication, City University of Hong Kong. The present paper is based on her unpublished MA thesis (Nanjing University, 1998) entitled "Seeking New Voices from Other Lands: Lu Xun as a Translator (1903-1936)".

翻譯名義：語言與文化

——佛經術語的翻譯

朱志瑜

Abstract

Chinese Translation of Buddhist Terminology: Language and Culture (by Chu Chi-yu)

One of the fundamental problems faced by early Chinese Buddhist translators, and perhaps by all translators throughout history, was how to express new phenomena with old language. How to create new words in translation is what Buddhist translators termed the problem of "fanyi mingyi", or literally, "translation: name and meaning". This paper addresses the issue of "name and meaning" as reflected in the theory and practice of translation of Buddhist canons. It analyzes the evolution of Chinese translation ideas, focusing on the conflicts between foreign ideas on the one hand and the local language and culture on the other, and assesses ways of compromise. In addition, it examines the language used in the discussion of translation problems by ancient Buddhist monks.

“翻譯名義”是佛經翻譯裏的一個重要概念，指的是外來佛教術語的定名問題。佛經翻譯是中國第一次大規模引進外來文化的運動，翻譯中首要的問題就是如何用漢語來表達一種對中國語

言和文化完全陌生的宗教思想。佛經翻譯家和理論家的注意力集中在兩個焦點上，一是句法，二是詞彙。在句法上，早期譯者採取“質”的做法，特意保留原文的特色，創造了很多新的結構，中後期開始留意提高譯文的可讀性，文人學士也參加潤飾譯文，於是譯文逐漸趨向“文”。但是在理論上，始終是“質”派佔上風。在詞彙方面要解決的困難主要是術語的譯法。關於術語翻譯的論述，在佛經翻譯時期取得了很高的成就，長篇巨著就有《一切經音義》、《翻譯名義集》、《法苑珠林》等。此後明清的基督教傳教士的宗教、科技翻譯，嚴復的人文、社科翻譯以至民國以後，歷代學者對術語翻譯問題的討論從未間斷，直到今天，術語仍是中西翻譯的實踐和理論的重要組成部份。可以說“翻譯名義”是貫穿整個中國翻譯理論史的一個論題。這大概是中西語言的語音系統和組合方式差別大、文字書寫形式完全不同的緣故。

翻譯問題歸根結底是如何用舊語言表達新事理的問題。宋僧釋法雲說的“譯之言易也，謂以所有易其所無，故以此方之經而顯彼土之法〔‘法’作‘事’解〕”就是這個意思。（1994: 626/一）其中“所有”和“此方之經”是指“舊”的本土語言，“所無”和“彼土之法”就是“新”的、中國原來沒有的他國事理。這“新”與“舊”，或“語言”與“事理”之間的矛盾是翻譯中重要的，也是必須克服的障礙。一種語言一般屬於一個民族，這是語言的民族性。事理可能為一個民族所獨有，也可能是普遍的；就是說，它有民族性的，也有世界性的。把一個民族所獨有事理翻譯給另一個民族，對後者來說這個事理就是我們說的新事理。翻譯要使用語言，而且只能使用後者的語言，否則不是一般意義上的翻譯；這後者的語言（目的語）就是我們說的舊語言。

一新一舊之間會出現矛盾衝突。實際上即使是翻譯世界性的事理也不是完全不會出現衝突。事理要用語言來表達，語言既然是民族性的，而且由於各民族的生活環境、社會結構、宗教信仰、哲學思想、思維方式以至風俗習慣等等千差萬別，對於同一事理，各民族又可能持不同的態度、懷不同的情感，所以語言表達方式也不可能完全一樣；即使是同樣的表達方式有時也會帶有不同的含義，引起不同的聯想。

幾乎所有的翻譯都會遇到新事理的問題，特別是中西語言之間的翻譯。爲了表達這些新事理，在語言上就要有所創新。所以翻譯的結果是創造了新的語言，連在語言方面非常守舊的嚴復都創造了許多新術語。譯者在翻譯時使用的語言是我們說的“舊語言”。創新發生在翻譯的過程當中，涉及到語言的各個層面，其中最主要的是句法和詞彙。翻譯時如何創造新的詞彙就是這篇文章要討論的“翻譯名義”問題。在現存最早的討論翻譯的文章〈法句經序〉裏，作者支謙¹¹就注意到了名義問題，所謂“名物不同，傳實不易”。（1995: 273）翻譯名義問題也是中國古代有關“名實”（即名稱與實際現象的關係）的爭論在翻譯理論上的體現。對翻譯本身來說，要創造新的詞彙，名實問題也是迴避不掉的。

翻譯名義包括兩個方面：一是對外來事物要譯音還是譯意；二是如果譯意，用甚麼方法。音譯也涉及不同的方法，但遠沒有意譯複雜。音譯比較單純，只翻聲音，不翻意義，所以古代稱之爲“不翻”，具體用法下面再談。先說意譯。意譯大致可以分爲兩大類，一類是譯字面義，如“計算機”（computer）、“超級市場”（supermarket）的“超級”二字、“獵頭”（headhunting）；

一類是譯隱含義，即從原文字面上看不出來的意義，比如，把上面三個英文詞譯爲“電腦”、“自選市場”、“人才開發”等等。翻譯隱含的意義又有多種方式。一般用一個字面意義不同而功能（無以名之，暫且用這個萬能的“功能”吧）相同的詞；也有釋義性的，就是用短語或句子來翻譯原文的一個詞（也叫“重寫”、“改編”或“編譯”）。在翻專業術語的時候，由於短語和句子很難重複使用，所以一般不用釋義的方法，佛經裏幾乎沒有。還有一種翻譯隱含意義的方法，是在目的語中找到一個與原文字面意義不對應，但可以類比的詞，以期達到容易理解，容易接受的效果。這就是美國理論家奈達所說的“動態對等”。早期佛經講說也用這種連類的方法，並稱之爲“格義”。當然，“格義”的方法僅用於詞彙的翻譯，而“動態對等”所涉及的層面相對要廣得多。

以下我們通過研究佛經翻譯裏關於翻譯名義的理論與實踐，探討在翻譯的過程中，外來思想與本土語言和文化之間發生的衝突和妥協辦法，同時檢討佛經翻譯理論所使用的語言，希望能對現代翻譯研究有些參考價值。

佛經裏有一個小故事，講的是佛教興起時的語言政策問題；季羨林引述過幾個不同的版本。其中一個是這樣說的：有兩個比丘去見佛陀，對他說佛弟子中有來自不同地方的人，說不同的語言，這樣“言音不同，語既不正，皆壞佛正義”，他們建議統一使用梵文。佛說：“吾佛法中不與美言爲是。但使義理不失，是吾意也。”（季羨林，1991a: 36）在另一個版本裏，佛還說：“汝等痴人，此乃是毀損，以外道言論〔指梵文〕而欲雜糅佛經。〔……〕聽隨國俗言音所解，誦習佛經。”（季羨林，1991a: 37）

禁用梵文是佛教對當時使用梵文的正統國教婆羅門教的反抗。

（季羨林，1991b: 54）當然後來佛教地位上昇，婆羅門教逐漸式微，這項禁令也就取消了，因此出現了梵文的佛經。這個故事告訴我們：（一）佛經是允許使用不同語言（包括方言）的，也就允許翻譯，這樣利於傳播；（二）佛教不重語言的華美；（三）佛不承認梵文的權威，並認為使用梵文就是“毀損”佛教。應該注意，佛允許使用外族語言，但不允許使用“外道”的語言。這三點對研究佛經的翻譯很重要。

佛教在漢末初傳的時候，正值中國鬼神方術盛行，而佛教又主要用於齋戒祭祀，於是就自然而然地被劃為方術的一派。最早可考的佛經譯本出自西域安息國來的僧人安清（字世高，名前冠以所屬國名）。三國孫權時期的康僧會這樣說他：“其為人也，博學多識，貫綜神模，七正盈縮；風氣吉凶，山崩地動；針脈諸術，睹色知病；鳥獸鳴啼，無音不照。”（1995: 244）這就有點神仙的道行了。那些黃老之徒終身修行所期望達到的境界也不過如此。可見佛教到了中國，從一開始就和道流結下了不解之緣。造成早期以至後來佛道結合的原因很多，這裏只能談一些和翻譯有關的問題。《出三藏記集》說世高“以漢桓帝之初，始到中夏。世高才悟機敏，一聞能達，至止未久，即通華語。於是宣譯眾經，改胡為漢。”（釋僧佑，1995: 508）這樣的語言天才做翻譯最好不過了。後人評他的譯文是：“世高出經，貴本不飾。天竺古文，文通尚質；倉卒尋之，時有不達。”（釋道安，1995a: 254）這裏說的“天竺古文，文通尚質”和上面故事裏講的“佛法中不與美言為是”是一致的。世高的翻譯也樸實無華，在文體上基本達到了原文的要求，只是有的地方乍一看還不易明白；不易

明白也是譯文太“質”的緣故。現代學者都說他是最早的“直譯”派。

說到這裏，有幾個術語需要解釋一下。現代學者說的“意譯”可以有兩種解釋。一種是對“直譯”而言的，是相對的，有程度大小的區別；另一種是對“音譯”而言的，是絕對的，沒有程度大小之分（音、意兼而有之的是特例，這裏不討論）。為避免混淆，下面有關佛經翻譯的討論，我們用“文”來表示第一種與“直譯”相對的“意譯”，用“質”來表示現代的“直譯”，“意譯”只用來代表第二種與“音譯”相對的“意譯”。

世高基本上採用“質”的方法。他的譯文“有的地方順從原文結構，不免重複、顛倒，而術語的創作也有些意義不夠清楚。”（呂澂，1979: 285）術語的創作就是名義問題。試舉一個意義清楚又比較典型的例子，以便說明譯者的翻譯觀與譯文結果的關係。當時影響最大的是《安般守意經》。“安般守意”是世高的譯文，原文“安那波那（ānāpāna）”是一種禪法。釋道安在注序裏說：“安般者，出入也。道之所寄，無往不因；德之所寓，無往不託。是故安般寄息以成守，四禪寓骸以成定也。”（1995b: 242-243）“出入”是“出入息”，就是呼吸；“守”和“定”是思想集中。丁福保的《佛學大辭典》對“安般守意”的解釋是：“數出入息鎮心之觀法名”。“安般守意”字面上的意思是說通過數呼吸以達到排除雜念，專心一意的目的。

世高的原意是把音和意全翻出來：“安般”他沒有翻成“呼吸”或“吐納”（字面義），而是只翻了聲音，大概是後來玄奘說的“生善故”（見下文）；“守意”是隱含義，是他加上去的補充說明，方便讀者理解。從翻譯術語最常見的三種方法

“音”、“字面義”、“隱含義”來看，他翻出來的是第一種和第三種，有“質”，也有“文”，所以後人說他的翻譯“辯而不華，質而不野”。（釋慧皎，1992: 5）這種翻譯方法在今天不多見了，更常用的是在音譯後面加上一個類詞，比如在“桑拿”後面加上“浴”字；前半譯音，後半用類詞補充解釋。這種方法當時稱為“華梵並舉”。但問題就出在世高選用的“守意”這個詞上。

湯用彤說：“守意之說，中國道家養生之常談。《春秋繁露·循天之道篇》〔……〕曰：‘意勞者神擾，神擾者氣少，氣少者難久矣。’繼言：‘君子欲止惡以平意，平意以靜神，靜神以養氣。’”（1997: 100）世高的“守意”大概來自老莊的“守一”。老子有“營魄抱一”的說法；（《道德經·十》）意思是魂魄合一，形神合一。莊子也說：“純素之道，惟神是守，守而勿失，與神為一。”（《莊子·刻意》）他還說：“目無所見，耳無所聞，心無所知汝神將守形，形乃長生〔……〕我守其一，以處其和，故我修身千二百餘歲矣，吾形未嘗衰。”（《莊子·在宥》）“守一”不外是守“神、形”，即精神和肉體，（後來道教又發展成守“精、氣、神”等）以求長生不老，是道家吐納食氣的養生之法。“守意”和“守一”字面上的意義很接近，部份的隱含內容（功能）或實行起來的表面形式也都是打坐，調理呼吸，排除雜念等，沒有太大的差別。但它們期望達到的最終效果和背後的哲學思想卻完全是兩回事。這樣翻譯的好處是對中國人不陌生，容易接受。

“守意”和“守一”貌合神離，是我們常說的“假朋友”。世高的“守意”是禪法的守意；它的“意”是“眾苦之萌基，背

正之元本”，（謝敷，1995: 245）不是好東西。守意是不讓意萌生（與莊子的“守而不失”形成鮮明的對比），“非謂守護心意也。其言為守護心意，乃中國因譯文而生誤解。”（湯用彤，1997: 100）對世高來說，他創造了新語言，引進了新事理。但他的讀者理解的卻是道家的“守意”（或“守一”），是舊語言，舊事理。這種方法就是“格義”，其結果是在佛教的肢體中注入了道家的血液，後來又被道教吸收過去，充實了自己的“守一”理論。這就是人們常說的佛道相得益彰；久而久之，兩教也就互相牽引附合，以至佛道難分了。

月支僧人支婁迦讖（簡作支讖）與世高同時期稍晚，他的譯文比世高更“質”。後人說他“因本順旨，轉音如己，敬順聖言，了不加飾。”（釋道安，1995c: 264）他完全順從印度的思想習慣，甚至原文的句式也照搬過來（早期譯文大都如此）。支讖譯文的特點是“辭質多胡音”（支敏度，1995: 270），就是音譯多。西文句法再加上音譯，自然增加了讀者理解上的困難，所以引起了後人的不滿。^[2]另一方面，支讖意譯的術語（即在詞彙層面）卻和世高一樣，充滿了道家的色彩，如：譯“波羅密多”（pāramitā）為“道行”，譯“如性”（tathatā）^[3]為“本無”等。（呂澂，1979: 290）“本無”的意義演變也和“守意”類似，先是老莊思想（萬物以無為本），佛家支讖首創此詞，後來又由道家發揮。（湯用彤，1997: 103-104）其他更通俗的例子如：把“智”或“明”（prajñā）譯為“聖”，把“空”（sūnyatā）譯為“虛”或“無”，把“寂”（santi）譯為“靜”，把“方便”（upāya）譯為“無為”、“自然”等等（許里和，1998: 97），都屬於這一類。佛家支讖學說的流傳結果很有趣。在中國人當中它

依附了道家，但在歸藉的月支移民當中卻“保持其純粹性。這對後來佛學傳佈逐漸糾正接近真相，是起了相當的啓發作用”。

（呂澂，1979: 290）所以後來道安說他的譯文“義理明晰，文字允正”。（釋慧皎，1992: 10）這證實了我們上面的推論：譯者自己並不是按照譯出來的隱含義理解譯文的。這樣在一般讀者當中很容易造成誤解，只有像道安那樣的佛學專家才能看到本來的意思。

世高和支謙都是“質”派最早的代表人物。他們的譯文“貴本不飾”，儘量保留原文的字詞句法，與中文形式相悖的倒裝句用得也很多，目的顯然是要“異化”佛經，以保留原文的本來面目。特別是支謙，他的譯文音譯多，而音譯又可以說是最徹底的異化方法。然而在一些術語上，他們卻在不同程度上使用了歸化的方法。換句話說，他們在語言形式上和目的語保持距離，而在文化上卻無意中用道家思想“歸化”了佛經。這就無法簡單地用異化和歸化來解釋他們的翻譯了。爲甚麼以異化爲出發點而最後卻達到歸化的終點呢？問題就出在翻譯名義上，而他們對翻譯名義的處理方法又是和他們的翻譯觀分不開的。從上面的分析我們可以推測出，早期佛經譯者把翻譯看作是純粹的語言（轉換）問題，而忽略了語言的民族性，即文化問題；他們認爲同一內容可以輕易“穿上”不同的語言形式。當初佛祖大概意識到了這裏的問題，所以不允許使用“外道”的語言，以避免文化上的衝突。但“外族”的語言也並非完全沒有文化上的問題；佛祖沒想到的是在幾百年後的中國，佛教又受到了“外道”的衝擊。實際上古代討論佛經翻譯所使用的術語“文”、“質”、“徑”、“曲”、“本”等等，也只是指語言，不包括文化。這種翻譯觀

持續了幾百年，直到後秦的鳩摩羅什才糾正過來，而在理論上要等到宋朝的釋贊寧才對翻譯現象提出了比較正確的解釋。

接下來的重要翻譯家是支謙（字恭明，一名越），他的背景和前面兩位外來僧人稍有不同。支謙是月支移民的第三代，生在中國，先學漢文，後學胡語。他雖然是支謙的再傳弟子，但對佛經的理解和翻譯方法卻和他的師祖大不相同。從世高到鳩摩羅什的250年間的重要譯者當中，支謙大概是惟一的所謂“文”派（還有一個康僧會，譯籍不多）。支謙自幼研習中國經典，精通文學、深諳音律，所以他能制梵唄（“唄”略同於中國的讚，以配樂的形式唱出），這一點是他的先輩遠遠比不上的。也正因爲他擅長文辭，所以不滿以前“辭旨不雅”以致晦澀難解的翻譯。他改譯、潤飾了很多經文，使譯文流暢易懂。他的譯文“曲得聖義，辭旨文雅”。（釋慧皎，1992: 15）梵文佛經很冗長，同一個意思往往以不同的形式重複多次；這不符合中文簡潔的習慣，所以支謙把原文刪去了不少。這一做法被人斥爲“傳事不盡”。（釋道安，1995d: 382）在語言形式上，可以說他主張歸化。“文”（包括“簡”）是支謙譯文的第一個特點。

另一個特點是他的譯文“胡音”最少。佛經術語本來就多，都用音譯顯然難以理解。支謙把音譯減到了最低的程度，“以至有時連應存原音的陀羅尼（佛教咒語的統稱）也意譯了”。（呂澂，1979: 294）他的意譯也是用道家、玄學理論比附佛經。如果說世高和支謙是無意中混淆了佛道，那麼支謙則是有意的。需要指出一點，支謙雖然有意使用道家術語，但他這個“錯誤”卻出於無心，因爲他認爲佛道本來是一家，而且相信佛的前身是國師道士。（湯用彤，1997: 95-97）在“誤植”這一點上，他和世高、

支識沒有本質的區別。既然支謙認為佛本來出自中國，那麼他在《瑞應本起經》裏的一個注裏把“釋迦牟尼”譯成“能儒”——釋迦（Sākya族名）為“能”，“牟尼”（muni聖者）為“儒”——也就可以理解了。後人批評他說：“恭明前譯，頗麗其辭，仍迷其旨。是使宏標乖於謬文，至味淡於華艷。”（釋僧睿，1995a: 308）這段話是說他的文字華麗，所以迷失了原文的旨趣。而實際上譯文偏離了佛經原意是因為譯者本身就是按道家思想理解原文的。如果支謙錯了，他錯在對原文的理解和對翻譯名義的處理方法，而不是錯在文字華麗。自此以後，凡論翻譯者大都批評“文”的作法，卻不知自己批錯了對象，直到鳩摩羅什來了以後他們才恍然大悟。道安似乎看出了問題的關鍵所在，他說支謙的譯文“斲鑿之巧者也。巧則巧矣，懼竅成而混沌終矣。”（1995e: 290）他說的“斲鑿之巧”可能指的就是支謙用道家術語穿鑿附會，而結果是原意盡失。後來梁朝釋僧佑明確指出，支謙所出，“多滯文格義”。（釋僧佑，1995: 533）

鳩摩羅什（義為童壽，簡作羅什），祖籍天竺，生於龜茲，於姚秦時期來到中國，前後譯經十五年，是中國翻譯史上最偉大的翻譯家之一。他的譯文前所未有，古今論者都給他很高的評價；直到今天很多佛教信徒仍然使用他的譯本。羅什把許多以前譯過的經文重新再譯，改動很大。“考之舊譯，真若荒田之稼，耘過其半，未詎多也。”（釋僧睿，1995c: 298）當時的學者評論他的譯文說：“曲從方言，而趣不乖本。”（釋慧觀，1995: 306）“其文約而詣，其旨婉而彰，微遠之言，於茲顯然。”（釋僧肇，1996: 310）

比較一下支謙的譯法，我們發現這兩位譯者都是“曲得聖

義”，都是文派，但結果卻截然不同。支謙因麗其辭而失其旨，因刪削重複而傳事不盡。羅什刪削的結果卻使譯文暢達，不直接表達原意反而原意更顯。為甚麼同樣的翻譯方法卻收到不同的效果呢？學者的觀點好像是支謙的“文”不夠成熟。（梁啟超，1998: 155）似乎翻譯的優劣只是文質掌握的分寸問題。（很多當代學者仍持這種觀點。）其實癥結之所在還是翻譯名義。

道安的弟子釋僧睿寫道：“經來自茲土，乃以秦言譯之，典謨乖於殊制，名實喪於不謹〔……〕不遇淵匠，殆將墮矣。”

（1995b: 292）由於術語譯得不妥，佛經幾乎要到了完全脫離原本的邊緣。道安早已發現佛經術語都在疑似之間，於是遍尋異本，試圖從中找到正確的解釋；但苦於不通梵文，又不可能徹底解決名實的問題。在羅什的譯場擔任筆受的僧睿評論羅什的譯文時說：“其事數之名與舊譯不同者，皆是法師以義正之者也。如‘陰入持’等，名與義乖，故隨義改之〔……〕諸如此比，改之甚眾。胡音失者，正之以天竺；秦言謬者定之以字義。不可變者〔不能譯意的〕即而書之〔譯音〕。是以異名斌然，胡音殆半。”（1995b: 293）例如，他把支識和支謙的“本無品”改為“大如品”。羅什的譯文所以被稱為“神授其文，真本猶存”，（釋僧睿，1995c: 298）最重要的一點是他音譯、意譯處理得當。羅什以後漢譯佛經才脫離了道家的影響，走上自己的軌道。所以梁啟超說：“佛教學理上得一堅實基礎，而為有系統的發展，自羅什始也。”（1998: 133）中國的翻譯也是從羅什以後才真正成熟起來。

羅什是第一個放棄“格義”方法的譯者。後來玄奘也批判了這種作法。“格義”是佛經講說時使用的一種方法，就是用道

家、玄學的思想解釋一些複雜的佛學概念。在佛經的譯文中，我們發現“格義”只是用在某些術語的翻譯上，就是說，它只是翻譯名義的一種方法。“格義”和音譯、意譯一樣，只涉及以詞為單位的翻譯。上文說過，早期譯者為了“質”，只追求在句法上和原文接近，而忽略了專業術語，即詞彙或翻譯名義的處理方法；這才是導致佛經失真的真正原因。連道安這樣出色的學者也一度陷於迷茫、困惑。其中最根本的原因是他們沒有弄清翻譯中的語言問題和文化問題。宋朝和尚釋贊寧研究了羅什的譯文，並得出結論：“言不關典，非子史之言，用其翻對〔……〕如童壽譯《法華》，可謂折中，有西域天然之語趣。”（1987: 55-56）他指出，羅什的譯文所以有西域天然之語趣，就是因為他沒有使用典故、子史之言等這類帶有強烈文化色彩的語言。這是中國翻譯理論家首次討論到翻譯中的文化問題，也是中國古代翻譯理論的最高成就。^[4]

在佛經翻譯的文獻中，也有許多關於音譯的論述。最著名的就是玄奘的“五種不翻”和贊寧的“六例”。

唐朝的翻譯家釋玄奘總結了前人翻譯佛經名相的方法，提出了“五種不翻”的原則，說的是在五種情況下譯音不譯意，其文如下：

唐奘法師明五種不翻：一，秘密故，不翻，“陀羅尼”是。二，多含故，不翻，如“薄迦梵”，含六義故。三，此無故，不翻，如“閻浮樹”。四，順古故，不翻，如“阿耨菩提”，實可翻之，但摩騰已來存梵音故。五，生善故，不翻，如“般若”尊重，“智慧”輕淺，令人生敬，是故不翻。（釋法雲，1995: 625/一）^[5]

“秘密”是爲了保留原文的神秘性；“陀羅尼”是咒語的總稱，原文爲 dhârâni；相傳用外文念的咒語比用中文念來得靈驗，所以應該保留原來的音。“多含”是原文一詞多義，因漢語中沒有完全對應的譯法而不翻；“薄迦梵”的梵文是 bhagavat，意譯爲“世尊”，是佛的第十個尊號；但根據不同的上下文，可能有六種不同的含意；它可能表示“自在”、“熾盛”、“端嚴”的意思，也能用來比喻“吉祥”、“尊貴”等等；如果簡單意譯成“世尊”，根據漢語的習慣，就不能當做比喻使用了，如譯成“尊貴”、“吉祥”等詞，又不能用來指世尊了，所以不翻。從這個例子可以看出，佛經的譯者特別注意一詞一譯，要求做到使譯文讀者也像原文讀者那樣，根據不同的上下文選擇不同的意義。

“此無”比較簡單，就是中土所無的事物要音譯。“順古”是遵循古人留下的習慣做法，如：阿耨 anu 原文是“極微”，非常小的意思，不是不能翻，但因為人們已經習慣了原有譯法，沒有必要再改成意譯了。最後一點“生善”是令人生敬的意思；“般若”的梵文是 prajñā，意譯爲“慧”、“智慧”、“明”。佛教中的智慧有層次深淺之分，“般若”是最高層的智慧，譯成“智慧”遠遠不夠，不能令人生敬，所以不翻。^[6]“五種不翻”的原則，今天基本上仍然適用。

宋贊寧的“六例”中的第一例“譯字譯音”進而把翻譯分爲四種不同的方法：

- （一）譯字不譯音，即“陀羅尼”是。
- （二）譯音不譯字，如佛胸前“卍”字是。
- （三）音字俱譯，即諸經律中純華言是。
- （四）音字俱不譯，如經題上“p”、“a”二字是。（1987: 53）

贊寧的術語有些奇怪，很費解。他說的譯字、譯音和我們今天的習慣用法不同。比如，我們說的“譯音”是把原文的聲音用漢語的字表現（譯）出來，如上面的第一條，把 dhârâni 譯成“陀羅尼”，而贊寧卻稱之為“不譯音”。這是因為古代對“譯”的解釋與後來不同。所謂“譯之言易也。”（釋法雲，1994: 626a）翻譯就是把原文的“音”（讀音）和“字”（書寫形式）“易”（改變）成另一種語言的音和字。這樣看，從 dhârâni 到“陀羅尼”，“字”改變了，而“音”沒有變，所以稱為“不譯音”。第二條，“𑖀”原文 srivatsalaksana，漢語的音應是“室利鉢蹉洛刹囊”；譯成“𑖀”保留了原文的書寫形式，而改變了原文的讀音，讀成“萬”，所以是“譯音不譯字”。第三條“音字俱譯”是普通意義上的翻譯，我們今天說的意譯。第四條是音字都不變，保留原文的書寫形式和讀音。這樣，贊寧全面總結了佛經翻譯使用的各種不同方法。玄奘的“五種不翻”只分“翻”與“不翻”，就是“意譯”和“音譯”，即贊寧的一、三條。贊寧還注意到了二、四兩條，在方法描述上無疑比較全面。

對於第二條，現代學者除了卡特福德以外很少有人提到。我們通常翻譯的日本人名就屬於“譯音不譯字”，如“清水”的音用漢語拼音表示應是 ximizi（英文 Shimizu），^[7]而我們翻譯成漢語時不譯（易）字，卻將它改成了漢語的讀音 qingshui。日本人翻譯中國人名一般也是用這種方法。美籍華人物理學家丁肇中發現了一種新的粒子，按習慣以發現者的名字命名，於是他就將這種粒子稱為“J-粒子”。如果我們把英文字母 J 和中文的“丁”的書寫形式看成一樣的話，他的這種方法就是“譯音不譯字”。如果再把這個粒子按讀音譯成中文的“介粒子”——“譯字不譯

音”，就辜負了他的苦心，還是還原成“丁粒子”才好。第四條在印歐語系內的翻譯中比較常見，而拉丁字母出現在中文翻譯中就成了特例。今天的“X-光”，“卡拉-OK”，香港的“T-恤”中的外文字母，大體上就屬於這一類。

“五種不翻”和“六例”（我們只談了其中第一例，上文提到贊寧關於“格義”的論述是第五例，論“華言雅俗”）從實踐中具體總結出了音譯和意譯的類型和使用場合，為翻譯名義進一步提供了理論基礎，避免了翻譯外來事物時，不能翻而強翻，結果造成讀者望文生義，最後混淆中外文化。

中國古代學者在描述翻譯策略使用的術語是“質”與“文”，現代用“直譯”、“意譯”。西方還有“異化”、“歸化”、“顯型翻譯”、“隱型翻譯”、或“趨向原文”、“趨向讀者”等等。以美國學者沃努蒂（Laurence Venuti）的“異化”和“歸化”為例。為調解“新事理”與“舊語言”之間的衝突，異化採取的方法是：尊重原文，刻意打破目的語的傳統習慣，以保留原文的“異國特征”；這就是德國翻譯學家施萊爾馬赫說的“將讀者移向原文”。歸化是面向讀者的，要使譯文遷就目的語的傳統習慣，在譯文中去除原文的“異國特征”，使讀者容易理解和接受；施萊爾馬赫把這種方法稱為“將原文移向讀者”。歸化反映在翻譯名義上就是在翻譯新事理的時候，只用舊語言，不必創造新語言。

我們在上面分析早期四位譯者的策略的過程中發現，古代的“文”與“質”只是指句法而言的，無法描述詞彙層面的翻譯策略。如果用西方現代的翻譯研究的術語來解釋佛典的翻譯，我們只能說，早期的譯文在句法上採用“異化”、“顯型”，“把讀

者移向原文”等策略，而在部份詞彙上使用的是“歸化”、“隱型”、“把原文移向讀者”的翻譯方法。也就是說，譯者在句法和詞彙上完全可以採取兩種不同的方法。而紐馬克的“傳意〔交際〕翻譯”和“語意翻譯”甚至無法用來解釋佛經翻譯的這一現象。那麼，（一）在研究翻譯策略上，是否應該將句法和詞彙分開來談呢？是否所謂“異國特徵”至少也應分為句法和詞彙兩個方面呢（或者還有其它成份或分類方法）？（二）根據佛經翻譯的經驗，我們發現，如果要分清翻譯中的語言問題和文化問題的話，所謂文化問題多出在詞彙或術語（以及有關概念）的層面；而文化內容如何反映在句法上，目前的研究還很含糊。這倆點佛經翻譯名義的問題在現代翻譯研究上能給我們甚麼啓示呢？

* 本研究計劃為香港理工大學資助（GB-YC44）

注釋

- [1] 〈法句經序〉收在《出三藏記集》裏，作者不詳，據湯用彤等考證，作者為支謙。
- [2] 後來朱士行為此西行取經，準備重新再譯；支謙將他的音譯改為意譯。
- [3] “如性”比較難解，簡單地說是“如原來的樣子”的意思。詳細解釋見呂澂，1979: 3-4。
- [4] 有關玄奘和贊寧對理論的詳細討論，見朱志瑜，1998: 111-115。
- [5] 此論見於宋僧釋法雲所編《翻譯名義集》卷一，周敦義為此書寫的序也節錄此段。另外在此大約一百七十年前，贊寧在《宋高僧傳》中也提了一筆，但未引原文。
- [6] 關於“五種不翻”，王文彥有更為詳細的論述；見王文彥，1984:

263-270。

- [7] 日語“清水”二字有多種讀法，用作人名只有一種。

參考書目

- 丁福保（1984），《佛學大辭典》，北京：文物出版社。
- 季羨林（1991a），〈原始佛教的語言問題〉，《季羨林學術論著自選集》，頁31-42。
- （1991b），〈再論原始佛教的語言問題〉，《季羨林學術論著自選集》，頁43-72。
- 梁啟超（1998），〈翻譯文學與佛典〉，《佛學研究十八篇（一）》，沈陽：遼寧教育出版社，頁141-170。
- 呂澂（1979），《中國佛學源流略講》，北京：中華書局。
- 釋道安（1995a），〈大十二門經序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁253-254。
- （1995b），〈安般注序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁244-245。
- （1995c），〈道行經序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁262-264。
- （1995d），〈鞞婆沙序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁381-382。
- （1995e），〈摩訶鉢羅若波羅蜜經抄序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁289-291。
- 釋法雲（1994），《翻譯名義集》，《佛藏要集選刊（三）》，蘇淵雷、高振農選編，上海：古籍出版社，頁625-755。
- 慧觀（1995），〈法華宗要序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁304-306。
- 釋慧皎（1992），《高僧傳》，北京：中華書局。
- 釋僧睿（1995a），〈思益經序〉，《出三藏記集》，北京：中華書局，頁308-309。

- _____. (1995b), 〈大品經序〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁291-293。
- _____. (1995c), 〈小品經序〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁297-298。
- 釋僧肇 (1995), 〈維摩詰經序〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁309-310。
- 釋僧佑 (1995), 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局。
- 釋贊寧 (1987), 《宋高僧傳》, 北京: 中華書局。
- 湯用彤 (1997), 《漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史》, 北京: 北京大學出版社。
- 王文彥 (1984), 《佛典漢譯之研究》, 台北: 天華。
- 謝敷 (1995), 〈安般守意經序〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁245-247。
- 支敏度 (1995), 〈合首楞嚴經記〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁270-271。
- 支謙 (1995), 〈法句經序〉, 《出三藏記集》, 北京: 中華書局, 頁272-274。
- 朱志瑜 (1998), 〈中國傳統翻譯理論: “文質說”〉, 《翻譯季刊》(香港), 頁95-118。

作者簡介

朱志瑜畢業於天津外國語學院英語系，香港大學英文系比較文學博士，曾任香港中文大學翻譯研究中心助理編輯；發表過遇羅錦的《一個冬天的童話》和《顧城詩選》英譯；現任教於香港理工大學中文及雙語學系，教授翻譯理論和翻譯史等課程；目前主要研究項目有“中國翻譯理論發展史綱”和“西方翻譯理論研究”等。

從語篇分析角度看翻譯 單位的確定

黃國文 張美芳

Abstract

Unit of Translation: A Text Linguistic Approach (by Huang Guowen and Zhang Meifang)

In the literature to date, there have been a number of papers that focus on issues concerning the unit of translation. Unlike scholars who regard the concept of the unit as a formal one, the authors of this paper adopt a functional-linguistic view, assuming that the concept is a semantic one and arguing that the unit of translation should be the whole text rather than clauses or paragraphs realizing the meanings in the text. By doing a generic-structure and semantic analysis, the authors demonstrate how the global meaning in the source text is realized in the target text.

一、引言

近年來翻譯界對翻譯學是否是一門獨立學科的問題進行了熱烈的爭論，雖然還沒有一個公認的看法，但大多數學者都認為翻譯學是一門研究翻譯的科學，翻譯學應享有獨立的學科地位（張

美芳，1997；許鈞，1998；譚載喜，2001）。我們在同意把翻譯學當作一門獨立學科的基礎上，認為有必要就翻譯學科建構的一些問題作些理論上的探討。本文擬就最近二十年來譯學界所爭論的翻譯單位問題作些探討；由於“翻譯學作為一門學科（還）缺乏堅定的理論基礎”（張美芳，1997: 308），因此，需要吸收包括語言學等學科的研究成果來建構自己的理論。本文試圖從功能語篇分析（Halliday 1994；Egins 1994；黃國文，1988，2001a，2001b）角度去考察翻譯單位的確定問題。

二、關於翻譯單位的討論

據司顯柱（2001）觀察，自 1984 年以來，在國內公開出版的外語、翻譯類專業刊物和譯論著作、教科書中專門探討、評（譯）述翻譯單位的專論、文章已超過 20 篇，這說明我國學者對這一問題相當關注，從目前的情況看，翻譯界對翻譯單位的確定意見分歧，各家立論相互排斥。有些人認為應把詞和小句作為翻譯的基本單位，有些人則把句子當作翻譯單位，而其他一些人則主張把句群、語段或語篇作為翻譯的基本單位（呂俊，1992；羅選民，1992；司顯柱，2001）。國外的學者對翻譯單位的確定也沒有比較一致的看法：有些人從語言學角度探討這個問題，有些人則認為翻譯單位應是思維單位（unit of thought）（林煌天，1997: 169；Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 192-193）。從我們所掌握的資料看，國內外的學者在翻譯單位的定義和研究方面沒有一致的看法，這主要是由研究視角和確定標準不一致所造成的。

三、語篇與句子（小句）

我們認為，在討論翻譯單位的確定時，必須澄清一些相關的概念。很多學者在主張把語篇作為翻譯單位時將語篇看作一個比句子大的語法（結構）單位，這是一種誤解。韓禮德（1994/2000: F43）明確指出，語篇是語義單位（semantic unit），而不是語法（grammatical）單位。這種“語篇是語義單位”的觀點已被不少翻譯研究者（Baker 1992: 6）所接受。

既然語篇是語義單位，那它與屬於語法單位的句子是甚麼關係呢？首先，語篇與句子屬於不同類型的單位，它們之間不存在一個比另一個大或小的問題，因此，把語篇看作是比句子高一層的單位是不合適的。其次，作為語義單位的語篇通過作為形式（語法）單位的句子來體現（realization），它們之間的關係是體現關係：語篇由句子或小句體現（張德祿，1998: 230）。換言之，語篇的意義由句子或小句這類形式來表達、來體現。最後，用來體現語篇意義的句子或小句之間的聯繫不是結構單位之間的聯繫，而是意義上的聯繫。語篇的整體性和連貫性指的是意義上的整體性和連貫性。

形式與意義之間的關係沒有一對一的關係，一種意義可以由兩個或更多的形式體現；同理，一種意義可以由不同的語法結構表達。例如：“海倫很早到達”這一意義可以英譯為句子（小句）：Helen arrived early，也可譯為名詞短語：Helen's early arrival；同理，“海倫很早到達，亨利感到很高興”這一意義既可譯成並列句：Helen arrived early and Henry felt very happy，也可譯為簡單句：Helen's early arrival pleased Henry 或 Helen's early

arrival made Henry very happy。從體現關係角度看，“海倫很早到達”既可由句子（小句）體現，又可由名詞短語體現。在翻譯過程中，原文的體現形式（如一個小句）可能在譯文中變成了兩個小句或一個短語，這是不言而喻的。從這一點看，翻譯中對等只是一個相對的概念，完全的對等是不存在的，不對等才是絕對的（申雨平，2000: F12）。

四、語篇作為翻譯單位

如果我們在翻譯實踐中追求的是對等，那麼這種對等只能是作為交際單位的原文和同樣作為交際單位的譯文之間的對等。因此，在翻譯研究中，應該強調的是原文的整體意義在譯文中的再現，而不是獨詞獨句在形式上的對等。這是因為，在翻譯實踐中，好的譯文注重的是整體意義方面的對等。雅可布遜（R. Jakobson）認為，在語際翻譯中，符號（形式）與符號之間一般不可能有完全對等的關係，只有資訊才能用來解釋外來的符號和資訊（意義）；從這一點看，翻譯所關注的是兩種不同語言符號中的兩個對等的資訊（林煌天，1997: 153）。奈達（E. Nida）所強調的翻譯就是交際，實質上講的也是原文所表達的整體意義在譯文中的再現問題。

在談到翻譯單位的確定問題時，巴斯納特（Bassnett 1980/1991: 118）認為，在文學翻譯中“語篇是主要單位”（the text is the prime unit），因為每個語篇都是由一系列相互連結的系統組成的，這些系統對於語篇的整體意義來說都有確定的功能（every

text is made up of a series of interlocking systems, each of which has a determinable function in relation to the whole）（Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 192-193）。我們同意巴斯納特的看法，但我們認為可以把“語篇是翻譯的主要單位”這一觀點延伸到所有語篇體裁（genre）的語篇中去，而不是局限於文學語篇體裁。從這點看，無論是一部小說、一首短詩，還是一句廣告口號，在翻譯時都應把它們當作一個翻譯單位。必須強調的是，由於語篇是一個交際單位，是一個語義單位，所以把語篇作為翻譯單位的做法實際上就表明了譯文應在意義（資訊、功能）方面（而不是形式上、結構上）再現原文。

五、文化語境與語篇體裁

語言是一個符號系統，語言也是一種社會現象，人們用語言來進行交流。每個言語社團都有自己特定的歷史、文化、風俗習慣、思維模式、道德觀念、價值觀念等。這些因素反映了這個言語社團的特點，同時也把它與其他言語社團區分開來。這些決定或影響特定言語社團中人們行為的因素構成了語篇分析者所說的文化語境（Context of Culture）。人們是在特定的社會、文化中生活，他們的言語使用當然受到了特定的文化語境的制約。這種制約會反映在“語篇體裁”的表現形式上。對於操本族語者來說，對語篇體裁的確定並不是一件難事。下面我們看兩個例子：

例(1)

Healing Chen, 21, female, major in English (journalism), Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, attain TEM8 & Computer II degree. Diligent, initiative and strong teamwork spirit, working experience of reporting, interpreting as well as photographing. Looking for any position of reporter or translator, etc.

BP: 9494 *****

(Guangzhou Morning Post, January 5, 2001)

例(2)

Attractive female, age 43, divorced, seeks male companion age 40-43, for social outings and possible lasting relationship, must like children. Genuine replies only. Photo appreciated.

Reply to Box SH 8007. The Scotsman Publications Ltd. Edinburgh

(Evening News (Edinburgh), March 10, 1990)

對於講英語的人來說，他們不難確定：(一)例(1)和例(2)都是分類廣告；(二)這兩則廣告可能刊登在報紙上或一般性雜誌(magazine)上，而不能刊登在學術期刊(journal)上；(三)例(1)的目的是尋找工作，而例(2)的目的則是找男朋友。

例(1)和例(2)整體結構非常相似，小句和片語結構也大致一樣(如都有表示性別、年齡、特性的名詞和形容詞，有 look for 或 seek 這類動詞)。但是，這兩個語篇一看就不是屬於同一語篇體裁。在例(1)中，表示特性的詞是 diligent, initiative and

strong teamwork spirit等，而例(2)中的卻是 attractive和divorced。

從例(1)和例(2)的比較可以看出，特定的言語社團有特定的交際方式(包括語言結構和語言使用的形式)，不同的交際方式表現在語篇中，就構成了不同的語篇體裁。

六、從語篇體裁看翻譯單位

在前面的討論中我們指出，應把作為交際單位的語篇作為翻譯單位，因為我們注重的是原文的整體意義在譯文中的再現，而不是原文中句子或單詞在形式上(結構上)的對等。但是，如果語篇的體現形式比較複雜(如由很多部份構成)，那可以從語篇體裁和語境配置(Contextual Configuration)角度對語篇進行語義切分。即是說，如果一個翻譯單位太大或太複雜，可以將其切分為一個個更小的語義部份，這樣就便於操作。

一般而言，切分可根據功能標準，也可根據形式標準。例如，對一篇學術論文的結構進行切分，可根據論文的主要組成部份切分出諸如“標題”、“作者”、“內容提要”、“目標”、“文獻綜述”、“假設”、“實驗”、“討論”、“結論”、“參考文獻”等部份；當然，也可按自然段切分為“第一段”、“第二段”、“第三段”等。

特定的語篇體裁要求特定的成份。例如，典型的英文食譜(recipe)這種語篇體裁應包括以下幾個部份：名稱→簡介→原料、配料→烹飪方法；在學術界，典型的個人履歷(curriculum vitae)則應包括：個人情況(包括姓名、出生年月、國籍、婚姻狀

況、住址、電話號碼)→學歷(包括受教育的年月、所獲得的學位)→工作經歷(包括擔任何工種、任何職務等情況)→著述情況(包括發表論文的刊物、時間,著作的出版社和年份等)。需要特別說明的是,這些成份都是語義(而不是結構)成份,雖然它們最終是由結構形式來體現。

每一語篇都屬於一定的語篇體裁;語篇體裁由“綱要式結構”(Schematic Structure)和“體現樣式”(Realizational Pattern)來體現。具體地說,綱要式結構指的是語篇中各個功能成份,如食譜語篇體裁中的名稱、簡介、原料、配料、烹飪方法;而體現樣式則指語言形式的選擇,如“名稱”由名詞片語體現,“簡介”由陳述(Declarative)小句體現,“原料、配料”由名詞片語體現,而“烹飪方法”則由不帶任何表示情態意義的祈使句體現(如用 Coat chicken with oil,而不用 Please coat chicken with oil 或 Perhaps you can coat chicken with oil 或 Would you coat chicken with oil?)。

語篇的體裁不同,它的綱要式結構就不同,它的體現樣式也可能不同。例如,在日常會話中的祈使句通常含有 please 這類表示情態意義(在這裏表示“禮貌”)的成份;如不用,則通常帶有“命令”或“過份熟悉”的含意。但是,在“食譜”這一語篇體裁中,無論讀者是誰,它所用的祈使句都不帶情態成份,這是這一特定語篇體裁決定的。

我們(張美芳,2001)在探討“會訊”的翻譯時發現,從語篇體裁的角度考察原文與譯文的關係,可以幫助我們進一步瞭解這一語篇類型,從而可以使原文的整體意義在譯文中體現出來。從我們的分析可以看出,根據語篇體裁把原文切分為若干語義部

份,在翻譯實踐中比較容易操作。

我們認為,作為交際單位的語篇應是翻譯單位,其整體綱要和意義是基本不變的;但在實際操作中,可以把語篇中各個功能部份看作是翻譯的小單位。這些小單位在結構(形式)上可能是單詞、片語(短語)、小句或句子。它們在譯文中的形式和位置可能會發生變化。其變化是體現“綱要式結構”中的自然調整,是形式對意義的表達問題。簡言之,翻譯單位實際上是個語義概念,單位與單位之間的關係是意義上的聯繫,不是形式(結構)上的關係。

七、討 論

在前面的討論中,我們在強調譯文應是原文的整體意義的再現的同時,也提出了從語篇體裁的綱要式結構方面對語篇進行功能成份切分。我們還舉了“食譜”和“個人履歷”這兩個語篇體裁作為例子進行簡單的說明,同時也提到張美芳(2001)對“會訊”進行語義切分的做法。

但是,由於語篇體裁的數量很多,一些語篇體裁的語義成份比較固定,而有些則不易預測、確定。在翻譯過程中,應視具體的語篇體裁進行語義成份切分。例如,對詩歌可以有不同的處理方法:如果詩歌只有一、兩行(如 In a Station of the Metro: The apparition of these faces in the crowd; / Petals on a wet, black bough. — Ezra Pound),則把整首詩當作一個翻譯單位。如果詩歌由若干節(stanza)(這些節的構成通常是根據意義來進行的)構

成，則可把節作為翻譯單位。又如，對於商業信函，可切分出發信人地址（包括電話、電傳、傳真、電子郵件）、日期、收信人姓名、地址（包括收信人頭銜等）、稱呼、開頭語（如 Thank you for your letter of 14 February suggesting that we ... / In reply to your letter of ... / Further to your enquiry of the 14th, I am happy to enclose the new contract 等等）、正文、結束語（如 Please let me know if this is convenient / I am looking forward to hearing from you / Please phone us to confirm the details 等），寫信人姓名或簽名、寫信人職務等成份。

在翻譯諸如商業信函的語篇時，可以把根據語義標準切分出的成分作為翻譯單位；各單位由不同的形式（結構）來體現、表達。至於各翻譯單位中各個形式的排列、前後順序，則根據語義表達和語言表現習慣來作決定。例如，英語“地址”中各成份的排列是從小到大（如：Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9LN, Scotland, Britain），譯成漢語時則根據語言表達習慣從大到小把地址寫出來（如：英國 蘇格蘭 愛丁堡 EH8 9LN 愛丁堡大學 文學院 英語系）。

上面的討論表明，我們確立翻譯單位的根據是語義標準，而不是形式標準。因此，書面語言的自然段雖然大多數也是原作者根據語義因素決定的，但在譯成另一種文字時，譯者還要根據意義在譯文中對自然段進行再劃分，結果可能與原文一樣，也可能有差異。我們曾就這一點對楊憲益、戴乃迭譯的《紅樓夢》與原文進行對比，發現英譯本的自然段比中文原文要多得多，尤其突出的一點是原文中的直接引語和引述句是嵌在自然段落中，而譯文卻讓引語和其引述句自己構成一個自然段。在對比過程中我們

還發現，原文某個自然段的話在譯文中被放在另一個自然段中。限於篇幅，以下僅舉一例說明這種值得注意的現象。^[1]

例（3）

……[1]說畢，拉着賈瑞，仍熄了燈，出至院外，摸着大臺階底下，說道：“這窩兒裏好，你只蹲着，別哼一聲，等我們來再動。” [2]說畢，二人去了。【1】

[3]賈瑞此時身不由己，只得蹲在那裏。[4]心下正盤算，只聽頭頂上一聲響，“滑拉拉”一淨桶尿糞從上面直潑下來，可巧澆了他一頭一身。[5]賈瑞撐不住，“噯喲”了一聲，忙又掩住口，不敢聲張，滿頭滿臉渾身皆是尿屎，冰冷打戰。[6]只見賈薈跑來叫：“快走，快走！” [7]賈瑞如得了命，三腳兩步從後門跑到家裏，天已三更，只得叫門。[8]開門人見他這般景況，問是怎的。少不得撒謊，說：[9]“黑了，失了腳，掉在毛廁裏了。” [10]一面到了自己房中更衣洗滌，心下方想到是鳳姐玩他，因此發了一回恨；在想一想鳳姐的模樣兒，又恨不得一時摟在懷內，一夜竟不曾合眼。【2】

[11]自此滿心想鳳姐，只不敢往榮府去了。[12]賈蓉兩個又常常來索銀子，他又怕祖父知道，正是相思尚且難禁，更又添了債務；日間工課又緊，他二十來歲人，尚未娶過親，邇來想着鳳姐，未免有那指頭兒告了消乏等事；更兼兩回凍惱奔波，因此三五下裏夾攻，不覺就得了一病：心內發膨脹，口中無滋味，腳下如棉，眼中似醋，黑夜作燒，白晝常倦，下溺連精，嗽痰帶血。[13]諸如此症，不上一年都全添上了。[14]於是不能支持，一頭跌倒，合上眼還只夢魂顛倒，滿口胡說亂話，驚怖異常。[15]百

般請醫療治，諸如肉桂、附子、鱉甲、麥冬、玉竹等藥，吃了有幾十斤下去，也不見個動靜。【3】

[16]倏忽又臘盡春回，這病更又沉重。[17]代儒也着了忙，各處請醫療治，皆不見效。……【4】

(摘自曹雪芹、高鶚《紅樓夢》第12回)

例(4)

{1} He blew out the light and dragged Jia Rui out to the foot of some steps in the yard. 【1】

{2} "Here's a good place," he whispered. {3} "Squat down there until we come back and don't make a sound." 【2】

{4} As the two others left, Jia Rui squatted obediently at the foot of the steps. {5} He was thinking over his predicament when he heard a splash above him and a bucket of slops was emptied over his head. {6} A cry of dismay escaped him. {7} But he clapped one hand over his mouth and made not another sound, though covered with filth from head to foot and shivering with cold. {8} Then Jia Qiang hurried over calling: 【3】

"Quick! Run for it!" 【4】

{9} At this reprieve, Jia Rui bolted through the back door to his home. {10} By now the third watch had sounded, and he had to knock at the gate. {11} The servant who opened it wanted to know how he came to be in such a state. 【5】

{12} "I fell into a sesspool in the dark," lied Jia Rui. 【6】

{13} Back in his own room he stripped off his clothes and washed.

{14} Only then did he realize with rage the trick Xifeng had played him,

yet the recollection of her charms still made him long to embrace her. {15} There was no sleep for him that night. {16} Afterwards, however, although he still longed for Xifeng, he steered clear of the Rong Mansion. 【7】

{17} Both Jia Rong and Jia Qiang kept dunning him for payment, so that his fear of being found out by his grandfather and the hopeless passion which consumed him were now aggravated by the burden of debts, while he had to work hard at his lessons every day. {18} The unmarried twenty-year-old, constantly dreaming of Xifeng, could not help indulging in "finger-play." {19} All this, combined with the effect of two nights of exposure, soon made him fall ill. {20} Before a year was out he suffered from heartburn, loss of appetite, emissions in his urine and blood in his phlegm; his legs trembled, his eyes smarted; he was feverish at night and exhausted by day. {21} And finally he collapsed in a fit of delirium. 【8】

{22} The doctors who were called in dosed him with dozens of catties of cinnamon, aconitum roots, turtle-shell, liriopse, polygonatum and so forth—but all to no effect. {23} With the coming of spring he took a turn for the worse. 【9】

{24} His grandfather rushed to and fro in search of new physicians, yet they proved useless. ... 【10】

(*A Dream of Red Mansions*, Chapter 12,

translated by Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang)

原文(例3)的第[1]句前面用了省略句(……)表示這個句

子並不是自然段的第一句，而譯文（例4）的第{1}句卻是該自然段的第一句。

原文共有4個自然段，由17個句子組成。譯文共有10個自然段，由24個句子組成。下面先從自然段和句子的對應方面進行比較：

原 文	譯 文
第【1】自然段：[1]、[2]	第【1】自然段：{1} 第【2】自然段：{2}、{3} 第【3】自然段：{4}
第【2】自然段：[3]、[4] [5]、[6] [7]、[8] [9]、[10]	第【3】自然段：{4}、{5}、{6}、{7}、{8} 第【4】自然段：{8} 第【5】自然段：{9}、{10}、{11} 第【6】自然段：{12} 第【7】自然段：{13}、{14}、{15}
第【3】自然段：[11]、[12] [13]、[14] [15]	第【7】自然段：{16} 第【8】自然段：{17}、{18}、{19}、{20}、{21} 第【9】自然段：{22}
第【4】自然段：[16]、[17]	第【9】自然段：{23} 第【10】自然段：{24}

表1：《紅樓夢》原文與譯文的自然段落比較

從表1可以看出，原文的自然段與譯文的自然段不但不對應，而且譯文中出現了三次“跨段”的現象：（一）在原文中，第[2]句（說畢，二人去了。）屬於第【1】自然段。而在譯文中，它屬

於第【3】自然段的開頭部份，是第{4}句中的時間狀語從句（As the two others left,）。（二）在原文中，第[11]句（自此滿心想鳳姐，只不敢往榮府去了。）屬於第【3】自然段的開頭一句，但在譯文中，它變成了第【7】自然段的最後一句，即第{16}句（Afterwards, however, although he still longed for Xifeng, he steered clear of the Rong Mansion.）。（三）在原文中，第[16]句（倏忽又臘盡春回，這病更又沉重。）屬於第【4】自然段的開頭一句，而在譯文中，它又變成了第【9】自然段的最後一句，即第{23}句（With the coming of spring he took a turn for the worse.）。

從上面的分析可以看出，原文與譯文在自然段的處理上是沒有做到對等的。這種不對等不僅表現在原文段落少、譯文段落多，而且還表現在多處的“跨段”現象。

無論是從句子與句子，還是從片語或短語方面看，原文與譯文的對等是不存在的。原文只有17個句子，而譯文有24個句子。只要稍作對比，便可看出原文與譯文在處理句子方面的差異。這裏先舉三例：（一）原文第[2]和第[3]句在譯文中變成一個句子，即第{4}句。原文第[2]句（“說畢，二人去了。”）在譯文中變成複合句中的一個時間狀語從句（即 As the two others left,）。（二）原文第[10]句在譯文中變成了三句（即第{13}、{14}、{15}句）。（三）原文第[12]句在譯文中是第{17}、{18}、{19}句和第{20}句中的一部份；原文中第[12]句和第[13]句是兩個獨立的句子，但在譯文中第{20}卻把原文對應句子上面的內容包括進來。這裏的討論表明，原文與譯文在句子方面也是不對等的。

再看一個較複雜的例子：原文中的“（……更兼兩回凍惱奔

波，因此三五下裏夾攻，不覺就得了一病：）①心內發膨脹，②口中無滋味，③腳下如棉，④眼中似醋，⑤黑夜作燒，⑥白晝常倦，⑦下溺連精，⑧嗽痰帶血。（諸如此症，不上一年都全添上了。）”在譯文中不但結構不一樣，而且順序也作了調整：

原文中的順序	譯文的結構及譯文	譯文中的順序
①→	名詞，充當介詞賓語：heartburn	①
②→	名詞片語，充當介詞賓語：loss of appetite	②
③→	獨立結構：his legs trembled	⑤
④→	獨立結構：his eyes smarted	⑥
⑤→	小句：he was feverish at night	⑦
⑥→	(省略)小句：(he was) exhausted by day	⑧
⑦→	名詞片語：emissions in his urine	③
⑧→	名詞片語：blood in hid phlegm	④

表2：《紅樓夢》原文與譯文的小句和片語（短語）的比較

從表2可以看出，原文的順序在譯文中作了調整，譯文中各個結構的排列是據其結構的複雜性而定的，即：簡單先出現，複雜後出現：名詞（①）→名詞片語（②③④）→獨立結構（⑤⑥）→小句（⑦⑧）。這種原文和譯文結構在排列方面不一致的情況的例子還有很多；例如，原文的第[1]句先說“拉着賈瑞”，再說“仍熄了燈”，而譯文卻說blew out the light，然後再說dragged Jia Rui out...。

從詞的對應方面看，原文和譯文也存在着大量的不對等情況，這點是明顯的，不贅述。

八、結語

本文對翻譯學中的翻譯單位的確定問題作了一些初步的探討。由於翻譯學界對這一問題還沒有比較一致的看法，且各持己見，因此，我們認為有必要對這一問題提出自己的看法，以求教於翻譯界的前輩和同仁。

本文的理論基礎是功能語篇分析。上面的討論可小結如下：

（一）在翻譯實踐中，原文和譯文的對等無論從句平面，還是片語（短語）平面和詞平面都是不容易做到的。正因為如此，把句子或片語（短語）甚至詞作為翻譯單位就不一定合適。

（二）語篇是語義單位，在翻譯實踐中是翻譯的物件。翻譯的目的是把原文的整體意義再現於譯文之中，形式只是體現意義的方式。

（三）在翻譯的過程中，翻譯的單位是語篇。如果該語篇可以從語篇體裁角度進行語義切分，則可把這些語義部份作為翻譯單位的小單位。但無論如何，翻譯單位是語義概念，而不是語法概念。

注釋

- [1] 楊憲益、戴乃迭夫婦譯的《紅樓夢》得到廣泛認可。因此，我們在此把它作為可接受的譯文進行分析。

參考文獻

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London:

Routledge.

Bassett, S. (1980/1991). *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Eggs, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994/2000). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 北京：外語教學與研究出版社。

Shuttleworth, M. and M. Cowie. (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: ST. Jerome Publishing.

黃國文 (1988), 《語篇分析概要》, 長沙：湖南教育出版社。

——. (2001a), 《語篇分析的理論與實踐》, 上海：上海外語教育出版社。

——. (2001b), 〈功能語篇分析縱橫談〉, 《外語與外語教學》(12)。

林煌天主編 (1997), 《中國翻譯詞典》, 武漢：湖北教育出版社。

呂俊 (1992), 〈談語段作為翻譯單位〉, 《山東外語教學》(1-2)。

羅選民 (1992), 〈論翻譯的轉換單位〉, 《外語教學與研究》(4)。

申雨平 (2000), 〈《換言之：翻譯教程》導讀〉, 《換言之：翻譯教程》, 北京：外語教學與研究出版社。

司顯柱 (2001), 〈對近二十年中國譯學界對翻譯單位命題研究的述評〉, 《外語學刊》(1)。

譚載喜 (2001), 〈翻譯學：新世紀的思索〉, 《外語與外語教學》(1)。

許鈞主編 (1998), 〈《翻譯思考錄》前言〉, 《翻譯思考錄》, 武漢：湖北教育出版社。

張德祿 (1998), 《功能文體學》, 濟南：山東教育出版社。

張美芳 (1997), 〈翻譯學——關係繁多的綜合性學科〉, 載黃國文、張文浩主編《語文研究群言集》, 廣州：中山大學出版社。

——. (2001), 〈從語篇分析的角度看翻譯中的對等〉, 《現代外語》(1)。

作者簡介

黃國文, 男, 中山大學外國語學院英語系教授、博士生導師, “語言學與應用語言學”碩士(廣州外國語學院); “應用語言學”博士(愛丁堡大學), “功能語言學”博士(威爾士大學)。二十年來在學術刊物發表論文100多篇, 出版了《語篇分析概要》(1988)、《英語複合句》(1996)、*Meaning and Form* (Norwood, N. J.: Ablex, 1996)、《語文研究群言集》(1997)、《英語語言問題研究》(1999)、《語篇分析的理論與實踐》(2001)、*Discourse and Language Functions* (2002)、《語篇·語言功能·語言教學》(2002)等著作。研究興趣包括：功能語言學、語篇分析、翻譯研究。

張美芳, 1977年於中山大學外語系畢業, 1981至1982年在香港大學修讀英國當代文學與翻譯課程, 1983至1987年在中山大學在職修讀研究生課程, 1996至1999年在香港浸會大學攻讀博士學位, 1999年獲香港浸會大學(翻譯研究)哲學博士學位後回中山大學工作, 曾任中山大學英語系主任。現為中山大學教授, 中山大學學術委員會委員, 英國Middlesex大學榮譽教授, 澳門大學客座教授; 中國英漢語對比研究會常務理事, 廣東省翻譯協會理事, 《外語與外語教學》雜誌編委。近年來, 在中外知名刊物中發表了二十多篇學術論文, 探討英漢翻譯問題及評介當代西方翻譯理論, 論述的主題包括：翻譯學學科建設、翻譯與文化研究、翻譯教材研究、翻譯研究方法、語篇語言學與翻譯研究、功能語篇分析與翻譯研究等。主要著作有《中國英漢翻譯教材研究》(2001)、《圖說香港電影史》(譯著, 1997)。

廣角鏡下翻譯名家新觀點

《翻譯新焦點》。劉靖之主編。香港：商務印書館，2003，xiii + 310頁。ISBN 962-07-1686-8。

香港無疑還是一個擁有多元文化及語言的社會，我們日常所讀的文字非中則英，其中當然不乏譯文，加上這個城市的歷史背景，其語文現象包括翻譯一直都很值得分題探討。劉靖之是香港文藝學術界的重要人物，活躍於香港翻譯界逾三十年，所編所寫的翻譯著作有十部。這部《翻譯新焦點》從性質、體例、內容來看，都可見編者視為其《翻譯論集》（1981）及《翻譯新論集》（1991）的後繼之製。十年一度似的，劉靖之再為譯界編成一部定期檔案，蒐集學者專家就中英互譯當中及以外的語言及文化課題的文章。

本集收錄專題文章十篇，書前有編者的“代序”一篇，篇名與書名相同。劉氏是寫概覽式論述文字的能手。他在1981年為《翻譯論集》所寫的代序，題為〈重神似不重形似：嚴復以來的翻譯理論〉，文長15頁，注釋25條，本身就是一篇深入淺出的翻譯理論史論文。文中不乏識明膽張之論，筆者很深印象的是這個斷語：“五十年代和六十年代的翻譯理論基本上沒有超出嚴復和林語堂這兩位大師所討論的範疇”（頁5），當年林語堂在絕大多數內地的學者筆下，無論其思想、文字，都是負面人物。

在這部《翻譯新焦點》中，劉氏的“代序”發揮一貫的夾敘

夾議筆法，為我們解讀轉變中香港的翻譯現象，例如：“香港的翻譯在20世紀80年代經歷了前所未有的發展，促成這種發展是基於兩大因素……”，下面的一大段話近四百字，相信有興趣閱讀的人不會少。編者之後對所蒐文章逐一介紹，最少的也有二、三百字，這種提要的工作並不是每一篇都那麼容易做的，因為在這部論文集中，並非很多像〈三言兩語辨中英〉這樣明快的文字，碰到〈句子翻譯內外觀：論句子作為關鍵的功能翻譯單位及其文本責任〉這樣的45頁長文，編者仍能舉其大要，並指出此文其實與〈三言兩語辨中英〉遙相呼應，可見導讀之功真是不少。

第一篇是劉靖之的〈21世紀的翻譯：香港的角色與作用〉，為不同背景的讀者提供了簡明而全面的歷史資料，包括大學的翻譯教學與研究，並介紹了法律語言和法定語言的政治、經濟及社會涵義，這些論述不但為回歸前的“風雨歷程”立一個簡記，對於本集及以後出版的相關論集更有承先啓後的作用。文章的“結語”部份認為香港應該建立“自己的翻譯理論”，又認為香港的中、英文水平有待提高，雖然都不是新見，但的確值得一提再提。

第二至第五篇從理論層面探討翻譯的各種問題。譚載喜的〈再論翻譯學〉細說“翻譯”應該是甚麼一回事：是“學科”？是“科學”？還是“研究”？譚氏在文末力陳我們要以科學態度研究翻譯，要將“翻譯學”建立起來。羅選民的〈跨文化視野中的異化、歸化翻譯〉和孫藝風的〈翻譯距離與視角轉換〉討論文化事物的翻譯，以至如何在譯入語及其文化和原文的文化之間取得站腳點。羅選民認為譯界討論歸化和異化“多是停留在語言研究的層面”，於是他便來從跨文化的角度探討這問題。文章分五

節：引言、關於“直譯”與“意譯”、漢語中的歸化／異化、歸化與異化的理論與實踐、結語。此文題目很大，惜篇幅較短，舉例論理均稍見淺嘗輒止，其實此文談的主要是“異化論”的接受問題。孫氏的文章從認知差異及審美心理等角度，探討轉換視角如何影響文化距離。這是一篇立論流暢的學術論文。

劉宓慶〈中國翻譯理論研究的新里程〉一文提倡翻譯體制化，使翻譯能發揮其社會、跨學科及學科研究的功能。劉氏的翻譯理論十分偏重於語言學理論和研究，又有清晰的圖表輔助闡釋論點，不過其理論層次頗深，陳義亦高，“以新的理論思維和取向構建翻譯學”，如此一來，務實的讀者也許一時之間目為之眩，未能充份掌握。

第六篇是朱純深的〈句子翻譯內外觀：論句子作為關鍵的功能翻譯單位及其文本責任〉。該文把西方有關文本與語域的主張套用於中英翻譯上的語文研究，並介紹句子的訊息結構及其與文本的關係，從而分析這些關係如何影響譯入語的結構。文章分三個個案討論不同問題，提出認清原文文本有助於有效地翻譯原文的文字風格和訊息鋪排。

黃國彬是譯界罕見能創作、能翻譯、能論理，而又無一不精的高手。〈三言兩語辨中英〉從對比語法的角度，舉出不少清楚的例子並加以說明，論點精闢而易明，事理明而文氣旺，極富姿采，入門者可先讀此文，再讀朱氏的文章，會更易把握。

第八篇是朱志瑜的〈清末民初時期關於翻譯名義的討論〉，文章介紹當時兼從事翻譯的學者如何處理外來語名稱的翻譯及他們的不同主張，為這方面提供頗充實的資訊。

香港政府的法律草擬專員嚴元浩的〈香港雙語法例計劃〉清

楚說明在華語都會雙語法律制度是必然、必須的。這制度不但有利於推行公民教育，更有助大眾行使知法權利。英語法律裏有很多不合時的語句，加上香港回歸適逢新世紀之始，政府與本地法律界更有責任為市民以現代的“淺白語”重新草擬整套法例，於是使用十年時間成就這明法利民的佳話。

第十篇是閔福德（John Minford）的〈功夫翻譯、翻譯功夫〉。這位學者對於華語文學獨有的文體——武俠小說——有很大貢獻和影響。一位外國人與《紅樓夢》及金庸的小說結緣，再對古典至現、當代華語文學都有無限興趣，這已是不可多得的美事；要立志將之推向海外而又得心應手者就更是絕倫。閔福德這位“吉卜賽學人”在十多頁中用輕鬆的語錄體記錄自己翻譯的歷程和奇想，使人讀來更感生動。文中點點滴滴的意見皆大膽而見卓識，例如評韋理（Arthur Waley）所譯李煜的《望江南》，謂其雖有誤讀，但“展現了過人的詩藝，大膽而動人”。

這部《翻譯新焦點》大部份文章都不難讀，較艱深的一兩篇其實都很有意思。一如劉氏過往所編的兩部翻譯論集，這兒的文章有普及易讀的，也有進階的，為對翻譯有興趣的人士和在大專修讀有關課程的學生概括了中英翻譯的一些基本知識和研究的新發展，有助讀者把文字觸覺鍛鍊得更敏銳，在這門學問得到更深的認識。全書校對甚精，暫時只發現“代序”頁 iv 第 7 行漏一“學”字，第 295 頁第 17 行“色”當作“式”，第 19 行的“挨”字在繁體字的印刷物中當作“捱”。

本書絕對是近年較重要的翻譯論文集，專家學者大概不會錯過任何一篇，但是一般讀者又如何？筆者建議翻譯工作者、翻譯班的學生，以及一般對翻譯或中英語文有興趣的讀者，也許可以

先讀劉氏的“代序”和他的論文，再讀黃國彬和閔福德的兩篇趣味盎然的文章，其一論英譯中，其一論中譯英，由題目以至內容，均見語言的機慧，不見堆積如山的理論，卻有仙則靈。

作者簡介

曾家輝，香港大學文學士，主修翻譯，現為哲學碩士研究生，曾於中文系任翻譯科導師。

BOOK NEWS



Recent Asian Perspectives on Translation: The View from Hong Kong and India

The history of translation studies in the Chinese context over the past two or more decades has been one of rapid development and diversification. The publication in 1981 of Liu Ching-chih's 劉靖之 *Fanyi Lunji* 翻譯論集 (*Essays on Translation*) marked an important step in this development, serving to draw together a range of crucially important Chinese essays from across the twentieth century that detailed the Chinese experience of translation. The essays in that volume, whilst dealing with a range of issues, revealed the clear importance of literary translation in the tradition. Subsequent trends, some global, others highly specific to the Chinese and Hong Kong situations, were to open up new fields of interest: the reform process that began in China in the 1980s, and Hong Kong's return to China in 1997, for instance, shifted attention to such areas as business translation and legal translation as valid – and necessary – fields of scholarly inquiry. Liu's second major collection of essays, *Fanyi Xin Lunji* 翻譯新論集 (*New Essays on Translation*), published precisely a decade after the first volume, attempted to give a sense of this changing emphasis, offering a collection of more recent works.

Not surprisingly, another decade on, we find the discipline still more varied, and in the spirit of those two previous works, a third volume has been necessary in order to take stock of some of those changes. Liu's newly-published collection, *Fanyi Xin Jiaodian* 翻譯新焦點 (*Translation: A New Focus*), Hong Kong: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 2003, sets about this task by bringing together a series of ten papers by leading

scholars in the Chinese translation milieu. The papers might loosely be divided into three groupings: four are concerned principally with the current state of translation theory, reviewing recent and possible future issues of importance. Another two are concerned with more specifically focused linguistic issues, whilst a further three deal with thematic areas including the translation of names, legal translation, and the translation of kung-fu. Liu's own essay aims to set the broader background for the whole collection by asking what the future and role of translation will be in Hong Kong in the unfolding new century.

The changes of emphasis charted in Liu's collections have been borne out in a whole plethora of recently published works which seek to provide a more systematic and serious treatment of non-literary translation. To cite but three of the latest additions to the fold from Hong Kong publishers: Lu Wenhui 陸文慧 (ed.), *Faliu Fanyi: Cong Shijian Chufa* 法律翻譯：從實踐出發 (*Legal Translation in Practice*), Hong Kong: Zhonghua Shuju, 2002, which is notable for its inclusion of a number of works by those in the legal profession, and which incorporates a strong Hong Kong interest; Chen Shibin's 陳仕彬 *Jinrong Fanyi Jifa* 金融翻譯技法 (*Techniques of Financial Translation*), Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2003; and Xu Jianzhong's 許建忠 *Gongshang Qiye Fanyi Shiwu* 工商企業翻譯實務 (*Business Translation Practice*), also published by Chinese University Press this year. Other works of a similar bent are certain to follow.

Like Hong Kong, India is another post-colonial society in which issues of language and power have long been central. With the growth of translation studies as a discipline, Indian scholars working on issues of post-colonialism have increasingly looked to translation as an important new paradigm through which to explore issues of language and dominance, as works by those such as Spivak, Bhabha, Niranjana and Trivedi attest. The appearance of two further publications recently

continues to demonstrate the importance of the Indian perspective in the Translation studies field. Rukmini Bhaya Nair (ed.), *Translation, Text and Theory: The Paradigm of India*, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2002, is a collection bringing together some eighteen essays by Indian scholars (Niranjana among them), which explore differing perspectives from the historical to the cultural, linguistic, pragmatic and philosophical. More recently, a second publication has appeared which also attempts to address the Indian context as a whole: Rita Kothari's *Translating India*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 2003. Of particular interest in Kothari's work is the emphasis on Gujarat as a case study. Gujarat, which is perhaps most well-known for its mercantile tradition, has sometimes been overlooked in regard to its literary and textual heritage, with other Indian traditions such as Bengal being given prominence. The focus on Gujarat here may be welcomed not only by those in the translation community, but also by those engaged in researching Gujarati textual traditions in general.

Returning to the Chinese context, two further recent publications deserve mention. Eugene Eoyang's *"Borrowed Plumage": Polemical Essays on Translation*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003, provides what the publisher describes as "a provocative potpourri of fascinating insights into the cultural and semiotic complexities of translation", which will prove of interest to a wide readership. Of interest to a perhaps more narrow audience is Idoia Arbillaga (ed.), *La literatura china traducida en España*, Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 2003. Perhaps due to the relative unusualness of the language pair Spanish-Chinese, it is sometimes easy to overlook the vital importance of the Spanish-Chinese cultural encounter. Covering a range of text types, both literary and non-literary, and with an extensive bibliography of Spanish translations of Chinese texts, this book will be an important work for those in the field.

Book-reviews and Book-news Editor

進口洋貨 本土包裝

《視角：翻譯學研究》。道勒拉普（Cay Dollerup）主編、中文版主編王寧。北京：清華大學出版社，2003，xiii+311頁。ISBN 7-302-06943-3。

國際權威的翻譯學期刊 *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 創刊於 1993 年，由丹麥的哥本哈根大學英文系和翻譯研究中心合辦，編者有國際著名翻譯學者道勒拉普（Cay Dollerup）等人。初期為半年刊，每期都是 144 頁，編審嚴謹，獲國際權威的學術檢索系統 Arts and Humanities Citation Index 和 MLA International Bibliography 等認證為翻譯研究源刊，其論文收錄率達八成以上，論文的撮要也見收錄於 Sociological Abstracts 和 Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts。

由 2000 年起這份刊物改由英國專門出版翻譯研究書刊的出版社 Multilingual Matters 出版，並改為每期 40 頁的季刊。到了 2002 年，哥本哈根大學與清華大學的外語系合辦這份刊物，由編委會授權清華大學出版社來出版和銷售中國內地版，原版的版權仍歸英國 Multilingual Matters 有限公司所有。

這部《視角：翻譯學研究》內文完全複製英語原版 2002 年的第一至四期，但封面和出版資料頁都沒有交代這一點，卻見另署為“第一卷”，看來有意為中國版自開新枝。此版和原版不同的地方還有兩處，其一為正文前有中文版主編王寧的中文長序，題

為〈翻譯中的文化和文化研究中的翻譯轉向〉，王寧是清華大學比較文學與文化研究中心的主任；其二為每期都附有一篇中文〈簡評〉，文長千餘字，簡單介紹該期的十數篇論文。〈簡評〉的執筆者是清華大學翻譯與跨學科研究中心的主任羅選民。

Perspectives: Studies in Translatology 是刊登中國學者文章最多的國際語文期刊之一，現在每年的四期合為一卷另以中國版面世，僅售 38 元人民幣，應該對推動中國的翻譯研究學者與國際學術界交流和對話大有幫助。有興趣一覽自 1993-2002 年各期的目錄及論文撮要，可到這個網址翻閱：www.engelsk.ku.dk/translationstudies。

書評及書話編輯

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：香港薄扶林道香港大學亞洲研究中心轉《翻譯季刊》主編劉靖之教授。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. The *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 the *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves on the first page, in the top or bottom margins, or in endnotes. A separate cover page with the title of the article, the name of the author and his/her institutional affiliation should be provided.
8. Book reviews are to follow the same format as that for submitted articles; they should be typed and doubled-spaced, giving at the outset the full citation for the work reviewed, plus information about special features (like appendices and illustrations) and prices. Unsolicited book reviews are as a rule not accepted.
9. Contributions should be submitted in both soft and hard copies, to Professor Liu Ching-chih, c/o Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, 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，學會會長劉靖之教授出任主編，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

香港翻譯學會義務司庫

黃紹顏女士聯絡

地址：中華商務聯合印刷（香港）有限公司

香港大埔汀麗路36號中華商務印刷大廈14字樓

電話：+852 2666 4888

傳真：+852 2666 4889

電郵：treasurer@hkts.org.hk

網址：http://hkts.org.hk

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 President, Professor Liu Ching-chih, 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 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:

Ms Candy Wong

Honorary Treasurer, The Hong Kong Translation Society

Address: C & C Joint Printing Co. (H. K.) Ltd.

14/F, C & C Building, 36 Ting Lai Road

Tai Po, Hong Kong

Tel: +852 2666 4888

Fax: +852 2666 4889

Email: treasurer@hkts.org.hk

Website: http://hkts.org.hk



香港翻譯學會有限公司
Hong Kong Translation Society Ltd.
香港軒尼詩道郵政信箱20186號
P. O. Box 20186, Hennessey Road Post Office, Hong Kong
網址 (Web): <http://hkts.org.hk>

Translation Quarterly 《翻譯季刊》 Subscription Order Form 訂閱表格

請填妥下列表格，連同劃線支票或電匯單影印本郵寄
香港新界大埔汀麗路36號中華商務印刷大廈14字樓
香港翻譯學會義務司庫黃紹顏女士收

Please complete the following order form and send your cheque payment or copy of remittance advice to

Ms. Candy Wong, Hon. Treasurer
The Hong Kong Translation Society Ltd
14/F C & C Building
36 Ting Lai Road
Tai Po, Hong Kong

You may send your order by fax at +852 26664889 or e-mail at treasurer@hkts.org.hk
歡迎傳真訂閱表到+(852) 2666 4889 或電郵 treasurer@hkts.org.hk

訂閱年期及費用 subscription rate	本地 Hong Kong	中港台 China, Macau, Taiwan	海外 overseas
<input type="checkbox"/> 一年(1 year)	HK\$240	HK\$285/RMB300	US\$50
<input type="checkbox"/> 二年(2 years)	HK\$450	HK\$500/RMB530	US\$90
<input type="checkbox"/> 三年(3 years)	HK\$650	HK\$735/RMB775	US\$125

Starting from issue # _____ 期起訂閱

Payment method 付款方式:

- ☐ by cheque/bank draft: number _____ (Bank _____)
payable to **The Hong Kong Translation Society Limited**
☐ 郵寄支票/匯票: 票據號碼 _____ (銀行 _____)
支票/匯票抬頭人 香港翻譯學會有限公司
- ☐ by T/T to Hang Seng Bank Ltd., 4 Hankow Road, Tsimshatsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong
Account holder: The Hong Kong Translation Society Ltd.
Account number: 024-295-003941-001
電匯香港: 香港九龍尖沙咀漢口道4號恒生銀行帳號 024-295-003941-001 香港翻譯學會有限公司收
- ☐ 電匯國內: 中信實業銀行深圳分行金山支行帳號 74423-1-01-920-011728-89 黃紹顏收

* 請訂戶自付電匯手續費

簽名 Signature _____

日期 Date _____

姓名(Name)	
機構(Affiliation)	
地址(Address)	
聯絡人(Contact person)	
電話(Tel.)	
傳真(Fax.)	

Office use			
------------	--	--	--

Translation Quarterly 《翻譯季刊》 Back Issues and Other HKTS Publications

Order Form

By fax to: Ms Candy Wong
@+(852) 2666 4885
By e-mail to: treasurer@hkts.org.hk

or by mail to: Ms Candy Wong
c/o C & C Joint Printing
14/F, 36 Ting Lai Road
Tai Po, N.T., Hong Kong

* Price is subject to change without prior notice.

Title	No. of pages	Listed price	Promotional * price @	Local S & H per copy	Qty	Total Amount
<i>Fu Lei and his World (paperback)</i>	338	HK\$75	HK\$40	HK\$8		
<i>Fu Lei and his World (hardcover)</i>	338	HK\$115	HK\$60	HK\$12		
<i>Translation Quarterly #1 (1995)</i>	84	HK\$40	HK\$30	HK\$3		
<i>Translation Quarterly #2 (1995)</i>	94	HK\$40	HK\$30	HK\$3		
<i>Translation Quarterly #3 & 4 (1997)</i>	210	HK\$100	HK\$60	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #5 & 6 (1997)</i>	240	HK\$120	HK\$72	HK\$8		
<i>Proceedings of Conference on Translation Teaching held on 2-4 December 1997</i>	570	HK\$120	HK\$120	HK\$16		
<i>Translation Quarterly #7 & 8 (1998)</i>	203	HK\$100	HK\$60	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #9 & 10 (1998)</i>	192	HK\$100	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #11 & 12 (1999)</i>	248	HK\$120	HK\$100	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #13 & 14 (1999)</i>	264	HK\$120	HK\$100	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #15 (2000)</i>	94	HK\$60	HK\$40	HK\$3		
<i>Translation Quarterly #16 & 17 (2000)</i>	160	HK\$120	HK\$100	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #18 & 19 (2000/2001)</i>	234	HK\$120	HK\$100	HK\$8		
<i>Translation Quarterly #20 (2001)</i>	134	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #21 & 22 (2001)</i>	148	HK\$120	HK\$120	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #23 (2002)</i>						
Special Issue I: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	123	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #24 (2002)</i>						
Special Issue II: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	128	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #25 (2002)</i>						
Special Issue III: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	128	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #26 (2002)</i>						
Special Issue IV: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	116	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #27 (2003)</i>						
Special Issue V: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	115	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #28 (2003)</i>						
Special Issue VI: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	108	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
<i>Translation Quarterly #29 (2003)</i>						
Special Issue VII: Selected papers presented at the FIT-Third Asian Translators' Forum	132	HK\$60	HK\$60	HK\$4		
Overseas shipping & handling, if applicable (see below for rates)						
Total						HK\$

USD1=HK\$7.7 GBP1=HK\$12.5 AUD1=HK\$5.0 EUR1=HK\$8.5 HKD1=RMB1.06

For overseas purchases, please indicate your choice of delivery methods:-

Overseas shipping & handling	Macau, Taiwan, Mainland China	Other Asia-Pacific countries	U.S.A., U.K., E.C.U. etc.
Surface mail	HK\$15/copy	HK\$20/copy	HK\$25/copy
Second class airmail	HK\$40/copy	HK\$40/copy	HK\$50/copy

Signature _____ Membership no. _____

Name (in block letters) _____ Date: _____

Contact person: _____ Telephone: _____

Payment by cheque: cheque number _____ (Bank _____)

Office use _____

Mailing labels - please print or write your mailing address in block letters:

Name:		Name:	
Address		Address	