

Translation Quarterly

No. 66 2012

Special Issue I:

Papers from the Fourth

Lingnan-Tsinghua

Translation Symposium

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by

The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇一二年
第六十六期
第四屆嶺南—
清華翻譯
研討會(一)

《翻譯季刊》

二〇一二年十二月 第六十六期

版權所有，未經許可，不得轉載。

Translation Quarterly

No. 66, December 2012

All Rights Reserved

Copyright © 2012 THE HONG KONG TRANSLATION SOCIETY

ISSN 1027-8559-66



The Hong Kong Translation Society has entered into an electronic licensing relationship with EBSCO Publishing, the world's most prolific aggregator of full text journals, magazines and other sources. The full text of the *Translation Quarterly* can be found on EBSCO Publishing's databases.



翻譯季刊

Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會
The Hong Kong Translation Society

創刊主編 **Founding Chief Editor**

劉靖之 Liu Ching-chih

主編 **Chief Editor**

陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan

執行主編 **Executive Editors**

倪若誠 Robert Neather 潘漢光 Joseph Poon

副執行主編 **Associate Executive Editors**

李忠慶 Lee Tong King 邵璐 Shao Lu

編輯委員會 **Editorial Board**

劉靖之 (主席) Liu Ching-chih (Chairman)
陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan 金聖華 Serena Jin
黎翠珍 Jane Lai 倪若誠 Robert Neather
潘漢光 Joseph Poon 黃國彬 Laurence Wong

顧問委員會 **Advisory Board**

鄭仰平 Cheng Yang-ping Mona Baker
賴恬昌 Lai Tim-cheong Cay Dollerup
林文月 Lin Wen-yueh 葛浩文 Howard Goldblatt
羅新璋 Lo Xinzhang Wolfgang Lörcher
余國藩 Anthony Yu 馬悅然 Göran Malmqvist
余光中 Yu Kwang-chung 沈安德 James St. André
Gideon Toury

編務經理 **Editorial Manager**

馬偉東 Tony Ma

Translation Quarterly No. 66, December 2012

Special Issue I: Papers from the Fourth
Lingnan-Tsinghua Translation Symposium

目錄 CONTENTS

vi Chief Editor's Note

論文 Articles

- 1 語文學與翻譯 余石屹
- 21 The Remake as a Translation: Localism, *Dorothy WONG*
Globalism and the Afterlife of
Horror Movies
- 31 The Latvian Translation Scene: *Andrejs*
Paradigms, Change and Centrality *VEISBERGS*
- 58 張愛玲英譯《海上花列傳》的女性翻 王小鶯
譯詩學
- 77 Deconstructing Comparative *Alan TSE Chung*
Translation: Facts, Myths and
Limitations

書評 Book Review

- 86 Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries WANG Hui
- 94 稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors
- 98 徵求訂戶啟事 Subscribing to *Translation Quarterly*
- 100 訂戶表格 Subscription and Order Form

Chief Editor's Note

After five special issues on the FIT Sixth Asian Translators' Forum (in 2011-12), the *Translation Quarterly* presents, beginning with this issue, selected articles from the Fourth Lingnan-Tsinghua Translation Symposium on "Translation and Interpretation Research: Global and Local Contexts."

Jointly organized by the Department of Translation of Lingnan University and the Department of Foreign Languages of Tsinghua University (Beijing), the symposium was held on 18-19 December. It coincided with the tenth anniversary of research collaboration between the two universities, which had begun with the first symposium held in Beijing in 2000.

Within the broad framework of "Translation and Interpretation Research: Global and Local Contexts," the symposium provided a forum for the discussion of issues related to translation and interpretation research in a globalized context, with a special focus on the synergetic relationship between work currently undertaken in China and theoretical trends developed elsewhere in the world. Presented on the two days of the symposium were papers on nine sub-themes: (a) local and global translation studies, (b) Chinese responses to Western theories of translation, (c) future perspectives for translation research in China, (d) the non-Western turn in translation studies, (e) interpreting research, East and West, (f) translation historiography: Chinese and Western models, (g) Postcolonial/feminist/sociological approaches to translation in China, and (h) comparisons between translation traditions.

For the symposium, five distinguished translation scholars gave keynote speeches. Edwin Gentzler spoke on "Micro- and

Macro-turns in Translation: New Definitions for the New World”, Paisley Livingston on “On Translation and Cinematic Adaptations”, Douglas Robinson on “Somatizing Narrativity”, Luise von Flotow on “Translating Women: Agency across Cultures”, and Wang Ning on “Translating Modernity and (Re) Constructing World Literature”. Over 40 papers were presented in 10 parallel sessions, and some 100 translation scholars, teachers, researchers and students coming from USA, Britain, Canada, Japan, Israel, Latvia, Ireland, Australia, Mainland China and Taiwan attended the various functions.

Now, featured in two consecutive issues of this journal are the finalized versions of articles originally presented there, by scholars from USA, Europe, Mainland China and Hong Kong, on topics as varied as translation and philology, adaptation as translation, pragmatics and simultaneous interpreting—all signaling some of the newest, most exciting research trends in the field.

Leo Chan

December 2012

語文學與翻譯

余石屹

Abstract

Philology and Translation (by Yu Shi-yi)

Since the turn of the new century, philology has been making a strong return to the humanities. Prominent among the advocates of this ancient interpretive model and “science of reading” was the late professor of English at Columbia University Edward Said, who went so far as to argue that philology is the “abiding basis for all humanistic practice”. In this article we argue, along with Said, that translation studies as a most vigorous humanistic practice today would be seriously handicapped without taking philology as its fundamental method. Then the return to philology in general will necessarily mean that translation studies should start to embrace philology, which entails a refreshed look into the philological aspects of translation, including choosing a sound base-text for translation, reading, interpretation, expression, and a new interpretation of reception and resistance, the two missions of reading according to Said, in translational terms.

“不知言，無以知人也。”

—《論語·堯曰第二十》

“頌其詩，讀其書，不知其人，可乎？是以論其世也，是尚友也。”

—《孟子·萬章下》

“是則不知古人之世，不可妄論古人之辭也。知其世矣，不知古人之身處，亦不可以遽論其文也。”

—章學誠：《文史通義·文德》

前言

語文學是語言文字之學的簡稱，又稱為小學，在現代漢語中常用來指我國集文字、訓詁和聲韻研究為一體的傳統的語言研究學科，其歷史可以上溯到漢代甚至以前，但早期它主要是一門幫助學生正確釋讀古代典籍的學問和方法，時至今日，這一功能仍是語文學的主要任務之一。^[1]我們這裡使用的語文學是 *philologie* 的譯文，它與中國的傳統有聯繫也有區別，在西方也是一門從語言入手來研究閱讀的古老學問，到十八至十九世紀又成為西方人文學科中長期佔據主導地位的研究方法。作為一門語言研究學科，在西方學術史上，主要指的是十八世紀以來古典語言如希臘語和拉丁語的研究，在近代東方學興起後，又包括了東方語言以及現代民族語言的研究，其光輝在二十世紀初逐漸被所謂的科學的現代語言學所掩蓋。^[2]作為一種“普遍的”研究方法，在人文學科領域也曾經輝煌一時，但也是在二十世紀初期就逐漸失去了主導地位，比如在文學研究中，二十世紀二十年代新批評興起之後，語文學方法就逐漸邊緣化，尤其是在上世紀下半葉文學理論的黃金時代，幾近銷聲匿跡，其名聲之微，有人乾脆把它翻譯成考證學，暗示它與我國明清遺老迂腐老套的經學考證相似，用以譏諷其自命清高、脫離實際的學術取向。^[3]

進入新世紀之後，語文學在歐美學術界漸次露出一些復興跡象。在西方人文學科的不同領域，都有學者公開出來宣稱語文學是自己的研究方法或物件，或呼籲給以重新評價。^[4]在這種語文學的回歸浪潮中，最引人注目的是美國著名的巴勒斯坦裔文學批評家愛德華·薩義德(Edward W. Said)，他對語文學寄予厚望，甚至認為新世紀危機四伏的人文學研究，捨之難以走出目前的困境。作為前衛的後殖民理論

家，薩義德此舉，無論怎麼說，多少有點令人出乎意外。大凡讀過他的名著《東方學》的人都會記得，雖然他對西方語文學在十八、十九世紀取得的驕人成績不時流露出讚歎之情，但是他也對這種語文學作了最強烈的批評，他認為厄納斯·赫南(Ernest Renan)等東方學者就是利用語文學這一工具，把他們充滿文化偏見、種族歧視的研究包裝成貌似科學的結論，“就赫南而言，正是語文學讓他的研究取得了合法性”。^[5]那麼，在《東方學》(1978)之後，尤其是在二十一世紀開初這個特殊的歷史時期，為什麼薩義德轉而力挺鑽故紙堆的語文學？語文學在他的話語中呈現出什麼樣的面貌？有什麼新的內涵？以薩義德在西方文學批評界的顯著地位而論，他的意見無疑具有一定代表性，所以我們可以先來仔細閱讀一下他的著作，瞭解他的看法，然後再來討論我們的主題，即語文學與翻譯的關係。

一、語文學：人文主義實踐的永恆基礎

新世紀伊始，薩義德在哥倫比亞大學以人文主義為題的系列演講中，對美國危機四伏的大學人文學科的前景以及人文主義者在新世紀所擔負的責任做了深入的思考，語文學是他討論的一個重要部分，這些演講於2004年即薩義德去世後才以《人文主義與民主批評》為題結集出版。雖然語文學這個話題貫穿全書各章，但是主要討論的文字是〈回到語文學〉一章。薩義德在該章的開場中首先承認語文學是一門非常不時髦的學問，容易讓人聯想到鑽故紙堆的老式學究。但是薩義德舉出最受當代學者推崇的現代西方最激進的思想家尼采，指出他總是首先把自己看成是一個語文學家，這一事實或許能讓害怕與語文學

沾邊的當代學者，鼓起勇氣與他一起來坦誠地探討這個問題。

薩義德簡短地回顧了一下語文學的歷史，認為語文學主要表達的是一種對言語的熱愛，是一門關於閱讀的科學。它作為一種學術訓練，在東西方（像薩義德的其他著作一樣，這裡東方主要是指阿拉伯文化傳統）重要的文化傳統中都一直佔有一席重要的位置。無論是東方的伊斯蘭學者還是西方的維科等大學者，他們很早就認識到語言本身在人類追求真理的過程起著特殊的作用，它負責承載、保存和轉遞人類的知識，所以人類要不斷獲取知識，就需要對言詞進行科學研究，提高閱讀和解碼水準，“閱讀的科學對於人文主義知識是極為重要的”。^[6] 在這一點上，薩義德的觀點令人想到十九世紀德國學者對語文學的推崇，在德國語文學家眼裡，語文學是“科學的女王”，一切學科的基礎，他們想把所有知識統一於其麾下。^[7] 但是薩義德顯然更願意把自己看成是在美國本土語文學傳統和伊斯蘭文化中成長起來的人文主義學者，並樂於以此身份來宣稱語文學作為閱讀的科學是一切人文主義實踐的“永恆的基礎”。^[8]

薩義德引述的本土傳統主要包括美國人文傳統中的里程碑式人物愛默生(Ralph Waldo Emerson)和當代美國研究泰斗理查·鮑里爾(Richard Poirier)，以及秉承歐洲語文學傳統、在二戰期間受納粹迫害而移居美國的著名學者，如艾裡希·奧爾巴赫(Erich Auerbach)和列奧·斯皮策(Leo Spitzer)等。愛默生把語言看成是變成了化石的詩歌，^[9] 認為語言中包含著一種巨大的能量。鮑里爾解釋說，愛默生的意思是“甚至在現在看來陳腐或死亡的言詞中，我們也能夠發現曾經鼓舞它們進行轉型的欲望。任何言詞，在其意義的變換甚至矛盾中，證明了早先的相反的用法；而正是這一點，鼓舞我們再次開啟它們，使它們產生更進一步的變化和轉喻”。^[10]

文學語言為我們提供了語言在實際運用中的最高層次的範例，它是最複雜、最有價值的語言實踐，為我們提供現實材料，同時它本身又是一個充滿能量、不斷抵抗和更新的動態過程，邀請讀者與之進行對話，等待我們開啟它們。那麼什麼才是語文學閱讀呢？“一種真正的語文學閱讀是積極的，”薩義德寫道，“它包括進入早已發生在言詞內部的語言的進程，並且使我們面前的任何文本中可能隱藏著的、或不完整的、或被遮蔽的、或被歪曲的東西洩露出來。”^[11]對當代人文主義者而言，閱讀有兩個重要的任務，即接受和抵抗。接受就是讓自己“諳練地進入文本”，進入它的歷史處境，由文本而理解整個歷史時代，同時把自己放在作者的位置，付出與作者同樣的努力，進入他的語言，以便理解他所處的社會和他如此創作的方式。他引用斯皮策的話來說明積極的閱讀總是指向作品內在的生命核心，而要達到這個核心則需要讀者作耐心的安心的閱讀。^[12]

閱讀的第二個任務是抵抗，也是最重要的任務。但是薩義德所討論的抵抗遠遠超出了愛默生、鮑里爾，尤其是斯皮策所謂的“語文學迴圈”的範圍，^[13]它涉及人文主義的歷史、文學的世間性及文學批評家作為人文主義者在當代的任務。作為人文主義者的一個重要職責，抵抗的核心是祛魔、質疑和批評。但是在二戰以後，人文主義的環境、目標和範圍已經完全不可與歐洲傳統的人文主義同日而語，薩義德用人文主義變化了的基礎來概括這種變化，他認為，歐洲傳統的人文主義主要關注的是歐洲人的價值、帝國的偉業，但是在後殖民時代，多元化社會，以及全球化浪潮中，人文主義關注的焦點轉向帝國主義對殖民地人民的蹂躪，對婦女兒童、移民、少數族裔等弱勢群體的歧視和壓迫上。薩義德希望當代的人文主義者能像達爾文那樣，以對小小昆蟲的研究來顛覆整個創世紀的神話，同時成為當代社會通行

觀念和價值的局中人和局外人，以質疑的精神來對充斥當代社會的文字資訊和話語霸權作語文學閱讀，打破沉默，開發記憶，從特殊發展到一般，重申人文主義的基本價值，“如果沒有一種脫胎換骨、詳盡闡述、非神秘化的普遍的悲憫、惻隱之深情，人文主義者就是俗話所說的空響的銅管和鑊鉞”。^[14]

二、翻譯與語文學

薩義德為美國當代人文主義事業開出的復興方案，最近得到了不少學者的積極回應。^[15]可以肯定的是，薩義德決不是呼籲回到以洪堡(Wilhelm von Humboldt)和曼克斯·米勒(Max Müller)為代表的那種局限於一種文化傳統、充滿偏見、目光短淺的古典語文學，而是希望發明一種善於吸收不同文明的先進成果、民主開放、以促進人類社會和諧共存為目的的新語文學。如果說翻譯今天也正式成為了一門人文學科，是人文主義實踐的一個日益成長壯大的組成部分，那麼這種語文學，也必然成為翻譯的基礎，為當今的翻譯實踐和研究提供積極有益的指導。^[16]下面我們就根據薩義德提出的基本思路，來討論翻譯跟語文學到底有哪些值得我們進一步研究的聯繫。

首先，我們知道翻譯活動對譯者而言涉及了選材、閱讀理解、資訊表達以及出版發行等環節，在這一過程中，選定了要翻譯的作品之後，確定正確可信並且有一定權威性的文本是最基本的環節。這一環節相當於語文學中考證和建立可信的文本的工作，這一工作是語文學的基本任務之一。語言學家索緒爾曾說過，“語文學的首要任務是對文本進行考訂、詮釋和評論。”^[17]雖然就古代文本而言，我們說沒有真正意義

上的原始文本和善本存在，所有的考證努力所獲，最多只能是相對完善的文本，但是，這種相對性，不能說是語文學工作無關緊要，相反正說明了在建立文本權威的過程中語文學的工作不是一蹴而就的，文本的可信度和權威性只有在不斷的考證過程中來把握。而且，只有在確定了文本的真偽和權威程度之後，接下來的工作如詮釋和評論才可以有可靠的基礎正常展開。翻譯是針對文本的翻譯，所以也必須要有正確可信的文本才可以取信於讀者，不然譯文將是鏡花水月，無以為根基。

那麼，從語文學角度視之，翻譯使用的文本應當符合那些標準才可以稱得上合格呢？在一般情況下，翻譯的源語文本首先是要有正當版權的文本，這大致是當下翻譯界選擇翻譯物件的文本時一般遵循的標準。對有多種版本的出版物，如果出版人沒有指定要翻譯哪一個特定的版本，那麼就應當考慮翻譯的是不是定本，有沒有權威性，這一文本的考證工作是翻譯前必須進行的環節。

在討論維護文本的權威性時，還應當包括對構成文本完整性和權威性的諸多語文學特點的尊重。其中一個最基本的語文學特點就是要尊重第一手材料，尊重源語，這一語文學原則體現在研究或翻譯中，就是一切都應以源語為起點展開，只有根據原始語言開展的研究或翻譯才能保證文本材料上的可信度。所以在翻譯中，就應當儘量以源語文本為底本，避免根據另一語言甚至是同一語言譯本做轉譯。我們堅持翻譯的這一語文學原則，把它作為衡量翻譯家資質的一個重要標準，並不否認相關的兩個推論。其一是雅克·德里達 (Jacques Derrida) 在哲學上的洞見，他揭示出翻譯本身就是我們認識世界的基本方式，不存在沒有翻譯痕跡的原始文本，因為即使最初的文本也是我們對存在現實的語言翻譯。其二，在語言上基於翻譯的不可避免，在歷史上它們甚至推動了文化的革新和發展，極大地影響了我們人類

文化存在的方式，而且如今也大量存在於我們的閱讀世界，讀者對此並不厭棄。在這一點上，霍米·巴巴 (Homi Bhabha) 認為世界上所有文化都無外乎翻譯文化這一說法是不無道理的。^[18]

在考慮翻譯文本時最棘手的一個問題是源語文本是用多種語言或混合語寫成的，如何從語文學角度來尊重它的特點？對翻譯者來說，我們認為應該從譯者的閱讀能力上來看。如果譯者能全部看懂理解所用的語言並進行翻譯，這就是源語文本和作者之大幸，是譯者對翻譯文本的尊重，因為至少他或他們是從源語進行翻譯的。這樣做，即使從本質上說翻譯的最終結果不可避免地讓原始文本的不同語言之間的張力和由此內含的意識形態扁平化、同質化了，但從譯文讀者的角度而言，他們也會因為得到了尊重而對這樣的處理表示理解。這種多語種和混合語言文本的翻譯，往往是譯者感到的糾結比讀者大得多。

《荒原》的首位漢譯者趙蘿蕤在上世紀30年代初次翻譯該詩時，把涉及的所有語言都譯成了漢語，但是在事隔半個多世紀之後出版的譯文最後定本中，她卻將題詩以及詩中的部分引語保留不動，聽憑漢譯文中同時出現兩種以上的語言，由此可以見出譯者的矛盾心理。作為讀者，我們不禁要問，這樣只譯英文，不譯詩中出現的拉丁文、德文、法文和梵文，還算是《荒原》的完整翻譯嗎？為什麼譯者要如此翻譯？是不是艾略特使用多種語言的意圖在詩意的傳達中佔據了太大的分量，非如此保留而不能盡顯其寓意？^[19]

二十世紀以來，從現代派到後現代派、後殖民主義文學，不少作家都不願把自己限於一種語言一種文化，同時使用多種語言創作幾乎成為一種風尚，而多種語言多種文化的混雜不僅僅是他們生活世界的真實景象，也是他們自我表達的一種重要方式，在很大程度上說，同質化的翻譯取消了這些作家的意識形態鋒芒和文化個性。但是翻譯如

何來保留和反映他們的語言特色，協調語言文化的同一與差異、地方性與全球性的關係，為讀者打開方便之門，讓翻譯完成文化傳輸的基本任務，這依然是目前值得翻譯界進一步研究的一個課題。^[20]

第二，閱讀理解直接處於譯者動筆翻譯之前，是翻譯工作最重要的環節之一。翻譯的閱讀重在理解，無論從強度和目的而言，都不同於一般的閱讀。原因在於，第一，就讀者而言，因為讀的是外語，所以在閱讀過程中就要求讀者比讀母語投注更大的注意力。第二，要理解原文，需要廣泛地涉獵源語文化及社會各領域的知識，同時還需要有一定深度的專業知識，否則，就不可能把理論性較強的著作成功地翻譯過來。第三，閱讀的主要目的是要把原文的意思譯成另一種文字，表達出來，所以需要讀者把每一個字詞的意思都弄清楚，恰如錢鍾書所言，這不像翻譯之外的閱讀，那是以瞭解大意为目的的流覽，偶爾有幾個字不明白也無關大局。^[21]文學作品的翻譯，對閱讀的要求會更高，因為文學作品首先是語言的藝術，其語言使用更複雜更微妙，譯者如果沒有嚴格的語文學訓練，沒有“對言詞和修辭的一種詳細耐心的審查，一種終其一生的關注”，^[22]就很難深入到作品的語言之中，理解文學作品，遑論把它成功地翻譯進另一門語言文化中。所以，可以說翻譯的閱讀最需要語文學的說明，它一定不是解構式的閱讀，而是最具有語文學特徵的閱讀。^[23]

翻譯活動的性質所必然要求的這種語文學閱讀，正如薩義德以及他反覆引述的語文學批評家所堅持的一樣，就必然預設語言中負載有關於作者以及他的時代的各種資訊，讀者只有老老實實地對原作下足夠的文字功夫，作認真的閱讀，才有可能把這些資訊提取出來，並翻譯成另一種文字。所以翻譯的閱讀，更是一種慢讀和細讀，一種從無到有、以悟為目標的閱讀。另一方面，從維柯(Vico)的理性和歷史主義原則出發，“我們真正能夠認識的只是我們所創造的東西，換言之，我們只能

按照它們被創造的方式來認識它們。”^[24] 我們認為以翻譯為目的的閱讀可以引向理解，這正是一種認識上的理性主義，這種理解照維柯的歷史主義來看，就要求譯者從創造者的角度去看待作品，具體而言就是要把自己放在作者的位置，捨身投入文化時空的差異和不確定性之中，進入作者的語言，“進入他的個性中去”，^[25] 準確地把握他想傳達的語言文化以及思想情感資訊。這種投入比之翻譯之外的閱讀受更多的條件限制，而且也更實際，因為翻譯作為跨文化的閱讀，需要譯者對外國語言文化和社會等方面有相當深入的素養，不然將難以進入作者的個性中去。另一方面，譯者的素養和閱讀的投入程度可以立即回饋在譯文之中，成為影響譯文品質的一個重要因素。薩義德所說的接受這個語文學閱讀任務對翻譯家而言，更是不可或缺而且需要更多語文學修養的環節。

的確，回顧以往一些翻譯大家的經驗，閱讀總是一種全身心的投入，他們總是自願忘我地沉浸于作者的世界之中，一遍一遍地閱讀，為作者描寫的藝術世界和傾注的思想情感打動。比如翻譯家朱生豪對莎士比亞戲劇之閱讀，“餘篤嗜莎劇，嘗首尾研誦全集至十餘遍。于原作精神，自覺頗有會心。”^[26] “病危時，……有兩次，他仰臥床上，高聲背誦莎劇原文，音調鏗鏘，表情嚴肅，……”^[27] 傅雷的經驗之談：“譯者不深刻的理解、體會與感受原作，決不可能叫讀者理解、體會與感受。……想譯一部喜歡的作品要讀到四遍五遍，才能把情節、故事記得爛熟，分析徹底，人物歷歷如在目前，隱藏在字裡行間的微言大義也能慢慢咂摸出來。”^[28] 趙蘿蕤對自己翻譯嚴肅的文學作品的第一條要求就是“對作家作品理解得越深越好。”^[29]

在很多情況下，翻譯常常緣起于翻譯家對作品的喜愛，這就是傅雷所說的“想譯一部喜歡的作品”的意思。閱讀產生喜歡，因喜歡而產生想要翻譯、與人共用的願望。翻譯閱讀的這一特點最能說明翻譯為人文主義

實踐的本質，這就是，情感或者說人的主觀性在翻譯決策過程中起了決定作用。從這一點來看，無論機器翻譯將來發展到哪一種地步，這種在閱讀中產生的對作品的喜愛，以及因喜愛而產生的翻譯選擇，是很難被不能進行主觀體驗式閱讀的機器替代的。機器翻譯終究離不開人給它選材餵食，它也無法結合文本對現實世界提出的問題作出適時的回應和批評。所以，作為人文主義實踐的翻譯，可以利用機器的輔助，但是終歸離不開作為人文主義者的翻譯家/讀者的努力，來推動它向前發展。

第三，翻譯閱讀一方面是個人的努力，它需要一個人在知識和語言方面的長期積累，耐心投入地閱讀，同時還需要讀者在閱讀中靜下心來，勤於動腦動手，認真地去解決文本中遇到的語言文化難題。另一方面，薩義德提到的讀者共同體對於深化翻譯的閱讀也是十分重要的。^[30]一個文本，尤其是古代文本，其文字表達的豐富性總是經過一代又一代讀者的閱讀逐漸展現出來，這些讀者/注釋家來自不同時代，有不同的文化背景，他們的解釋，毋寧說揭開了真理的面紗，發掘出了終極意義或正確的意義，還不如說揭示了文本意義的多面性和豐富性，譯者通過他們的注釋和評論，可以進一步發掘語言的原始能量，讓自己更接近文本的生命核心。如果拒絕這種共同體，往往會對翻譯造成極大損失。這方面的例子很多，其中較著名的有王國維對辜鴻銘的批評。後者翻譯的《中庸》屢屢出錯，其中一個原因在王國維看來就是忽略了前人的閱讀，比如他把“君子之道，造端乎夫婦”譯成“The moral law takes its rise in relation between man and woman”，而且還引德國詩人歌德的《浮士德》來引申證明。王氏指出，這純粹是捨近求遠，不得要領。此前此地早有鄭玄的注釋，其言曰“夫婦謂匹夫匹婦之所知所行，”鄭注甚為精確，而且也得到後代學者朱熹的肯定。辜鴻銘翻譯的閱讀顯然不夠周詳，出錯的根本原因在王國維看來

就是忽視讀者共同體的智慧造成的。^[31]

翻譯中閱讀的共同體還應該包括以前的譯本，以及其他語言的譯文。不同的時代呼喚不同的譯本出現，不可能有一譯而傳萬世的翻譯存在。一個譯者決定翻譯一本書，肯定也是受到了薩義德所稱讚不已的那種人文主義的英雄情懷的鼓舞，感受到那種“讓自己得以親身體驗藝術作品的最初的衝動和鼓舞人心的力量”，意識到“我們的行動將成為正在我們身邊形成的人類共同歷史之一部分。”^[32] 新的翻譯新的閱讀，不應該忽視以前的翻譯以前的閱讀，應該從以前的譯文中吸取智慧來豐富新的譯文，為我們偉大的共同歷史提供新的見證。許多翻譯家都善於從以前的翻譯和不同語種的翻譯中吸取養料，這方面的例子中外都有，而且特別多。索緒爾(Saussure)《普通語言學教程》的漢語譯文，就是參照了許多譯文而定的。它先是由著名語言學家高名凱在1963年從索緒爾的法文原文翻譯過來，然後由語言學家岑麒祥參照俄文和英文譯本精心校對，付印前又由語言學家葉蜚聲根據原文，參考俄文日文譯文再行校訂、修改，最後由岑麒祥審定後才於1979年出版。^[33] 由此可以看出，草率的閱讀、拒絕式的閱讀、非專業的閱讀，必然為翻譯家所不取，而專注於語詞、細心地閱讀、廣泛地參照前人的閱讀成果、尊重由譯者組成的讀者共同體，正是翻譯閱讀重要的語文學特徵之一。

第四，既然翻譯是以原文為指歸，一切服從於準確完整地傳譯原文資訊的目的，那麼，翻譯的閱讀還應不應該承擔薩義德所說的抵抗的任務呢？我們認為，答案是不言而喻的，因為如前所述，翻譯主要是針對文本的工作，是人文主義的重要實踐之一，所以翻譯的閱讀也必然是語文學的閱讀。作為語文學閱讀，它必須堅守抵抗這一任務。那麼它抵抗的目標是什麼？抵抗以什麼方式進行？或者用薩義德的話說，翻譯閱讀引向抵抗的途徑何在？

薩義德曾多次引用鮑里爾研究愛默生得出的一個結論，來說明語言本身蘊蓄的那種反抗的能量能夠持續不斷地延續下去，“事實上，要求我們順從的那些社會形式和文字形式，本身就是在反抗早先的慣例中創造出來的。甚至在現在看來陳腐或死亡的言詞中，我們也能夠發現曾經鼓舞它們進行轉型的欲望。”^[34] 鮑里爾希望讀者以最大的耐心，在無論多麼古遠的文本中去認識開啟這種能量，讓它呈現為新的動力，為革新現存的語言習慣、思想方式以及行為慣例服務。對翻譯家而言，認識和開啟這種能量仍然是翻譯閱讀的任務，但是它的功能及其表現稍有不同。在一般的閱讀中，接受也不能止於自身，讀者既要全身心投入，站在作者的立場上去理解，同時又要善於從作品中跳出來，回到現實世界的關懷中。薩義德認為，閱讀“需要一個人把普通的語言進一步轉化成自己的批評語言”。在翻譯閱讀中，正是翻譯家發現了語言之間的差異，認識到語言文化向新求變的必然趨勢，所以才在表達中不遺餘力地引入新的形式，促進新的語言文化的誕生，把閱讀的接受引導到一個完全不同的文化語境中去實現語言的潛能。可以說每一次成功的翻譯都包含了許多創新的形式於其中，但是最劇烈的創新，應當是在一個語言文化處於新舊轉型之中，翻譯家借助外來的語言文化，去推動新的語言形式的誕生。比如上世紀白話文早期的文學翻譯，魯迅先生對翻譯的創新要求和作用做過極為明確的描述，他在寫給瞿秋白的信中，是這樣來解釋為什麼他要堅持“寧信而不順”的翻譯原則的：“為什麼不完全中國化，給讀者省些力氣呢？這樣費解，怎樣還可以稱為翻譯呢？我的答案是：這也是譯本。這樣的譯本，不但在輸入新的內容，也在輸入新的表達法”。^[35]

翻譯的閱讀還不會止於翻譯的表達，就像它不會始於動筆翻譯前的研讀一樣，它在兩個相反的方向上都延伸得很遠。“人文主義中的

抵抗運動的核心是批評”。^[36] 其實翻譯在選材階段已經開始在體現對現狀的不滿和預測，這種批評動能會一直延續到文本在另一種語言的出現和傳播。翻譯家的選材，他的表述方式，風格特徵，他的介紹和注釋等等，都是他參與抵抗運動、實現人文主義價值、承擔人文主義責任的形式。在這裡我們可以用我國翻譯界前輩方平先生的翻譯實踐為例。方平在回顧翻譯美國詩人羅伯特·弗洛斯特 (Robert Frost) 的詩歌〈幫工之死〉的經歷時，寫道：“我反覆吟誦，為詩中的情景深深感動，曾前後兩次譯成中文。第一次在解放前，蔣匪幫倒行逆施的時期，…第二次在四人幫倒行逆施的時期，…兩次都在民族遭受深重苦難，個人的人格、人權遭受任意踐踏的黑暗時期，這並非偶然，有借酒澆愁之意吧，在譯詩中寄託著無可表達的悲苦和憤慨的心情。重譯稿根本不可能發表，當時曾以手抄本小冊子的形式，連同一篇長長的譯後感，私下流傳在友好中間，曾引起過一些讚賞聲和歎息聲。”^[37] 方平在這篇異國詩歌中找到了共鳴，“敬愛的詩人啊，你可知道，在遙遠的東方，有一個你從來沒聽說的讀者，他的心弦被你的傑作打動了，世界上哪一個評論家也不能像他那樣，對你這篇長詩有那麼深、那麼痛苦的理解——因為他們中誰也沒經歷過他那種經歷啊。”^[38] 翻譯家自己為之震動的，不僅是詩人對幫工這個身處社會底層的人表達的同情和惋惜，更重要的是翻譯家認識到，詩人超越了一般的憐憫或者同情，在幫工身上表現出“人的尊嚴”這個更加深刻崇高的人道主義命題。這一命題與譯者個人的經歷以及他對中國現代歷史的反思相契合，他的選材和翻譯正是基於這種與詩人之心的共鳴，所以無論從動機還是效果上看，他的翻譯都成功地借弗洛斯特之口表達了他自己作為譯者、讀者和人文主義學者對人類崇高價值的殷殷追求和似饑若渴之心情，起到了抵抗、批判黑暗社會現實的作用。

三、結束語

薩義德呼籲回到語文學，顯然不是要回到歐洲古典語文學，而是要回到人文主義者的本行，即對語言和閱讀的關注，重建人文主義的學科基礎，並從這個區別於其他學科的基礎出發，擴大人文主義的關懷。^[39] 在他看來，唯其如此西方岌岌可危的人文學科方可重獲新生。薩義德非常推崇維柯以及研究維柯和西方文明富有卓見的奧爾巴赫，認為他們兩人代表了語文學方法的最高境界，“為了能夠理解一個人文主義文本，必須設法把自己當作那個文本的作者，生活在那個作者的現實之中，經歷內在於作者生命之中的生活經驗，如此等等，而且一切憑藉學識與同情之結合……”，^[40] 來解析作品的語言文字，達到理解之目的。這種清醒的語文學方法，我們認為可以用來糾正一些仍在流行的理論對閱讀造成的負面影響，改變時下大學文科普遍輕視細讀慢讀的不正之風，還人文主義實踐一個清白。

如果說翻譯有危機的話，那主要就是由胡譯、亂譯帶來的危機，薩義德發現的那種“奇怪的”閱讀邏輯反而影響不大。胡譯、亂譯的根本原因當然還是在不重視閱讀，不重視對語言、修辭作認真的研究，忽視從作者的角度來體會原作，把握原作的社會歷史背景，以及心理情勢。薩義德對奧爾巴赫的語文學闡釋方法常常表現出發自內心的崇敬之情，但是他也意識到要從作者的觀點來閱讀原文，從單方向的考問，到兩個靈魂跨越時空，產生共鳴，要求讀者積累大量的學識，學習多種相關的語言及其傳統，研究主要的經典作家，以及政治、文化風俗等等。像奧爾巴赫這樣一個語文學家的訓練，必須歷經多年，不然面對橫跨多種語言文化的文本是不可能進行基本閱讀的。這種情形也提醒我們，翻譯文學和思想文化著作，尤其是西方文學作

品，譯者面臨著複雜繁重的自我訓練任務。比如，西方實際上是一個在時空上範圍很大的一個概念，其中語言文化的關係極為複雜，一般的西方作者都可能是在這樣廣大的語言文化背景下進行創作的，所以要進入他們的語言文化和時代，瞭解他們的思想情感，對他們的文本作語文學閱讀，只懂一門語言，顯然是不夠的。這種情形在二十一世紀全球化文化的語境下，變得甚至更加複雜，通常一部作品隨時可能出現東西南北互不相干的語言文化，在這種情形之下，圍圖吞棗式的翻譯時有發生。但是在當今語言文化高度混雜的時代，是不是要求每位入行的翻譯者也要象維柯時代的人文主義者一樣，接受長時間的語文學訓練，廣泛涉獵文學、歷史、哲學、經濟、政治、社會學、心理學，以及現代科學各門類，成為百科全書式的學者之後，方能從事翻譯？這樣的要求在現行教育體制之下顯然是不現實的，但是尊重翻譯的語文學特徵，遵循語文學的閱讀方法，不斷培養提高譯入語語文的運用能力，反覆實踐，這必然是一條譯出優秀作品的可行之路。

注釋

- [1] 參見王力，1981: 1-53；胡奇光，2005: 1-4。又見何九盈，2005; 1995。何氏不用語文學，而以傳統語言學代之，無過。又見本文注釋二，高名凱的翻譯，在中西語境中更明確了這一術語之所指。
- [2] 關於語文學的歷史，參見 de Saussure 1959: 1-5; 高名凱譯，1980: 17-25。索緒爾說：“早在亞歷山大裡亞就曾有一個‘語文學’學派，不過這一名稱現在主要用來指沃爾(Friedrich August Wolf)自1777年起所宣導，目前還在繼續著的學術上的運動”(1980: 17-18)。
- [3] 參見 Owen 1990: 76。
- [4] 比如義大利左翼哲學家吉奧吉·阿甘本，見 de La Durantaye 2009: xx。此前的美國學者保羅·德曼(Paul de Man)在上世紀八十年代初(1982)寫過一篇以回到語文學為題的文字，收入de Man 1986: 21-26，但德曼之意不在讓文學研究真正地回歸到語文學方

法，所以跟新世紀主張回歸的學者旨趣相異。Lee Patterson也寫過一篇同名的文章，但沒有脫離1988年在哈佛以〈什麼是語文學？〉為題開的討論會的思路（會議文集見Jan Ziolkowski編的專輯 *Comparative Literature Studies*, 27.1, 1990），當時美國學界對語文學的態度比較曖昧，薩義德的卓識改變了這一現象，正如為《人文主義與民主批評》作前言的比爾格雷米所說，薩義德的“這場辯論（始於維柯關於人文主義的辯論）賦予了人文主義嚴密而知性的肌理，還有一種時事性的、政治性的適用性，這使它在上個世紀顯得太早熟了，也就未能得到陳腐教條的承認……”，見薩義德 2006: 5。Patterson的文章“The Return to Philology”，見收 van Engen 1994: 231-244。

- [5] 見薩義德，1999: 192-93；Said 1979: 149-50，譯文有改動。
- [6] 薩義德，2006: 68-69。又見 Said 2004: 58。
- [7] 參見 Pollock 2009: 931。
- [8] 薩義德，2006: 71。薩義德所謂的人文主義實踐主要是指以大學人文學科為中心的對人類勞動成果所做的研究和傳播工作。參見同書第1-36頁。
- [9] 譯文有改動。
- [10] 同上引，第69-70頁，譯文略有改動。
- [11] 同上引，第69頁。
- [12] 同上引，第77頁。
- [13] 語文學迴圈 (philological circle) 是斯皮策語文學方法的核心，關於這一方法，參見Calin 2007: 16-18。
- [14] 薩義德，2006: 94-95。
- [15] 參見比如 Pollock 2009; Harpham 2009: 34-62，最近（2010年10月）美國現代語言協會前主席耶魯大學教授 Michael Holquist 在清華大學以〈語文學與世界文學〉(Philology and World Literature) 為題的演講中，也大力呼籲回到語文學的方法，以拯救人文學科。
- [16] 目前明確從語文學角度來討論翻譯的研究，作者見到二種，Becker 1995; Apter 2006。前者結集作者翻譯研究東南亞多種語言文化的經歷，主張體驗語言和深度閱讀對翻譯的重要性，具體討論翻譯中的過與不及 (exuberances and deficiencies) 的問題，在一定程度上揭示了語文學與翻譯的密切關係；後者主要考察翻譯給比較文學帶來新的契機，其中試圖從語文學的角度來說明語言之間的複雜關係，以及對翻譯的影響，討論重點主要在翻譯與比較文學的關係。
- [17] 索緒爾的法文原文是 “[La langue n'est pas l'unique objet de la philology.] qui veut avant

tout fixer, interpreter, commenter les textes ...” 參見 de Saussure 1922: 13。漢語譯文參照了 Calvert Watkins 的英語譯文, “The task of philology is above all to establish, interpret, and comment upon texts”, 見 Watkins 1990: 21。Baskin 的英文譯文是: “The early philologists sought especially to correct, interpret and comment upon written texts” (第1頁); 高名凱的譯文是 “語文學首先要確定、解釋和評注各種文獻” (第18頁)。Fixer 有 to fix, to determine 之義, 也有 établir (set up, establish, prove right) 之義, Watkins 的譯文較 Baskin 和高名凱的貼切, 更明確地體現出作者所談為文本批評的步驟。

- [18] 參見 Selection from Jacques Derrida's *Des Tours de Babel*, 收入 Kamuf 1991: 243-253。漢語譯文見陳永國譯, 〈巴別塔〉, 收入陳永國編, 2005: 13-41。又見 Bhabha 2007: 436-464。
- [19] 趙蘿蕙的翻譯見《荒原》(1937); 又見趙蘿蕙, 張子清等譯, 2006: 45-58。
- [20] 斯皮策採取不譯的辦法, 不是所有人會贊同的, 見斯皮策, “Linguistics and Literary History”一文, 轉引自 Apter 2006: 61。
- [21] 參見錢鍾書, 1979: 75-76。
- [22] 參見薩義德, 2006: 72。
- [23] 薩義德認為解構式閱讀推卸了理解的責任, 難以增進讀者對原文文字的專注與理解, 見 2006: 78。
- [24] 同上引, 第13頁。
- [25] 趙蘿蕙語, 見趙蘿蕙, 〈是怎麼翻譯文學作品的〉, 收入趙蘿蕙, 1996: 191。
- [26] 朱生豪, 〈譯者自序〉, 引自宋清如, 〈朱生豪與莎士比亞戲劇〉, 收入宋清如編, 1995: 445。
- [27] 見宋清如編, 1995: 447。
- [28] 傅雷, 〈翻譯經驗點滴〉, 收入怒安編, 2005: 8。
- [29] 趙蘿蕙, 〈我是怎麼翻譯文學作品的〉, 收入趙蘿蕙, 1996: 184。
- [30] 即薩義德所說的 a community of witnesses, 見薩義德, 2006: 80。
- [31] 王國維, 〈書辜氏湯生英譯《中庸》後〉, 收入余石屹編, 《漢譯英理論讀本》, 北京: 科學出版社, 第5頁。
- [32] 薩義德, 2006: 80。譯文有改動。
- [33] 參見岑麒祥, 〈校後記〉, 索緒爾著, 高名凱譯, 1999: 333。
- [34] 鮑里爾, 《文學的再生》, 轉引自薩義德, 2006: 69。
- [35] 魯迅回瞿秋白信論翻譯, 收入余石屹編, 《英譯漢理論讀本》, 北京: 科學出版社, 2008年, 第9頁。

- [36] 參見薩義德，2006: 85。
- [37] 參見方平，1988: 144-145。
- [38] 方平，1987: 349-350。又見方平譯，1988: 220。
- [39] 不同的意見，可以參見 Apter 2006: 58-60, 65-81。
- [40] 參見薩義德，2006: 108。

參考書目

- Apter, Emily (2006). *The Translation Zone: a New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Becker, Alton L. (1995). *Beyond Translation: Essays Toward a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (2007). "Postcolonial Criticism." In *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 436–464.
- Calin, William (2007). *The Twentieth-Century Humanist Critics: From Spitzer to Frye*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- de La Durantaye, Le (2009). "Preface." In Giorgio Agamben: *A Critical Introduction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- de Man, Paul (1986). *The Resistance to Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand (1922). *Cours de Linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.
- _____. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. Éd. Charles Bally, et al. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Harpham, Geoffrey Galt (2009). "Roots, Races, and the Return to Philology." *Representations* 106: 34–62.
- Kamuf, Peggy, ed. (1991) *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Owen, Stephen (1990). "Philology's Discontents: Response." *Comparative Literature Studies* 27: 175–178.
- Pollock, Sheldon (2009). "Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World." *Critical Inquiry* 35: 931–961.

- Said, Edward W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____ (2004). *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- van Engen, John, ed. (1994). *The Past and Future of Medieval Studies*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Watkins, Calvert (1990). "What Is Philology?" *Comparative Literature Studies* 27: 121–125.
- 方平譯 (1988), 《一條未走的路：弗洛斯特詩歌欣賞》，上海：上海譯文出版社。
- _____ (1987), 《三個從家庭出走的婦女》，北京：外國文學出版社。
- 王力 (1981), 《中國語言學史》，太原：山西人民出版社。
- 何九盈 (2005), 《中國古代語言學史》(第三版)，廣州：廣東教育出版社。
- _____ (1995), 《中國現代語言學史》，廣州：廣東教育出版社。
- 宋清如編 (1995), 《寄在信封裡的靈魂：朱生豪書信集》，北京：東方出版社。
- 怒安編 (2005), 《傅雷談翻譯》，瀋陽：遼寧教育出版社。
- 胡奇光 (2005), 《中國小學史》，上海：上海人民出版社。
- 索緒爾著，高名凱譯 (1999), 《普通語言學教程》，北京：商務印書館。
- 陳永國編 (2005), 《翻譯與後現代性》，北京：中國人民大學出版社。
- 趙蘿蕙 (1996), 《我的讀書生涯》，北京：北京大學出版社。
- _____ 譯 (1937), 《荒原》，上海：新詩社。
- _____，張子清等譯 (2006), 《T. S. 艾略特詩選：荒原》，北京：燕山出版社。
- 錢鍾書 (1979), 《舊文四篇》，上海：上海古籍出版社。
- 薩義德 (2006), 《人文主義與民主批評》，朱生堅譯，北京：新星出版社。
- _____ (1999), 《東方學》，王宇根譯，北京：三聯書店。

作者簡介

余石屹教授，哲學博士，研究領域包括比較文學、翻譯、英美文學、文學理論、中西文化等，現任教於清華大學外文系。出版有專著、譯著以及研究論文若干。

The Remake as a Translation: Localism, Globalism and the Afterlife of Horror Movies

Dorothy Wong

Abstract

*Walter Benjamin constructs his own distinctive view of translation by examining the relationship between the original and the translation. He describes a translation as an afterlife that prolongs the prior existence of the original, thus the translation is liberated from a subservient role by being empowered with the ability to “revive” the original “anew”. However, the power of translation may become so overwhelmingly strong that the aura of the original is removed in its “rejuvenating process”. The original is seen in some intertextual traits connoting, in Linda Hutcheon’s term, a fluid relationship between itself and the translation. Remakes, especially those in Hollywood, are examples. Their fluidity, resonating the postmodern hybridity and pastiche, reveals the global cultural politics. This paper focuses on a locally produced horror movie *The Eye* (2002) and its Hollywood remake so as to understand how Hollywood, a global capitalistic force, reformulates the regional/local specificities in the original for the purpose of generating a transnational appeal. Moreover, the echoes of the original, in Benjamin’s theory of translation, serve to keep the ethnic Other monstrous.*

Andrew Horton and Stuart McDougal begin their introduction to a book on movie remakes with a quotation from the auteur Jean-Luc Godard:

“I don’t invent: I steal” (Horton and McDougal 1998: 1). Questions that arise include: what does the word “invent” connote? What has he stolen? And why did he steal? Certainly, to me, he is being ironic. He invokes the notion of “invent” and “steal” to underline the “mosaic” nature of a text. However, to begin a book on movie remakes, the quotation nevertheless helps define the notion of a remake which is amendable to any scrutiny. It is possible to see the analogy between “steal” and remake. The latter seemingly “robes” (à la Walter Benjamin) the original in negativity suggesting a break-in, a theft, a violation. A remake is then in a partial stance depending on a prior existence—an original—and is parasitic.

The key problem is that the analogy also describes the condition of the original. However, one should be reminded that there is no original in the absolute sense of the term. This is well captured by Roland Barthes’ metaphor of the text as a network; it is “the text-between of another text” (Barthes 1977: 15) and is interconnected with other texts. In Benjamin’s dictum, the origin of the original “is an eddy in the stream of becoming” (Benjamin 1977: 45). That means a text denotes intertextual relationships. It is impossible to dissociate a remake from this concept of intertextuality, thus giving rise to another question: what is to be remade if there is no original? There is no fixed inside and outside of a text. As such, the remake disappears; there is no way out.

It is therefore essential to invoke Roland Barthes’ concept of a text and a work. Barthes, in theorizing a text, nevertheless makes a new definition of a work crucial to the argument here. He sees a work as “a finished object” (Barthes 1977: 39). It is concrete and complete. It can be a physical object with stable meanings. On the other hand, a text is not a finite product and it is not a property of the work. Instead, it is represented by signifiers which are “always leading on to other signifiers, and the ‘trace’ (Derrida’s term) of signifying chain” (Allen 2000: 66). These depict what may be understood as the original and its remake. The original is a work and what is to be remade

is the text. So it is with this idea of a work that prompts an investigation into the relationship between an afterlife and a remake, while probing the relationship between globalism and localism.

When Godard mentions “steal”, he alludes to a sort of crossing, a breaking up of the boundary set by the original in the form of already existent meanings which, to Derrida, should be disseminated. This, in some way, echoes Walter Benjamin’s perception of translation. He employs the term “afterlife” to describe the proliferating relationship between the original and its translation. He brings into his discussion of an original a somatic metaphor – “organic corporeality” (Benjamin 2000: 76) to suggest the boundary of the original. Translation is to overcome this boundary of the original and become the afterlife of the original.

Remakes can also be regarded as the afterlife of their originals, though Benjamin is referring to literature and translation, not on movies. They transcend precursor cinematic works which are metaphorically corporeal. Through citing and iterating the signs in a new context in the Derridean sense, the remakes as translations become representations of afterlife that show a “combination of acknowledgment and a repudiation in a single ambivalent gesture” (Leitch 2002: 53). This should be a way, in Benjamin’s discussion, to “catches [sic] fire on the eternal life of the works and the perpetual renewal of language” (Benjamin 2000: 74). By default, then, the original as a body is forever there although its boundary and context (Hutcheon 2006: 170) are being changed.

However, this concept of remake as translation is partial. Continuing with the body image, a remake of horror movies may be perceived as a ghost, the abstract afterlife while the original is the disappeared body. Being a ghost, it cannot claim to be eternal. It signifies “secondariness”, a comeback in a different form declaring an absence of the original as a fixed prior existence. In such a way, the boundary of the body is being transcended. Borrowing from Helen Cixous’s discussion of Freud’s uncanny,

“in asserting this presence of an absence, the unreal, the meaning of ‘reality’ is emptied, leaving the signs without significance” (qtd. in Jackson 2000: 68). “Ghosts pretend to assert transcendence but actually speak of nothingness, the death, of the things they name” (Badley 1995: 42). The original can be thought of as a body stagnant as the Barthesian work, and the content of signs representing this materiality is being emptied, henceforth the body will remain static (in terms of meaning) which means death, an absence. This absence is apparent in the remake because a true remake, to Thomas Leitch, obliterates the original and empties the memory of the previous movie (Leitch 2002: 145). This is done through destabilizing signs with signification in the original, turning them into ambiguous intertextual traces denoting not the presence but an absence.

It is similar to an apparition. A ghost manifests itself through sounds, temperature, touch, odors (as noted in the *Encyclopedia of Ghosts and Spirits*), but not in the form of its material body. It tells of the absence of the body through appealing to the sensory nerves of others who are present on the spot; it is not about the physical materiality of a body as it occupies no space as compared to this body. It is the alterity which is central. That means the intertextual traces represent the absence of the original and are concerned not so much with the shape of the original, which is to be overthrown. With alterity at the core, they echo Derrida’s iterability. This is marked by the etymological connotations evoked by Derrida. He writes, “*iter* ... comes from *itara*, other in Sanskrit, and everything follows may be read as the exploitation of the logic which links repletion to alterity” (Derrida 1982: 315). When the boundary of the body dissolves into intertextual traces, the remake becomes a big Other to the original. It is “repetition and first time” (Lim 2009: 219). That being said, remakes do not resurrect the original. Kenneth Chan, in his book *Remade in Hollywood*, shares a similar perception. He sees a remake as “a filmic form of secondariness: one removed from its “original” text, but exploited for its box office potential” (Chan 2009: 8). To

be more precise, your terrifying screams would give way to boring yawns as you would not be scared a second time when every unexpected event becomes wholly predictable. This is especially true to Hollywood remakes of Asian horror movies in which the originals disappear.

These ghostly remakes, characterized by alterity, however, signify paradoxes of the global-local dialectic. What globalism refers to is a mythology of universalism constructed through the alleged mobilization of capital or talents and the unification of markets striving to decompartmentalize the world. This is well represented by Hollywood, which highlights the existence of global audiences. A Miramax executive told people on the subject of the remake of Asian horror movies that “these stories can work in any culture” (Lim 2009: 223). Cultural specificities are erased as if they never existed. After all, as Wimal Dissanayake, a renowned scholar in Asian movies, asserts, “cinema is not an indigenous form of entertainment to Asia; however, before long, this imported Western art form was able to sink roots in the national soil and the consciousness of the people to assume the status of a national art” (Dissanayake 1994: xiv). He sees a global circulation of technology as well as knowledge in cinema but somehow also suggests the existence of differences which, to a certain extent, allow one to see the failure of homogenization.

The term “Asian” articulates differences not just in terms of geographical depiction. David Morley and Kevin Robins have argued that “onto the geography of East and West is directly mapped the distinction between the pre-modern and the modern” (Morley and Robins 1996: 328). Meanwhile, modernization is well defined in terms of Westernization (Morley and Robins 1996: 116). In the case of horror remakes, Asia is to be conceived of from the point of view of the globalized system. Simply put, formulations such as “global Hollywood” and “local Asia” point to what the inside is to the outside. Being outside is unstable unless it reduplicates the inside so as to dissolve frontiers, or the inside would extend its influence to the outside and turn the outside into an object of interference. That is to

stabilize the unstable meanings represented by these Asian texts. Translation is invoked here. It becomes a way to turn the original into a dead body which is fixed and obliterated. This ghostly remake empties the original and neutralizes its otherness. It is hegemonic.

The Asian horror movie *The Eye* (dir: Pang's Brother 2002) is a good example. It is a story with a *trans-Asian* location. It is based in Hong Kong and Thailand. It is a narrative about looking, about the confrontation of gazes. Eyes become the connection between the one who haunts and the one being haunted. Both the female protagonist Mun (Hong Kong) and the ghost Ling (Thailand) are trapped. Mun is haunted by her eyesight, which she regains after receiving a cornea transplantation, and is locked in Ling's image. Then, Ling is trapped in transition as she needs her mother's forgiveness because she was driven to suicide by the unbearable pressure of being regarded as a monster that was able to see and foretell death. Mun brought all these to resolution in her visit to Thailand, only to find that she has inherited Ling's ability. She turns blind again in a serious road accident in which she recognizes her possession of the ability to predict death; she keeps warning the trapped drivers and passengers to take shelter from the danger of explosion in a traffic jam in Thailand. The story ends with her coming back to her comfort zone when she loses her eyesight again.

This movie, according to Tony Rayns, "owes very little to Hollywood models; it's unapologetically Asian in everything from its supernatural backstory to its characterizations. Its immediate inspiration was local. . .[it] revived the Chinese tradition of 'ghost-seeing eyes'"(Rayns 2002: 44). *The Eye*, which *BBC Movie* describes as "[taking] eyeball horror to a new height" (Russell 2002), was directed by Oxide Pang and Danny Pang in 2002. It drew Hollywood's attention because "Hollywood's horror industry is running scared. The formula and franchises have been squeezed dry. And now Hollywood is turning to Asia to restock the cupboard" (Lim 2009: 194). The right for a remake was brought by Tom Cruise and Paula Wagner for Paramount. It

came out in 2008, using the same English name *The Eye* and was directed by David Moreau and Xavier Palud. It was a box office success.

David Moreau and Xavier Palud successfully made *The Eye* totally adapted to an American cultural background while keeping the plot construction faithful to the original; the locations in the original, Hong Kong and Thailand, are translated into places in the United States and Mexico. Sydney, who lost her vision since she was five, receives a cornea transplantation. When she regains her vision, she keeps experiencing some terrifying visions. What's more, she is trapped in Ana's image. Ana, a Mexican, is found out to be the donor of her cornea. She embarks on a journey to find the reasons behind her horrifying visions and Ana's history is revealed. In both the original and the remake, the monstrosity is inherited by the female protagonists. This monstrosity is the ability to see ghosts and to foretell death.

The original, which articulates the Asian presence and thus is the unstable "local", is fixed in the remake representing the global force by invoking the stereotyped Chinese characters in a clichéd iconographic setting such as Chinatown which is sustained by the codes of a Chinese kitchen in a small Chinese restaurant. The visual and audio juxtaposition of the chopping of the roast pork and the boiling of congee against the quiet and weird attitude and gazes of the Chinese waiters and the Chinese customers helps establish a tone of dreadfulness. The protagonist Sydney enters and confronts this Chinese space with uneasiness. Her emotion is intensified by the difference she represents. Later, she finds out that this kitchen is a haunted place and it no longer exists because of a fire. It is deprived of its own meanings because of its "absence".

Moreover, the horror movie is about "eyes", which themselves are monstrous, as asserted by Carol Clover (1992: 167-168). Eyes as body parts constitute cultural identities and are apt examples of the translation of Asia into an absence. Horror is culture-specific; watching and gazing are filled with desire and anxieties which the victims in the movie and the audiences

share. This intrinsic connection between the local audiences and the female protagonist Mun through the sharing of a spectacle is disintegrated in the remake. The tradition of ghost-seeing eyes representing the local as a mystified monstrous Other is naturalized. Ghosts within this tradition are seen in relation to the everyday life that we cannot evade. It's a matter of fact whether one can see them or not. This concept of ghosts has entered the shared spectacle of local people. This is well represented by the Hungry Ghost Festival in the seventh month of the lunar calendar when people try to appease wandering ghosts by "feeding" them. This prescribes forms of behavior – for example, one pretends not see to them so as not to disturb their activities as advised by the waitress in the restaurant, where Mun sees the return of the dead wife and her son licking the roasted pork displayed in the kitchen. She claims that they don't expect to be seen and the returning gaze is thus terrifying. Therefore, stop looking. The visual construction of ghosts is based on Chinese rituals for the dead, which produce imaginary things we try to avoid such as the wandering hungry ghosts eating white candles and licking roasted duck or pork. Such abnormal eating behavior constitutes the primacy codes for the backwardness of this presumably modern place. They are neither scientific nor Christian. They are karma in a Taoist sense, or they are superstitious, and thus they belong to the category of the exotic Other, the local. This must be translated.

This is appropriated in the remake in which once again this monstrous and exotic Other is transformed, or is simply dead or emptied. The western gaze is disciplined. For instance, in Roman times, power was externalized and represented by the architecture that structured a visual order. Simply, power must be visualized and can be observed or looked at and then believed in. In the modern western world, this power comes from rationality, which regulates people's vision. They rely on their eyes to establish their relation with external reality which is experienced and rationalized. As a homogenizing global force, this rationality overthrows the exotic Chinese otherness embedded in the

ghost-seeing eyes. It is irrational to see ghosts and that triggers the journey to restore order in the remake of *The Eye*. The focus of this remake is to stabilize the exotic Otherness of vision. The local representing this irrationality must be stabilized and thus made to disappear. The seeing of a ghost becomes a violation of rationality and thus must be challenged. The protagonist Sydney starts her journey in rationalizing the irrational rather than pacifying the ghost.

A remake is a translation in that it denotes the existence of a source text and a target text. In Benjamin's theory of translation, the original will not be bereft of its aura; it will be enlarged by having a translation as its afterlife. Remakes which can be seen as translations do not somehow present this kind of afterlife. In the recent Asian horror remake fever we see the operation of a global force that attempts to obliterate the local which is tantamount to the original. The original, in the process of translation, disappears, leaving behind a ghostly afterlife of manipulated intertextual signs. Central to this disappearance is the global-local dialectic which provokes the practices of cultural appropriation and disappropriation through fixing the local. It does not energize the enriching interflow of the global and local and is therefore a force of disruption and destruction in which the essence of transgressing the boundary is obliterated.

References

- Allen, Graham (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Badley, Linda (1995). *Film, Horror, and the Body Fantastic*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Benjamin, Walter (2000). "The Task of The Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*". In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge. 75-85.
- (1997). *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Trans. John Osborne. London: NLB.
- Chan, Kenneth (2009). *Remade in Hollywood: The Global Chinese Presence in Transnational Cinemas*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.

- Clover, Carol J. (1992). *Men, Women, and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dissanayake, Wimal (1994). "Introduction: Nationhood, History, and Cinema: Reflections on the Asian Scene". In *Colonialism and Nationalism in Asian Cinema*. Ed. Wimal Dissanayake. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. xx-xxix.
- Horton, Andrew and Stuart Y. McDougal (1998). "Introduction". In *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*. Ed. Andrew Horton and Stuart Y. McDougal. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1-14.
- Hutcheon, Linda (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, Rosemary (2000). *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion*. London: Routledge.
- Leitch, Thomas (2002). "Twice-told Tales: Disavowal and the Rhetoric of the Remake". In *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*. Ed. Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos. New York: State University of New York Press. 37-62.
- Lim, Bliss Cua (2009). *Translating Time: Cinema, the Fantastic, and Temporal Critique*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Morley, David (1996). "EurAm, Modernity, Reason, and Alterity: Or, Postmodernism, the Highest Stage of Cultural Imperialism?" In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge.
- Rayns, Tony (2002). "Review of 'The Eye.'" *Sight and Sound* 12.11: 43-44.
- Russell, Jamie (2002). "'The Eye' (Jian Gui) (2002)." *BBC Movie*. http://www.bbc.co.uk/films/2002/09/02/the_eye_2002_review.shtml (Accessed 24 Sept 2012).

About the Author

Dr. Dorothy Wong teaches translation at Lingnan University in Hong Kong. She has published in the area of translation and literary studies. Her current research is on translation and education. She published in both English and Chinese.

The Latvian Translation Scene: Paradigms, Change and Centrality

Andrejs Veisbergs

Abstract

The Latvian translation scene demonstrates a flexible and surprisingly fast re-orientation both in regard to the sources of translation as well as to the approaches to translation strategies. Translation played an exceptionally important role in the beginnings of written Latvian in the 16th-18th centuries dominated by faithful rendition of religious texts and adaptations of secular ones. Parallel to the rise of native literature in the 19th century a gradual transition from adaptation/domestication to foreignization and fidelity as the main approach occurred. Even after an explosion of national literature, translations remained in the centre of the Latvian literary polysystem. During the last two decades an enormous growth in the volume of translated information and a major shift from expressive (fictional) texts to appellative and informative texts have occurred. Translation again (like in the early stage of Latvian) became the main vehicle of language development. The particular Latvian translation scene poses a much more general theoretical question about the validity of the traditional dichotomy of “translation language” versus the “real” language.

Smaller and “new” nations and their writing and translation scene often tend to have different vectors of development from the large and established nations. The case of Latvian is such – it is an old language with an extremely rich oral culture heritage, yet its writing and translation history

is relatively new and initially not developed by native speakers. The case of Latvian has been sometimes viewed within postcolonial studies (Moore 2001). This can, in theory, be applied to three periods of the Latvian translation and literary polysystem – the early German-dominated period, the 19th century Tsarist Russian rule and finally the Soviet period. In all of them elements of colonial hegemony, suppression and cultural imposition can be discerned. Yet the German period anchored Latvian culture in mainstream Europe, something the Russian imperialism could not erase. The usual opposition of civilized metropolis versus primitive periphery in the case of Latvian does not apply in the Soviet period (Račevskis 2006: 166) – the opposite is more likely. Yet as the “colonial process itself begins in language” (Ashcroft 1995: 283), Latvian preoccupation with their language and language-centered identity suggests that elements of colonialism and postcolonialism can be discerned. However, since the middle of the 19th century the Latvian writing and translation scene fully followed and reflected the general European trends. Being open to outside processes via translations helped the Latvian literary polysystem sprint through the century-long development of many other nations.

First Attempts: Faithful Translation of the Word of God

Latvian translations began in the 16th century. Latvians at this time were a peasant people and the official cultural sphere was fully in the hands of non-Latvian governors, German clergy and landowners. This had lasted for about 400 years since the territory came under the German crusaders and bishops in the 12th century. The dominant powers had changed (and would continue to change) from time to time – Danes, Poles, Swedes,

Russians came and went, hardly affecting the status of the peasants and their language situation, as their sole interest was the territory, the possessions and the power of the nobility. The German nobility retained its position until the end of the 19th century. The regular change of rulers, rivalry between churches, conflicts between neighbours, ideological clashes and other “winds of change” ensured Latvian sustainability; without these changes the small nation and its language would have been assimilated long ago by the larger players in the region (Tāgepera 2010). Because of regular invasions and foreign rule Latvian identity has been very language-centered, as language was the sole heritage that could be securely passed to other generations. Yet the variety of outside influences also created a multifaceted, rich and extremely adaptive culture. Too small to catch the eye of mainstream studies (Albrecht 1998: 331; Chan 2009), it still boasts a viable language-related culture.

16th century translation and writing in Latvian was the result of the Reformation which, like in other parts of Europe, was an “engine” of translation (Albrecht 1998: 127). In the Baltic region it was competing with Counter-Reformation/Catholic religion. The first (surviving) books to be published were *Catholic Catechism*, published in Catholic Vilnius in 1585 and Luther’s *Small Catechism* published in Lutheran Koenigsberg in 1587. A century later followed the New Testament in 1685 and the Old Testament, published in Rīga in 1689. The first translations into Latvian were very literal/word-for-word translations of German, Latin or Polish texts, retaining numerous parallels to the source language constructions. This seems partly because of the amateur character of the translators, partly because of the genre (God’s words were to be transferred literally), partly because of poor linguistic resources – the first dictionary was published in 1638 (Mancelius), the first grammar in 1644 (Rehehusen). Mapping a new linguistic territory was a hard task for the German clergymen who attempted it. One can see elements of missionary language field work

in the early linguistic work and translations, its agents incorporating the features of Christian missionaries and “gentlemen-scholars” (Chelliah 2011:33).

As Latvian translation started with religious texts, the appropriate method was a close, literal and formal transposition of the God’s Word. This meant equivalence was sought and maintained. According to the governing trends/norms, the pragmatic functions of neither the source text (Naude 2010: 288) nor the target text were taken very seriously. The tradition of faithful rendition (Nida’s (1964) formal equivalence) survived for centuries and was the main strategy in “serious (i.e. religious) translations”, as distinct from localizations.

The translation of the Bible (Ta 1689) done by Glueck (with one assistant) is viewed today as remarkable, taking into account the shortage of notions and words, the variety of dialects and patois, the scarcity of previous translation samples and the fact that Glueck’s knowledge of non-standardized Latvian (as a foreign language) could be far from perfect. Yet if one can say that Luther’s translation of the Bible gave rise to the German language (Brisset 2003: 344), the Latvian Bible translation to some extent “created” Latvian, and certainly created written Latvian. One can also see the importance of individual translators (Stender, Girgensohn, Rainis) as agents of change (Pym 1998).

The quality of Latvian used by the German clergy in the beginning was not high – the author of the first dictionary Mancelius (1631) tells a story that after a sermon a Latvian had commented “Who knows what that German cat is saying” (a wordplay on *kaķis* [cat] and *katķisms*) [catechism]). All texts in the first centuries are translations by non-native speakers, who simultaneously form the written language. Besides the translation of the Bible there were about 60 books published in the second half of the 17th century (Plakans 1995: 57), all of them translations. Readers could now learn the mechanism of reproducing and transforming reality, modes of

information structuring characteristic of the written text and the use of the literary language (Apinis 1991: 71).

Change of Pattern: Free Translation/Adaptations/ Localizations of Secular Texts

While constituting about 90% in the first half of the 18th century, religious books fell below 50% in the 1780s (Apinis 1977: 92). Once other types of text appeared, a different approach was exercised by the translators – texts were freely adapted to suit the level of education and understanding of the peasants. These were translations of moralizing stories and plays, secular information concerning agriculture, gardening, medicine, cooking and, more important, semi-encyclopedic information. Most of these were adaptations, localizations, domestications, compilations, rewrites. Adaptation is, perhaps, the most suitable term for these works, as they combine localization, domestication and elements of foreignization. Thus they do not conform to the simplified dichotomy of Venuti's (1995) domestication versus foreignization. Moreover there is no "ethnocentric reduction" taking place. Domestication in the early case of Latvian was a logical approach in a situation where the target audience was semi-illiterate and had little idea of many abstract and novel phenomena beyond its limited vision. Thus the usual means of domestication – change of names of characters, geographical names, settings, as well as a touch of simplified explanation and moralizing, are often practiced. Yet one can also often observe elements of foreignization in introducing unknown notions, flora, fauna, etc. Finally, perhaps paradoxically, traits of foreignization can be seen in the language use (because of the subjects and the narrators), as it differed considerably

from the spoken parlance and folklore.

Among the translators G.F. Stender stands out as a paramount representative of the new trends. Stender was a rationalist, enlightener and educator as well as the greatest authority of the time on issues of the Latvian language. Stender was the author of the first Latvian ABC, Latvian grammars, the most advanced dictionary, numerous translations, localizations and original writings. Thus he translated German poetry, religious stories, fairytales and stories, songs. He also localized Aesop's, Phaedrus' and La Fontain's fables, German enlightener's C.F. Gellert's writings, many of which actually entered Latvian folklore. Stender wrote/localized a huge and impressive popular "peasants' encyclopedia" *Augstas gudribas grāmata* [High Knowledge Book] (Stender 1774; 1776, second edition 1796), which was a creative localization of J. K. Gottsched's *Erste Gruende der gesammten Weltsweisheit* (1734). Another localization of Stender (1774) – *Svetas gudribas grāmatiņa* [Sacred Knowledge Booklet] was done on the basis of Swiss theologian J. K. Lavater's *Aussichten in der Ewigkeit* (1768). For many works the establishing of authorship is difficult; generally Stender's translations/works are ascribed to him. Thus his activities can be viewed as symbiotic – translating enlightening information in a rationalist and didactic ideology and, in parallel, expanding the Latvian lexis. Being an authority (language, science, translations) Stender can also be seen as a major trend and norm-setter; his habitus (Simeoni 1998) was never repeated, only replicated on a smaller scale. The varied nature of Stender's work can be viewed as an early example of the fluidity and the gradual blurring of the categories of the translation and the original (Hermans 1996: 43), as well as an example of the cline between the "translation language" and the "real", authentic language (Veisbergs 2009). Moreover the author/translator was to some extent the creator not only of the concrete translation text, but also of the Latvian language as such. Stender was very much aware of the duality of Latvian – he was so amazed by the abundant lexis of Latvian in the spheres of natural phenomena, flora and fauna, that his dictionary had

special appendices enumerating their huge variety. At the same time he had to introduce hundreds of necessary scientific and philosophical terms and words.

His translation method is theoretically interesting as it is really free and emancipated (he chose what to translate and how to translate) as well as target oriented. Of course there were no copyright infringement issues to be considered. It is almost impossible to state whether many of these works are translations, localizations or original texts (see Chesterman [1996] on the boundaries of the notion of translation). Stender's approach corresponds to a subsequent Goethe's understanding of translation as an organic change of form, beneficial growth, metamorphoses, enlightenment. These translations were not merely reproductive, but most productive, especially for the language demonstrating an early emancipation of their agents.

In the beginning of the 19th century the pattern continued. Translators were still the native German speakers. Practically all the texts had German sources, even when the original came from a different language. In many localizations the authorship is missing, but the translator's name is present. Most of the literary works belonged to the literary canon of the day, something that can be seen in comparison with neighbouring Estonia, where the same Genovevas and Robinsons ruled the scene during the same years. Thus 1824 saw the publication of "Robinsons Krūziņš" (1824), a translation by Girgensohn of the extremely popular German adaptation of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) by Joachim Campe's *Robinson der Juengere* (1779). The translation was actually done earlier, as Girgensohn died in 1814. Girgensohn's translation, however, is a landmark – this is the first novel to be translated in Latvian and the translation is meticulously faithful (the translator was advised to localize the heroes and the venues, but refused). Instead foreignizing tendencies can be observed, e.g. Girgensohn meticulously explains unknown words and proper names to the Latvian reader and introduces loans and coins neologisms. This continues the

growing trend of using translations to develop the language. The translation itself was later – 1871, 1885, 1886, 1894, 1886 – republished in a modified form (getting shorter and shorter) and consumed by several generations, serving as a perfect case of rewriting (Lefevere's term) and construction of the image of Robinson. The genuine Defoe's hero appeared in Latvian only in the 20th century. Incidentally Campe's Robinson, translated at the same time in neighbouring Lithuanian, obtained Lithuanian ethnicity and proclaimed nationalistic anti-Russian sentiments, as the Russian government had banned the use of Lithuanian. This is a similar story in many European languages (Monteiro 2006, Dimitriu 2006). Robinsons tended to acquire whatever traits were welcome at the moment.

The 1830s saw the first regular newspapers and magazines. In the 19th century Latvian newspapers and magazines played an important role in the development of the native literature. There were frequent discussions on linguistic issues and practical advice for the translation or composition of texts (Scholz 1990). More sophisticated literature, mostly poetry, appeared: Schiller's "Ode to Joy" (1804) and "The Robbers" (1818). These were followed by translations of Heine, Goethe, Lessing, Sudermann and Krilov's fables (1847). As choir singing spread, many song texts were adapted from German.

Early translations out of Latvian mainly focused on *dainas* (folksongs): Herder J. G.'s "Volklieder" (1779), "Stimmen den Voelker in Liedern" (1807). *Foreign Quarterly* carried *dainas* translations and a review in 1807/08. Herder, who resided in Rīga 1764-1769, is to be noted not only for the translations, but also for his deep impact on Neo-Latvians, who adhered to his idea of recovering national individuality and political identity through the rediscovery of folklore.

Translators often found that there was no word in the target language (Latvian) for a notion expressed in the source language – the linguistic lacunae (Schroeder 1995: 10) had to be filled with either

a borrowed or new native lexis. In the religious texts this mainly concerned specific religious items or occasional unknown cultural items (lion, olive, camel). When translation scope and depth increased, so did the amount of lexis created or borrowed. Thus translation was the main source of language enrichment and growth. Nevertheless this gradually led to two variants of Latvian. The peasant people were speaking one language at home and another while communicating with the non-Latvian governors in the official spheres – the court, the church, the administration, the manor. Only the second variant of the language had a written form. Thus two parallel languages or two variants of one language coexisted – the so-called Old Written Latvian and the spoken folk language. The translations reflected predominantly the first; they were also central in the Latvian literary polysystem (Even-Zohar 1990).

National Awakening: Spread of Translations, Birth of Native Writing

The situation changed in the middle of the 19th century when the so-called Latvian national awakening started, led by Neo-Latvians (nationally-aware Latvians who refused to be Germanized, as former well-to-do and educated people tended to do). This meant turning the vernacular language into the referential language (to use Gobard's terminology [1976: 34]) in an act of reclaiming identity. Parallel to the standard menu of sentimental popular German stories, the Neo-Latvians glorified the national past embodied in folklore. It also sparked an interest in the folklore of other nations, thus Russian, German, Estonian folktales were translated. Thus inspired by Macpherson's "Ossian's songs" (a forged ancient Scottish

epic) and simultaneously by the Estonian epic “Kalevipoeg”, Pumpurs, on the basis of Latvian folksongs and myths, compiled/wrote a Latvian epic “Lāčplēsis”. Neo-Latvians also borrowed ideas from Romanticism and translated Romantic and classical works, e.g. fragments of *Niebelungenlied* (1888), *Odyssey* in the 1890s.

The other trend focused on the future of the nation and the language that should service it – much scientific and educative literature had to be created. A huge expansion in translation started and the new writers-cum-translators turned to serious literature, in order to prove that anything could be expressed in Latvian. Thus language became both the aim and the means of national emancipation, similar to Finnish, Estonian, Czech, Slovak and other “new” languages and nations (Paloposki 1998: 376). It assumed a new representative function (Prunč 2007: 46). While there were 75 Latvian books published in 1867 (Apīnis 1977: 240), in 1884 the number had grown to 181, and by 1904 the yearly output had reached 822 (Plakans 1995: 101). As national literature proliferated, the share of translations dropped somewhat – from 93% in the early 1860s to about 80% in the the 1880s (Apīnis 1977: 313), yet it was still predominant. A broader spectrum of source languages reduced the share of German as a source language to about 70%, with Russian and English scoring about 7% each. Yet German often functioned as an intermediary language. The scope of the translations widened and the quality improved, so that in the last two decades of the 19th century satisfactory and adequate translations of long prose texts were widespread. The moment translations were viewed seriously (and now done by native Latvians), and the criterion of faithfulness was applied to these works. Domestication, still dominant in pulp literature, gradually terminated. Foreignization became a stable trait of Latvian translations as the source cultures were generally prestigious. One could say that around the turn of the 20th century the Latvian literary scene

had reached the level of contemporary European literature; it now followed and was part of the Western trends. Individual authors now aligned themselves with various imported literary trends. Translations were naturally the source of these ideas and leanings.

From Literalness to Freer Translations

Celebrity authors were freer in their translations (i.e. better use of language and less respect for the source text). Another reason why many outstanding native writers/poets turned to translation (which seems to be a general tendency at the period [Albrecht 1998: 279]) was the relatively high proportion of poetry texts in the Latvian translation menu. Here the greatest Latvian poet and playwright Rainis is a centerpiece. He started his literary career in late 1880s with translations of Pushkin, Ibsen, Ovid and Burns. He later translated several big and important works of Goethe – *Faustus* (1897/8), *Prometheus and Iphigenia*, Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, *Wilhelm Tell*, *Robbers*, Byron's *Cain*, Shakespeare's *King Lear*, *Anthony and Cleopatra* and other works by Maupassant, Dostoyevski, Chekhov and Sudermann. The translation of *Faustus* was hailed as a remarkable sample of Modern Latvian, overcoming the long split between the language variants. Nevertheless it was criticized by leading Latvian linguists as being too free and imaginative in its use of Latvian – the first serious translation criticism to emerge.

The beginning of the 20th century saw translations from French and its influence in the original literature. This also affected translation patterns – it liberated itself from the Germanic faithfulness. Thus when Rainis translated Alexandre Dumas' *The Count of Monte Cristo*, he Latvianized it in a very liberal way, cutting out less interesting passages, in line with the French tradition. This could be viewed as another watershed from fidelity and

literalness to a freer and more dynamic use of language (unless one views the early localizations as such). Rainis also grew interested in Eastern thought and ancient poetry (Mongolian, Persian, Armenian, Indian, Chinese). The poems were translated using German as an intermediary language. He was particularly fond of the ancient Chinese poet Li Tai-pe, using a German translation (Li Tai-pe 1915) as the source for his translations.

Parallel to a huge expansion in national writing, the 1920s (independence period) saw an enormous growth in translations, as well as an expansion beyond the traditional big quartet of source languages – German, Russian, English and French. An interest in the writings of neighbouring cultures – Lithuanian, Estonian and Scandinavian literatures – emerged. The Baltic cooperation, partly supported by governments, created a large turnover of these translations. The 1920s also saw translations from the Eastern languages (Chinese, Arabic, Persian, Japanese, Indian), which extended the scope of strategies. Translations were done by experts of the languages, e.g. P. Šmits, who had studied in China, translated Chinese tales. Many masters of native Latvian literature still practiced translation, partly for honing literary skills, borrowing ideas and, of course, to earn extra money. Yet one could also see a certain professionalization of the translators.

The Soviet Period: Reign of Standards and Norms

The Soviet period, especially after Stalin's death, saw many quality translations of various classics, as well as extensive translations from many hitherto less known languages. Russian, however, was frequently used as an intermediary language. Growing Russification also meant that translations

were mainly of fictional texts; other texts would be mostly accessible in Russian only. The translation scene was Moscow-controlled, and most translations were of Soviet literature and classics. Modern western literature was considered suspicious and ideologically dangerous. The fidelity approach was paramount, accuracy and norms were a hallmark of proper translation and the standard use of Latvian was demanded. Sometimes omissions were practiced for ideological/manipulative reasons, and sometimes footnotes explained points of ambiguity in the text. Though the policy determined what could be translated and how, the resulting product, despite the censorship, sometimes undermined the goals of the communist party. A fine-tuned system of ambiguous subtexts and undercurrents developed behind the official monolith façade. A considerable number of retranslations were done, mostly of classics, making them more accurate and using a language that is more modern. Literary translation gradually became a profession, while Latvian writers gradually moved out of translation. Translation criticism remained within the boundaries of target language (Latvian) quality.

Postmodern, Post-Soviet Period: Change of Norms and Conventions

Following Latvia's independence in 1991, the establishing of Latvian as the sole official language of the state led to an enormous growth in the volume of translation and a major shift from expressive (fictional) texts to appellative and informative texts. Most of the translations are not in book form or those of literature. The tradition of adaptation has found a new creative outlet in advertising translation and software localization. The collapse of the Soviet Union led to a fast linguistic reorientation as most of the information for Latvian speakers now came from the West and from

English. Within 10 years the source language pattern changed radically: in 1985 the proportion of translated books from Russian and English was 15:1; in 1994 it was 1:6 (Nītiņa 2008: 268).

The abolition of censorship and government control of publishing brought modern western writing, but also an interest in Far East literature. A fast change of the main contact language from Russian to English took place, and foreign language teaching was altered. Translation language/translationese phenomena spilled over into the general use of Latvian, changing many Latvian norms and conventions (Veisbergs 2007). While in the past this was a gradual and extended process, as in the case of many languages such as German (Koller 2000: 113), in the modern stage this was fast and noticeable even by the laymen. Finally, a change of the cultural paradigm (from traditional to postmodern) has occurred. Translation has become a huge industry and profession in its own, though of a varying status. Translation criticism has gradually overcome its traditional linguistic limitations. Translation has again (like in the early stage of Latvian) become the main vehicle of language development (Veisbergs 2011b). The major role played by translations in language and cultural development, as exemplified by Latvian, calls for a reassessment of the dichotomy and juxtaposition of translation and native writing.

“Translation Language” and “Real language”

Dichotomy

Translation theory, contrastive and corpus linguistics traditionally operate within the dichotomy between the translation language and the genuine, natural one. Yet, the pervasiveness of translation in the modern

world puts in doubt the dichotomy. Cross-cultural communication affects not only the translations per se, but also target culture and thinking in general. Globalization, migration, tourism, exchanges, international trade and business and, most of all, media openness bring numerous new concepts and terms into languages. However, the direct lexical impact is only part of the process. There is also a broad effect on target language composition/corpus, conventions, norms and even deep structures. Most “original” texts in Latvian, and one can presume in most languages, today carry many of the same traits as translations. Interference has long ceased to be characteristic of translated texts only. Translations in many languages constitute more than half of the texts that an average citizen “consumes”. We cannot speak any more of a clear dichotomy of “translation language” versus the real language – there is no isolation in the modern world. One can view this asymmetrical phenomenon as a deplorable interference, as linguistic and cultural imperialism or as a general standardization of languages with a consequent potential loss of cultural uniqueness. Yet language change is inevitable in the modern world, where translation functions as a major vehicle of change. It also calls for a review of some of the traditional approaches to translation theory within the new globalized, international and multilingual communication framework.

Nevertheless, the dichotomy still exists, reflecting a deeply engrained idea that translation language, translationese and translated texts are defective – to some degree tinted by the source language. This can be countered by recognizing that numerous original texts are also defective, poor and even wrong. The sharp distinction between the two is further confused by an obvious and well-recognized cline of translated texts from the carefully domesticated and literally edited to the carelessly done and/or foreignized.

Translationese and Corpora

Within the framework of lexicography, corpus linguistics and

translation studies, parallel texts (Hartmann 1994: 293) are usually divided into texts that are the result of translation (often called bitexts or translated texts) and independently formulated texts (comparable texts) (Hartmann 2001: 105; Laviosa 2010) matched by the same topic, similar discourse participants and footing, i.e. their intertextuality. The latter are viewed as more appropriate for linguistic processing, contrastive and textual analysis, while the former are seen with some suspicion as they may have features (slips, shifts, wrong usage) inherent in translations. These features, which go against what is called naturalness (Lewandowska 2001: 177), are viewed as alien and translation language is seen as constrained language (Toury 1995). Naturalness is interpreted in terms of frequency and preference in native texts from which translation language allegedly deviates.

Deviations caused by translationese are usually ascribed to interference from the source language (Lewandowska 2001: 178) that leads to a breach in target language norms. Even deliberately covert translations that conform to target text-type norms (not to speak of overt ones) may contain linguistic features that have different distributions as compared to non-translated, parallel texts (Chesterman 1999: 51). While less frequent in domesticated translations, these would be more pronounced in translations done according to foreignizing strategies, “deviating from prevailing domestic values” (Venutti 1998: 240).

Not disputing the theoretical possibility of differentiating translation texts and native texts, I still suppose that a quality translation may in fact be unrecognizable as a translation, while many “native” texts suffer from breaches of norms caused by ignorance or deliberate manipulations, as well as the ever-present interference (see below).

The principles of selecting comparable texts also seem to carry a congenital fault. Typical examples of these texts are often encyclopedia articles on the same topic, e.g. descriptions of iceberg, Biedermeier chair, pagoda. However, let us be realistic. Where would the author of

encyclopedia entries get the information on items like pagoda, iceberg, camel, sampan, kungfu, blog, media, non-native fauna and flora, recipes, chemical elements, notions of physics, general and international legal items (like presumption of innocence or PoW) if not in some other encyclopedia or reference source in another language, or in the best case a book on the subject which the author would have anyway done as a result of being part of another language community or comparing other language sources? This is certainly true in Latvian, and most likely so in numerous other languages, while perhaps less true of the few global languages.

The Manchester Translational English corpus, consisting of edited translations by native target language translators, confirms the universals set out by Baker (1996), namely, that there are some insignificant differences between natural text corpus and translated language corpus. Translations have more explicitation, fuller forms, more stale phraseology; less novel phraseology; a preference for concrete language as opposed to idiomatic language. This can partly be explained by translators being more qualified, more prudent and perhaps timid in their language use. But then the translated text corpora should be viewed in pairs, as the influence is source language specific.

Interference

My second argument concerns interference. Interference (elements of one code in the context of another) is an omnibus term (Baetens-Beardsmore 1986: 45) and can have a narrow or broad understanding. Besides, as Toury points out, it is usually negatively marked (Toury 2008: 411). Yet neither in the narrow nor in the broad sense can it be exclusively linked to translation. Interference is in fact inherent in bilingualism or multilingualism as such. A bilingual or multilingual person may/will also have interference in “native” speech without necessarily doing translation. The use of language by a bilingual person will be affected by his/her knowledge of the situation.

For example, there may be less interference in his/her conversation with or writing for monolinguals and more for bilinguals.

A quality translation of a general text may not have any elements whatsoever to suggest that it is a translation; it is the subject and foreign markers (exotic lexical elements, place names, names, surnames) that betray its foreign origin. On the other hand, a conversation or an internet chat between two computer experts (whatever their nationality) on their problems in their native language could have so many deviations (mainly on the lexical and semantic level) that its transcript would have all the elements of interference-saturated translation.

Interference in the broader sense is not limited to formal features: there may be serious or not-so-serious interference on the semantic, pragmatic or associative level, which is very difficult to trace in corpora. Moreover, there is an abundance of interlingual texts with frequent code-switching depending on the topic, situation and participants. Thus, in order to find “clean” untainted samples of speech/text one has to find:

1. a monolingual;
2. this person should preferably be in touch with monolinguals only;
and
3. this person should be cut off from any means of modern communication.

Yet most of our contemporaries read books (or at least magazines or papers), watch TV, use the internet, purchase imported food and goods, take medicine, etc, many of which carry translations. Such isolation would be difficult in the modern world and it seems that corpora compilers in general would not be able to carry off this surgical task. Finally, it should be pointed out that, with time, most untranslatable and “foreign” items will become virtually native or semi-native for the non-expert.

Hybridity

Most modern texts (and translations) are characterized by hybridity (Wolf 2000), which extends in the global village not only to translations and translated texts but also to most of the original/natural texts. We live in a translated world where international culture competes and interacts with local forms. Discursive similarities appear, irrespective of the language in which a text has been created; “transnational” and “translational” concepts have become synonyms (Zauberga 1999: 265). While stressing the hybrid character of modern media and intercourse, we are not suggesting that this is something new. The borrowing of linguistic elements and ideas and memes has a long history. Suffice it to mention the Bible and its translations, which by means of endless repetition have deeply affected the wordstock, idiom stock and metaphoric thinking of Christian societies. Yet the modern scope is broader.

Not attempting to cover all fields and set an exhaustive list of the translation-dominated spheres where hybridity is rife and inevitable (unless consciously combated), the following could be mentioned in the Latvian case:

- any text on international matters (politics, economy);
- most texts on popular international culture (cinema music, football, celebrities);
- recipes;
- travel books, guides and descriptions;
- International (and EU) laws transposed, contracts (legal concepts and language in general for most nations is borrowed from Latin or some other dominating language);
- localization of software;
- advertising;
- films, dubbed, with voice-over and/or subtitles according to the tradition;

- TV dubbed, with voice-over and/or subtitles, in international media in various languages;
- localized, franchised TV shows and games which add to the import of modes, norms and conventions;
- usage instructions, labels (food, equipment, medicine);
- higher education textbooks, education books;
- reference books, encyclopedias;
- covert translations offered as original writings in newspapers, magazines;
- fiction translations (deliberately at the end of the list – though translation studies usually have a bias for literary texts/translation – these texts constitute a tiny fraction of the whole). Also local fiction and many “original” writings tend to be influenced by trends and currents in other countries.

These must be complemented by spheres where people are in direct contact with another language, such as companies and their branches operating in another language, pop music, Internet, satellite TV, original soundtracks in subtitled films, broadcasts, sports, etc. These spheres increase linguistic interference, which mentally affects “natural” original speech/text norms and conventions. Of course, many countries have official bilingualism and close mass language contact.

Such a broad and pervasive impact cannot but trigger noticeable changes in home conventions and norms at an amazing speed and scope. We can talk of higher or lower levels of hybridity depending on the degree of concentration of foreign elements, but translation certainly destabilizes cultural identities and makes it difficult to draw the line between national and international, translation and non-translation.

All writing/speech is translation and interpretation

This is the fourth, philosophical argument, in fact, Chesterman's fifth (and the most basic A.V.) supermeme (Chesterman 1997: 14). Translation is rewriting: we resort to various types of rewriting/retelling (stories) often. Our words are not ours, they have been used before, and our own use is inevitably tainted by their previous usage, in other people's mouths/writings. There are no "originals"; all we can do is translate (Gentzler 1993). The same issue can be approached from the other end. Gutt does not believe that "translational language" is somehow a linguistically distinct variety of language. A variety of factors account for it as a particular form of communication, rather than purely linguistic peculiarities, among them the purpose (scopos) of the translation or, for that matter, the purpose of any text.

Thus, though theoretically feasible and in some cases valuable, a contrastive study of broad corpora of translational versus non-translational language can certainly produce some data on the peculiarities of the former. However, in the modern situation, clear delineation of the two seems both impractical and often impossible. Translations are part and parcel of language use and thus part and parcel of its corpus.

It has been estimated that the proportion of translations in the total volume of texts the average Latvian citizen would encounter is about 60%. This, perhaps, reflects the traditional divide between the large and small languages regarding the percentage of translations among published books, e.g. Britain 3%, Germany 14%, France 18%, Sweden 60% (Albrecht 1998: 337). An enormous growth in the volume of translated information and a major shift from expressive (fictional) texts to appellative and informative texts has occurred (Veisbergs 2011a).

Conclusions

Translations have played an exceptionally important role in constructing Latvian identity, culture and nation. They have been central and most influential in the Latvian literary polysystem. Translations have constituted the majority of texts produced and available in Latvian. The Latvian translation scene has grown in scope, depth and width, starting from an almost exclusive German and religious menu, spreading to other big languages (Russian, English, French), then addressing neighbouring literature and finally turning to more exotic and far-away cultures. Translations have been deliberately used to enhance and spread the wordstock of Latvian. Nonfiction translation has always been governed by the dominating contact languages – consecutively German, Russian, English, which have also been the major influences on the Latvian language per se. The Latvian translation scene also demonstrates fast shifts with regard to contact languages and approaches to translation depending on the extralinguistic situation, currents, vogue, target audience and personalities of translators. Translation criticism, however, has mainly focused on the quality of the Latvian language in the translations.

References

- Albrecht, Joern (1998). *Literarische Uebersetzung. Geschichte-Theorie-Kulturelle Wirkung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Apinis, Aleksejs (1977). *Latviešu gramatniecība*. Rīga: Liesma.
- _____ (1991). *Grāmata un latviešu sabiedrība līdz 19. gs vidum*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (1995). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Baetens-Beardsmore, Hugo (1986). *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Baker, Mona (1996). "Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges that Lie Ahead". In *Terminology, LSP and Translation Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*. Ed. Harold Somers. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 175-186.
- Brisset, Annie (2003). "The Search for a Native Language: Translational and Cultural Identity". In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge. 343-375.
- Chan, Sin-wai (2009). *Translation in China and the West*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Chelliah, Shobhana L. and de Reuse, Willem J. (2011). *Handbook of Descriptive Linguistic Fieldwork*. Dordrecht: Springer Science.
- Chesterman, Andrew (1996). "On Similarity". *Target* 8.1: 159-164.
- _____ (1997). *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____ (1999). "Translation Typology". In *The Second Rīga Symposium on Pragmatic Aspects of Translation*. Eds. Veisbergs Andrejs and Zauberga Ieva. Rīga: University of Latvia. 49-62.
- Dimitriu, Rodica (2006). "From Robinson Crusoe to Robinson in Wallachia". In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 73-82.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990). *Polysystem Studies. Poetics Today* 11.1.
- Gentzler, Edwin (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- Gobard, Henri (1976). *L'Alienation linguistique*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. and James Gregory (2001). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge.
- _____ (1994). "The Use of Parallel Text Corpora in the Generation of Translation Equivalents for Bilingual Lexicography". In *EURALEX '94 Proceedings*. Eds. Willy Martin et al. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit. 291-297.
- Hermans, Theo (1996). "Norms and Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework". In *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Eds. Roman Alvarez and Vidal

- Carmen-Africa. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters. 25-51.
- Koller, Werner (2000). "Übersetzungen in Deutsche und ihre Bedeutung fuer die deutsche Sprachgeschichte". In *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*. Eds. Werner Besch, Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann and Stefan Sonderegger. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 112-129.
- Laviosa, Sara (2010). "Corpora". In *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 80-86.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara (2001). "Dictionaries, Language Corpora and Naturalness in Translation". In *Translation and Meaning*. Part 5. Eds. Marcel Thelen and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. Maastricht: UPM. 177-185.
- Li Tai-pe (1915). *Gedichte. Nachdichtungen von A. Klabund*. Leipzig: Insel Verlag.
- Mancelius, Georgius (1631). *Lettisch Vade-mecum*. Rīga: Gerhard Schroeder.
- _____ (1638). *Lettus. Das ist Wortbuch*. Rīga: Gerhard Schroeder.
- Monteiro, Maria Goreti (2006). "Choosing Not to Translate. Zero Translations in the First Portuguese *Robinson Crusoe*". In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 65-72.
- Moore, David Chioni (2001). "Is the 'Post' in 'Postcolonial' the 'Post' in 'Post-Soviet'? Notes Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique". *PMLA* 116.1: 111-128.
- Mossopi, Brian, Ernst-August Gutt, Jean Peeters, Kinga Klaudy, Robin Setton and Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (2005). "Back to Translation as Language". *Across Languages and Cultures*. 6.2: 143-172.
- Naude, Jacobus (2010). "Religious Translation". In *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 285-293.
- Nida, Eugene (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nītiņa, Daina and Veisbergs Andrejs (2008). "Changes and Quality of the Language". In *Break-out of Latvian*. Eds. Daiga Joma and Andrejs Veisbergs. Rīga: Zinātne. 264-293.

- Paloposki, Outi and Riita Oittinen (1998). "The Domesticated Foreign". In *Translation in Context*. Eds. Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador and Yves Gambier. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 373-390.
- Plakans, Andrejs (1995). *The Latvians*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- Prunč, Erich (2007). "Priests, Princes and Pariahs". In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 39-56.
- Pym, Anthony (1998) *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Račevskis, Kārlis (2006). "Toward a Postcolonial Perspective on the Baltic States". In *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Ed. Violeta Kelertas. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 165-186.
- Rehehusen, Johann Georg (1644). *Manuductio ad linguam lettanicam facilis et certa*. Rīga.
- Robinsons Krūzjūņš* (1824). Jelgavā : pee Jahņa Wridriķķa Steffenhagen un dēla.
- Scholz, Friedrich (1990). *Die Literaturen des Baltikums: Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung*. Abhandlungen der rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vol. 80. Düsseldorf: West-deutscher Verlag.
- Schroeder, Hartmut. (1995). "'Lacunae' and the Covert Problems of Understanding Texts from Foreign Cultures". In *Lacunaology. Studies in Intercultural Communication*. Eds. Hartmut Schroeder and Brett Dellinger. Vaasa: University of Vaasa. 10-25.
- Simeoni, Daniel (1998). "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus". *Target* 10.1: 1-39.
- Stender, G.F. (1774). *Augstas Gudribas Gramata no Pasaules un Dabbas*. Jelgavā un Aispute.
- _____ (1774). *Svētas gudribas grāmatīņa, sarakstīta no Sērpils un Sunākstes baznīckunga Stendera*. Jelgavā un Aizpute.
- Ta Swehta Gramata jeb Deeva Swehtais* (1689) Rīga: J. G. Wilcken.
- Tāgepera, Reins (2010). "Alberts, Mārtiņš un arī Pēteris: viņu loma latviešu un igauņu nāciju izveidē". In *Akadēmiskā dzīve / Academic Life*. Rīga: University of Latvia. 3-12.
- The Translational English Corpus* (TEC). www.monabaker.com/tsresources/TranslationalEnglishCorpus.htm (last accessed 22 Jan. 2013)

- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- ____ (2008). "Interview in Toronto". In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger and Daniel Simeoni. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 400-413.
- Veisbergs, Andrejs (2007). "Occasional and Systematic Shifts in Word-formation and Idiom Use in Latvian As a Result of Translation". In *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Ed. Judith Munat. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 239-263.
- ____ (2009). "Translation Language: The Major Force in Shaping Modern Latvian". In *Vertimo Studijos 2*. Vilnius: Universito Leidykla. 54-70.
- ____ and Ločmele Gunta (2011). "The Other Polysystem. The Impact of Translation on Language Norms and Conventions in Latvia". In *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Ed. Brian James Baer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 295-316.
- ____ (2011). "Latvian Language Policy, Translation, Impact on the Language Development". In *Language Policy in the Practice of Translating*. Eds. Stephen Kessler and Marko Pantermoeller. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 65-82.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- ____ (1998). *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Wolf, Michaela (2000). "Du weisst, dass ich Slave, Deutscher, Italiener bin. Hybridität in Original und Uebersetzung am Beispiel Scipio Slatapers Il Mio Caros". In *Translationswissenschaft*. Eds. Mira Kadric, Klaus Kaindl und Franz Poehhacker. Tuebingen: Stauffenberg Verlag. 115-131.
- Zauberga, Ieva (1999). "Hybridity as Inevitable Feature of Cross-cultural Communication". In *The Second Rīga Symposium on Pragmatic Aspects of Translation*. Eds. Andrejs Veisbergs and Ieva Zauberga. Rīga: University of Latvia. 265-274.

About the Author

Andrejs Veisbergs (b. 1960), Dr. Habil. Philol., is a Professor of the University of Latvia. His research publications since 1985 amount to more than 300, mainly on idioms, borrowing, Latvian, language contacts, translation and interpreting and lexicography. He is the author of the biggest Latvian-English dictionary (1997, Second edition 2005) as well as several monographs on Latvian idioms, contrastive linguistics, conference interpreting (2007, 2009) and idiom borrowing (2012). Since 2004 he has been Chairman of the Presidential Latvian Language Commission, occupied many other positions within the Latvian language and academic community, and sat on several editorial boards. He is a corresponding member of the Latvian Academy of Sciences, member of EURALEX and consultant of Oxford English Dictionaries.

張愛玲英譯《海上花列傳》 的女性翻譯詩學

王小鶯

Abstract

Translating *Haishanghua Liezhuan*: Eileen Chang's Female Translation Poetics (by Wang Xiaoying)

Eileen Chang spent decades on the translation of Haishanghua Liezhuan in her late life, a traditional novel written in the Wu dialect. Hence, the target text The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai stands out as one of the most valuable translation works in her life worthy of research. The paper discusses Chang's unique translation poetics as a female writer-translator. In the light of feminist translation theory, this author interprets Chang's translation poetics through three kinds of textual evidence, i.e. her translation of the detailed descriptions in the source text, her deletions and her annotations. It is the author's conclusion that Eileen Chang's translation poetics carries feminist implications, although she deviates from Western feminist translators.

一、引言

張愛玲（1920-1995）的譯者身份已浮出歷史地表，學界對其翻譯作品的關注亦方興未艾，然而，卻鮮有關注張氏晚年長篇譯作 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*（1995?）^[1]，作為張愛玲翻譯生涯中歷時最久（數十年）、篇幅最長（30餘萬字）的翻譯作品，*The Sing-song*

Girls of Shanghai 應是張氏翻譯生涯中最具研究價值的作品之一，說它是觀照張氏翻譯詩學的地標性作品恐怕並不為過。然而，縱觀學界對張氏譯作的研究現狀，尚無專述張氏晚年譯作 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 的研究，致使其成為學界視域中的盲點。^[2]

The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai 譯自晚清吳語小說《海上花列傳》（以下簡稱《海上花》）。《海上花》是晚清韓邦慶用吳語寫成的章回小說，以晚清上海青樓女子為主角，它由幾位青樓女子的生活瑣事說開去，描摹出晚清十里洋場飲食男女的生活長卷，風格質樸，然其描寫細膩精緻、毫不俗媚——這些特質使得它具極高的文學價值。魯迅（2006：94）稱讚《海上花》的文字“平淡而近自然”。胡適（2003：7）讚譽它是“吳語文學的第一部傑作”。王德威（2003：124）、范伯群（2006：14）等學者更認為，《海上花》的敘事跳離了傳統的窠臼，沒有追求完滿的結局，書中寫實的敘事、對人物個性化的描摹、富現代性的結局包含了中國古典小說向現代轉型的要素，在中國現代文學發生史上有重要地位。然而，由於方言障礙和意識形態的原因，閱讀《海上花》的受眾一般僅限於近現代精英文人圈，銷量小眾。在現代出版業繁盛之際，這部優秀的傳統小說面臨著湮沒的命運，正如張氏本人所惋惜的，“《海上花》兩次悄悄的自生自滅之後，有點什麼東西死了”（1997a：257）——而盡最大努力留存這部優秀小說，這也正是張愛玲翻譯《海上花》初衷。

張愛玲對《海上花》的英譯始於20世紀60年代，一直延續到其晚年逝世前期。張氏對這部譯稿可謂視若拱璧，除1982年在香港中文大學翻譯中心主編的《譯叢》（*Renditions*）上發表過 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 之第一、二章之外，張氏對這部譯稿一直秘而不宣。^[3] 值得一提的是，這部珍貴的英譯手稿經歷了一個失而復得的過

程。晚年時期，張愛玲居無定所，也因此遺失了這部心愛的譯稿。張愛玲逝世後，她的遺囑執行人宋以朗在遺物中發現了這部手稿，^[4] 經孔慧怡整理、潤色，張氏譯稿 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 終由美國哥倫比亞大學出版社出版，賦予了這部久為方言所困的傳統小說新的文學生命。

作為張愛玲至喜愛的古典小說之一（另一部為《紅樓夢》），張愛玲小時候就開始閱讀《海上花》，並一讀再讀，《海上花》對張氏的文學創作有深遠的影響，例如，余斌（2002：412）談到《海上花》對張愛玲創作的影響時就認為：“（張愛玲）以後的小說風格上趨於平淡，心追手摹的範本是《海上花》。”日後張愛玲正是借鑒了《海上花》中的古典白話敘事風格，形成了其“張腔”（王德威，2004：1）的獨特文風——我們從張愛玲筆下俗世中的男女情愛故事、精緻細膩的細節描寫都能看到張氏作品和這部小說之間的互文性淵源。此番張愛玲以女性譯/作者的身份英譯《海上花》，人們不免關心：她是如何處理源文本的細節寫作呢？她又以何種態度處理源文本的男權話語呢？在女性主義視角的觀照下，我們看到 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 呈現出張愛玲融女性譯者、作者為一體的獨特翻譯詩學。

二、具“張腔”特色的女性翻譯詩學

在中國現代文學史上，張愛玲以其獨特的女性寫作詩學獨具一格。她善於打通人體感覺，營造紛繁複雜的意象，在她的作品中，讀者可以看到作者對服飾、傢俱、髮型等瑣碎細節不厭其煩地描寫。不少學者如林幸謙（2003a; 2003b）、孟悅和戴錦華（2004）都把這些視為張氏最具女性作家特質的文本特徵。而貫穿張氏女性創作詩學中

的，也正是張愛玲本人的獨特女性意識。張愛玲以其文學創作表述出了婦女（尤其是沒落世家的婦女）在晚清以遺老遺少為男性家長的大家族中的焦慮。縱觀張愛玲所有作品，她的創作主題實為作家對中國特定語境（晚清至民國這一轉型時期）下女性生活與命運的探討。事實上，對於五四運動以後由娜拉等西方女性角色引進而風靡一時的中國“新女性”概念，張愛玲自有其深刻洞察與反思。在〈走！走到樓上去〉一文，張愛玲預言了中國新女性們走出封建家庭後終將面對的尷尬：“‘走！走到樓上去！’——開飯的時候，一聲呼喚，他們就會下來的”（1992: 75）——這句話也為張氏的獨特女性意識做了注腳。

而今，當我們審視譯者張愛玲的英譯文本 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 時，我們發現張愛玲對《海上花》的翻譯同樣體現出其女性意識，其風格特徵與她本人作為作家的風格特徵是一致的。以譯注為例，讀者可以看到譯者在譯文本中加入大量註腳，藉此對源文的服飾、髮型等細節進行事無巨細的鋪陳，投射出張氏作為一名女性譯者的情感體驗和性別視角。當然，作為一位中國女性譯者，張愛玲的翻譯所關注的始終是中國本土文化、歷史語境下中國女性的生活與命運。另外，張愛玲的獨特之處還在於，作為一名深受中國傳統文化浸潤和影響的女性譯者，張氏對《海上花》的翻譯多處可見她對傳統的敬意和審慎的翻譯態度——在忠於原著、原作者這一總體原則下，她在翻譯的縫隙中不時穿插評論性質的註腳，委婉地表達出了譯者與原作者、讀者對話的意圖。所以在此背景下，張氏的翻譯策略和手法頗具中國傳統迂迴曲折、折衷之妙。正如陳吉榮（2007: 51）所評述的，張愛玲慣於也擅長運用本土化的翻譯策略，“在一個傳統的框架內獲得某些改變和新生”。確實，和戈德（Barbara Godard）等西方女性譯者相比，張愛玲的翻譯策略和手法顯得較為委婉、溫和。然而

仔細品味 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*，我們仍從中領略到她深具女性主義特質但又有別於西方女性主義譯者的翻譯詩學，也正是從這個意義出發，本文稱之為張愛玲獨特的“女性翻譯詩學”。

下面將對張氏對源文細節描寫的翻譯、對源文的刪節和譯注進行考察，觀其女性翻譯詩學之獨特面貌。

（一）對源文本細節描寫的翻譯

源文《海上花》作者韓邦慶用平實的語言描摹人物服飾、心理、動作等細節，形成了其具平實特色的細節描寫。《海上花》這種白描功夫被王德威（2003）視為“海派”文學的先河之作，對日後的“海派”傳統和作家都有影響。《海上花》是張愛玲至喜愛的文學作品，當中的細節描寫對張愛玲日後的文學創作有著巨大影響——“張腔”風格的建立也是汲取了《海上花》的細節描寫的養分。分析張愛玲如何以一位譯者的身份再現《海上花》的細節，對考察此時張氏的女性翻譯詩學有著重要意義。下文將從服飾、景物這兩處細節描寫中選取例句，進行分析，首先看服飾細節。

- (a) 子富見他穿著銀紅小袖襖，蜜綠散腳褲，外面單一件寶藍緞心天青緞滾滿身灑袖的馬甲；並梳著兩角丫髻，垂著兩股流蘇，宛然是《四郎探母》這一套戲內的耶律公主。（韓邦慶，2006: 64-65）

He saw her wearing a pale pink jacket with narrow sleeve and honey-green wide trousers, topped by a sapphire blue sleeveless jacket trimmed with dark blue satin, with scattered embroideries all over; her hair done in two high buns up front, trailing two tassels just like the Princess Yeh-lü in the opera “General Yang Visits his Mother.” (Chang 1995: 99)

這是《海上花》中典型的對人物形象的細節描寫，具古典白話小說風

韻，作者用一個長句，以“流水帳”的形式依次排出人物的衣飾、服裝、形象等細節。再看張愛玲的翻譯，我們看到張愛玲以忠實的翻譯原則、直譯的翻譯手法展現出她對源文本細節描寫的理解，其中有兩點值得注意。首先，張愛玲細緻地呈現出了源文每一個近似繁瑣的服飾資訊，比如，“sleeveless jacket trimmed with dark blue satin, with scattered embroideries all over”對應源文的“滾滿身灑袖的馬甲”，當中，包含了譯者對這種服裝中針腳（trim）、刺繡（scattered embroidery）、料子（satin）等隱藏細節的再現；需要特別指出的是，要準確地翻譯出這些資訊，譯者要有扎實的服飾知識。其次，目標文本的語序和源文本直接對應，有一種字字對應的效果——這表明張愛玲並打算根據英文文法規則重排源文本的資訊，而是意欲透過直譯的方法以一種更為直觀的形式再現源文。其實，縱觀張愛玲的整個譯本，讀者可以發現張愛玲對源文本服飾、傢俱、髮型等細節的翻譯都採取了這種有著字字對譯效果的直譯手法，這表明張愛玲力圖“原汁原味”呈現源文本細節描寫面貌的意圖。

張愛玲出生於晚清沒落的豪門世家，外曾祖父為晚清重臣李鴻章，張愛玲從小得以目睹前朝的繁華與沒落。張愛玲的家庭背景深刻地影響了她日後的創作。少時張愛玲對顏色、氣味、傢俱、服飾等諸種細節特別敏感，她也善於觀察各種瑣事，由此捕捉其中的細節之美。她曾說，“顏色和氣味常常使我快樂，……翠藍夏布衫，青綢褲，那翠藍和青在一起有一種森森細細的美……，我坐在一邊，無心中看到了，也高興了好一會”（張愛玲，1997b: 161）。上述細節成為張愛玲日後文學創作的直接題材。而張愛玲在 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 中以其直譯的翻譯手法、事無巨細的翻譯態度同樣反映出她對細節描寫的喜愛。由此可見，在對待細節描寫的態度和處理方式

上，張氏在《海上花》中體現出來的翻譯詩學與她的創作詩學是一致的。再來看下例關於景物的細節。

(b)當下開筵坐花，飛觴醉月，絲哀竹急，弁側釵橫。(韓邦慶，2006：93)

Thereupon began the feasting amidst flowers; cup flew about and one grew tipsy from the moon reflected therein; strings mourned, the bamboo beat fast; hats tilted, hairpins went horizontal. (Chang 1995: 99)

例子描寫了眾人宴樂的情景，仔細讀來，它是描寫得很泛的應景之作。源文字數並不多，然而牽涉到頗多資訊，如中國傳統弦樂器類的“絲”、“竹”，又如服飾類的“弁”和“釵”；此外，文中除“當下”這一時間副詞之外，其餘詞句對仗較為工整，以“開筵坐花”對“飛觴醉月”，以“絲哀竹急”對“弁側釵橫”。

再來看張愛玲的翻譯。首先，讀者撲面而來的感覺是譯者仍舊採取了高度直譯的翻譯手法處理源文本各種細節，比如，源文中“開筵坐花”中“花”字隱喻席間青樓女子，譯者把“花”就直接譯為“flowers”，把“絲哀竹急”中“哀”譯為“mourned”，又如，“飛觴醉月”中的“飛”指眾人觥籌交錯、互相敬酒的動作，張愛玲也直譯“飛”為“flew about”，等等。另外，對源文那較為對仗的結構，張愛玲雖拘于英文文法規則未完全保留，但她的譯文還是顯示出她對此有相當的考量，如“絲哀竹急，弁側釵橫”就被譯為較為平整的“strings mourned, the bamboo beat fast; hats tilted, hairpins went horizontal”，譯者在其中以分號顯示出平衡此句句意的意圖。此時，張愛玲對細節描寫的翻譯原則可概括為：直接、細緻。

當然，對於源文本的細節描寫，其餘許多女性、男性譯者也都有可能譯得直接、細緻（如楊憲益、戴乃迭夫婦對《紅樓夢》細節描寫

的英譯)。然而，細究起來，張愛玲對細節描寫的翻譯和其他譯者有著截然不同的特點。

首先，她對源文本細節的翻譯和處理方式和張氏本人的女性寫作詩學呈現出一致性的特徵，可以說，這也是譯者張愛玲在她本人強大的寫作背景下作出的有意（抑或無意？）的選擇。和她本人的文學創作一樣，張愛玲在 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 中對細節進行細細鋪陳的同時，也注入了譯者的女性意識——對細節描寫的翻譯反映出張氏對女性特質一如既往的欣賞與喜愛，也反映出了她作為一名女性譯者的思維特質。這一點，在下文即將分析的張氏對“品藍”、“月白”二詞的譯注中尤為明顯。

其次，和其他譯者不同的是，張愛玲本人對細節描寫的翻譯歷經了不同的態度轉變，折射出張氏前後迥異的女性譯者的主體性面貌。要分析這一點，我們必須從張愛玲整個英譯生涯之概況說起。

張愛玲的中英翻譯生涯歷時很長，從1952年她任職香港美新處時就開始中英翻譯，多為中英自譯（詳情參見單德興，2009）。須提及的是，張愛玲的英語寫作計畫對她本人的中英翻譯有著深遠的影響：張氏抵港初即著手英語寫作以“打進美國出版界”（周芬伶，2007: 99），希望在英語世界重現她在中文文壇的盛景，在這一語境下，張愛玲的中英翻譯（尤其是中英自譯）可視為張愛玲英語寫作計畫中獨特的組成部份，承載著張氏英語寫作的夢想。如果把張愛玲的中英翻譯活動和她本人的英語寫作計畫聯繫起來，張愛玲的中英翻譯可以分為前後兩期：前期為1952-1967年，這分別是張愛玲開始、終止英語創作的時間；後期為1967-1995年，正是在此期間，張氏開始潛心翻譯《海上花》。1952年，張愛玲來港後經濟拮据，此時她力圖打入英語出版界的願望格外強烈。因此，在張氏中英翻譯之

前期，為了能讓自己的作品更符合西方讀者的期待視野（horizon of expectation），進入英語出版界，張氏早期眾多自譯作品，如 *Naked Earth*（1956）（《赤地之戀》）、*Shame, Amah!*（1961）（〈桂花蒸 阿小悲秋〉）中，張愛玲對源文本的細節描寫採取了大幅度改寫、刪除的翻譯策略，從而丟失了源文、其實也是她本人最具女性作家特質的精彩意象，展現出張氏女性譯者主體性的強烈消滅。^[5] 然而，與前期英譯不同的是，張氏後期放棄了其屢不得志的英語寫作計畫，這也意味著她放棄了對西方讀者閱讀口味的追逐與迎合，因而，此語境之下的張氏晚期譯作 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 中，譯者重新回歸她對細節的百般鋪陳，重新表現出對細節翻譯的欣賞與喜愛。在這一背景襯托之下，張愛玲後期翻譯生涯中重返對細節描寫的沉湎便顯得十分突出、特殊了。

（二）刪節

譯作中的刪減是我們瞭解譯者的立場和姿態的重要途徑，“因為刪改之處所要隱藏的訊息，往往與刪改之後所要表達的意義同樣重要”（張佩瑤，2003: 16）。張愛玲對《海上花》的內容、情節做了幾處有限的刪減，其中，最大的刪減來自她對《穢史外編》的刪節。張愛玲上述刪減表達了什麼意圖、帶出了她怎樣的立場呢？下面以張氏對《穢史外編》的刪減，分析其中包含的立場與態度。

傳統的中國小說，如果題材涉及某些社會禁忌（比如情欲），那作者往往會在行文之初先申明小說的主旨是規避這些禁忌、警醒世人。受到這種以規避禁忌為小說正統的“影響的焦慮”（Bloom 1973: 1），作者韓邦慶（2006: 1）在《海上花》中開篇明義，自陳創作目的乃是“欲覺晨鐘，發人深省……懲惡揚善”。除了這個楔子外，書中還

穿插對以青樓女性為代表的“邪惡”女人的抨擊，此即作者假託文人尹癡鴛杜撰的《穢史外編》。《穢史外編》是全書唯一的性愛描寫，由駢體寫成，約1200字，投射出彼時男性對女性的性幻想，充斥其中的還有對女性的蔑視與偏見。^[6]

張愛玲在英譯《海上花》時，以作家的眼光指出《穢史外編》是全文的糟粕之處，不僅造成前後敘述矛盾，而且影響文本美學效果的呈現（張愛玲，1997: 232）。因此，她翻譯時把《穢史外編》全部刪去，對因此而引起的情節破損與斷裂，她在譯文中運用了多種方法進行縫合。比如，源文本五十一回目為“胸中塊《穢史》寄牢騷，眼下釘小蠻爭寵眷”，譯者把前半回“胸中塊《穢史》寄牢騷”全部刪掉，根據上下文的情節把這半回改寫“A grass widow in Eden, the hounded girl hid from her tormentor's attention”。改寫後回目已經和《穢史外編》沒有任何關係，她此處補綴的是源文中的弱女孫素蘭躲避惡霸欺負的情節，譯文中“tormentor”一詞暗示出當時青樓女性被折磨欺凌的命運。把源文侮辱女性的描寫刪去，代之以另外一個青樓女子被折磨的故事，這本身就反映出張愛玲譯中有作、具女性主義特質的翻譯詩學。

同時，張愛玲對《穢史外編》的刪節也顯示出她的女性本位立場，表現出張氏翻譯《海上花》全書時最為大膽、最為激進的深具女性主義特質的翻譯策略。張愛玲從1967年開始英譯《海上花》，對於這部心儀已久的小說，她採取了忠實的翻譯原則以及直譯的翻譯手法，因此，《The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai》中大部分文字和源文本忠實到了字字對應的程度。然而，她在英譯的過程中，對源文本惡意描寫女性的《穢史外編》全數刪去——在張氏英譯《海上花》全書所採用的以委婉、溫和為主要基調的翻譯策略中，她對《穢史外編》堅決的

處理方法是罕見和突出的，反映出女性譯者對如何處理傳統小說中糟粕之處的嚴肅探討與反思。其中，尤其呈現出譯者以其女性作/譯者的立場對以《穢史外編》所象徵的男性中心寫作傳統的拒斥與分離。

(三) 譯注

源文本《海上花》用吳語寫就，書中有大量的方言、行業特色辭彙。因此，目標文本 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 中有極多譯注。總體說來，*The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 中的譯注可以分為五類：1. 服飾類；2. 名物典故類；3. 清末上海地名和習俗類；4. 青樓行業用語類；5. 對源文隱晦情節的補充說明類。譯注是譯者介入翻譯的重要手段，縱觀張愛玲在其英譯本的譯注，我們發現它們都從不同角度表現出張氏的女性翻譯詩學。因篇幅所限，本文將選取1、4類譯注，對此做進一步闡釋。

A. 服飾類譯注

The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai 中有大量極為詳盡的服飾類譯注，這和張愛玲在譯文正文對源文服飾綿密細緻的翻譯形成有趣互動。縱覽譯者所作的服飾類注釋，它們詳盡到了令人乍舌的程度。如在翻譯源文的“時路行頭，連鑲鞋小帽並煥然一新”（韓邦慶，2006: 102），譯者對“小帽”這一詞條作出譯注：“The sectioned black satin skullcap topped by a little scarlet knob of knotted silk, called ‘the small hat’, ‘the big hat’ being the mandarin’s formal hat with the top knob denoting rank”(Chang 1995: 163)。在上述譯注中，張愛玲不僅詳細解釋了“小帽”的形狀、顏色、質地，還順帶一起解釋了什麼叫“大帽”（“the big hat”）。又如，在翻譯“膏荷縐面品月緞腳松江花邊夾腳褲”時（韓邦慶，2006: 65），張愛玲對“品月”這個顏

色做出如下譯注：

The approximation of an unknown color, *p'in yueh*. *P'in lan*, grade blue referring to the nine grades of officials, is a special shade of a medium blue, a cobalt lighter, probably drawn from the multi-colored heraldic square on the chest and back of official garments. *P'in yueh* would be a special shade of *yueh pai*, moon white, which is the palest turquoise. (Chang 1995:101) (下劃線為源文本所有)

在譯注“品月”一詞的過程中，她興之所至，還一併對“品月”（*p'in yueh*）的兩個同級辭彙“品藍”（*p'in lan*）、“月白”（*yueh pai*）做了詳細解釋。我們僅從上述兩例譯注就可看到張愛玲對翻譯服飾細節的投入與沉涵——從顏色到面料再到質地、做工，譯者樂於呈現出所有與源文相關、不相關的細節，似乎耽於細節帶來的快感。此處，張愛玲以其對服飾類譯注的高度關注再次展現出了她作為一名女性譯者的視角與情感體驗。

張愛玲在上述譯注中表述出來的翻譯取向和她的家庭背景有著深刻關聯。上文說過，張愛玲出生于晚清貴族之家，她曾在文章〈更衣記〉中描繪過她家把前清官服、皮裘大衣、旗袍拿出去晾曬的宏大場面。因而在傳統服飾方面，她有着大多數中國現當代作家難以企及的專業知識。作為一名女性，她小時候就以其驚人的敏銳察覺出顏色、服飾之間的細微差別。在她日後的文學創作中，張氏亦有意識的把她本人對上述細節的體認帶入其中，因此，顏色、服飾類細節描寫在張愛玲的文學創作佔有非常醒目的位置，是張氏女性作家特質的重要表徵。

在 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 譯注中，張愛玲在其中英翻譯之中同樣表達了對同類細節的關注：隨著譯者對服飾類的譯注越來越全

面、深入，譯者的女性意識也就越來越鮮明了。由此我們看到，張愛玲在這服飾類譯注所透露出的原則和立場和她本人秉承的創作觀是一致的。還要指出的是，張愛玲在她各個時期的文章中都不不同程度地流露出過對服裝、色彩等細節的迷戀，而在現實生活中，她本人“奇裝炫服”的穿衣之道也是彼時上海文壇一景，這都為她在*The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*的服飾類譯注中所展示的譯者習性做出了有力注腳。

B. 對青樓行業用語的譯注

張愛玲在*The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*中穿插了不少對青樓行業用語的譯注，我們注意到，張愛玲亦透過這些譯注表達出她對這一女性群體的態度和立場。《海上花》有一處描寫到客人們點菜的場景：

魚翅之後，方是小碗。陸秀林換了出局衣裳過來，楊家姆報說：‘上先生哉’（韓邦慶，2006：23）。

源文把青樓女子陸秀林（即文中的“先生”）和“魚翅”、“小碗”等菜肴並置描述。反觀譯文，張愛玲對“上先生”做出這樣一個注解：“Treating the girls as a course in the banquet”（Chang 1995: 32）。這是一個十分貼切的譯注：它以“上菜”（“a course in the banquet”）的意思解釋出了“上先生”的蘊含之意，即青樓女性其實並不是一個獨立的人，而是和“魚翅”、“小碗”等菜肴是同等性質的物品，因而也都是可交易的商品。從這一視點出發，張愛玲的譯注有效地揭示出彼時男性對這些命運多舛的女子極為輕賤的態度。這個譯注還可以讀出更為深刻的含義，那就是這些女子在男性話語中被物化為一道菜，供人隨意品嚐。從這個意義上來說，這個譯注蘊含了譯者深刻的女性主義人道立場，它包含了張愛玲對

這些女性的同情、理解和人道主義關懷。

三、張愛玲女性翻譯詩學之獨特面貌

張氏女性翻譯詩學的獨特面貌可從兩方面進行詳細論述：一方面，張氏的女性翻譯詩學和她本人的女性創作詩學有著一致的淵源；另一方面，它的表現形式和書寫意圖和西方女性主義譯者宣導的詩學理論又呈現出諸多相似之處。因此就女性譯者的翻譯詩學而言，張愛玲和西方女性主義譯者之間呈現一種和而不同的格局。

（一）與西方女性主義譯者的契合

以西方女性主義為理論背景的西方女性主義翻譯理論從一開始就質疑以“忠實”為核心價值的傳統翻譯觀，力圖在其批評話語中重新審視乃至定義翻譯文學中蘊含的價值觀與規範。與此並行的是，西方女性主義譯者們注重在翻譯實踐中彰顯女性譯者的主體性（agency），如西方女性主義譯界中執牛耳者戈德（Godard 1995: 94）就提倡一種“婦佔所譯的文本”（womanhandling the text in translation）的干涉型策略；又如，加拿大譯者洛特比涅爾—阿伍德（de Lotbinière-Harwood）在其翻譯中故意創造新詞以凸顯其女性譯者的性別差異。弗洛圖（Flotow 1991: 69-84）總結了女性主義譯者常用的三種干涉文本的方式：增補（supplementing）、加寫前言和註腳（prefacing and footnoting）和“劫持”（hijacking）。當然，就時間先後順序而言，張氏具女性主義特質的翻譯詩學的出現時間無疑要早於上述西方女性主義譯者/翻譯理論家們提出其理念的時間。然而，現今我們在試圖比較、觀照二者的區分時，我們發現，在表現形式和

書寫意圖這兩方面，張氏的女性翻譯詩學與西方女性主義翻譯理論有著眾多契合之處。

首先，就表現形式而言，張愛玲英譯 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 時就用了類似的翻譯策略。如上所述，張愛玲運用了加寫前言、譯注、刪除等多種翻譯策略對源文進行了一系列的干預，在譯者上述處理手法之下，譯文本 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 更清晰、更完整地再現出了彼時青樓女性的生存狀態和命運。從這個立場出發，張愛玲運用的翻譯策略和西方女性主義譯者所宣導的干涉型翻譯策略是一致的。

其次，就翻譯的女性書寫意圖而言，張愛玲和西方女性主義譯者也是契合的。如弗洛圖(Flotow 1991: 2004)等所陳述的，西方女性主義譯者們致力於恢復、彰顯男性歷史掩蓋的女性譯者的聲音，運用翻譯來表達父權話語中女性的焦慮、抗爭，以及重建女性翻譯史的意圖。在 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*，張愛玲以其敏銳的譯筆捕捉到這些身陷囹圄的女性內心心理。縱觀整篇譯文，我們看到張愛玲在翻譯中始終深切關注這些弱勢女性的命運。因此，在翻譯的女性書寫意圖方面，張愛玲的女性翻譯詩學和西方女性主義譯者們有契合之處——二者都試圖表達女性在男性話語中真實的生存狀態，並且對女性的命運進行嚴肅、認真的思考。

（二）一種折衷、溫和的女性翻譯詩學

西方女性主義譯者和理論家們從一開始就對傳統的翻譯忠實觀念提出激烈的質疑，西方女性主義譯者提倡以其翻譯實踐顛覆忠實的翻譯觀中隱喻男性父權制話語，“試圖動搖那些維持這種聯繫的權威結構”（Showalter 1985: 1）。如果我們按照上述西方女性主義翻

譯理論的標準來衡量張愛玲的話，那麼，她無疑不是一個徹底的女性主義譯者。西方女性主義者提倡以一種直接而劇烈的方式顛覆男權社會，這一理念反映到女性主義翻譯實踐上則表述為譯者要“婦佔所譯的文本”（Godard 1995: 94）。然而，張愛玲的翻譯實踐全部在於表述、考察中國語境下的女性經驗和經歷，因其更多地體現了中國傳統思維浸潤的緣故，從而表現為一種平和持中、細膩體貼的女性譯者主體性。

所以，承襲了文學傳統的張氏女性翻譯詩學並不刻意突出二元對立，而是更為關注二者之間的滲透交織，對經驗的反省較為溫和，其女性翻譯詩學也因此呈現出與西方女性主義翻譯理論不同的面貌。張愛玲英譯《海上花》時，基本秉承並採取了以忠實為主的翻譯原則。因此，尊重源文、尊重原作者，是張氏譯文 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 的另一顯著特徵，這其中折射出譯者和男性象徵秩序進行對話，構建自己的女性翻譯詩學的意圖，此中，譯者擅長運用細節描寫，輔以委婉、含蓄的翻譯策略，緩緩言說中國傳統父權體制下女性的生活狀態。因而，和激進的、力圖解構父權話語的西方女性主義譯者相比，張愛玲對《海上花》的英譯體現出一種較為折衷、溫和的女性翻譯詩學。

四、結語

作為張愛玲英譯生涯最具研究價值的作品之一，張愛玲對《海上花》的英譯表述出了張氏較為完整的女性翻譯詩學。如果說此中呈現出與西方女性主義翻譯理論和而不同的獨特面貌，筆者亦注意到，張氏英譯《海上花》的女性翻譯詩學之複雜度和多面性非“獨特”一

詞可言說盡。以張愛玲對《穢史外編》的徹底刪節（而非保留）和對“上先生”的委婉譯注（而非刪減）中呈現出來的矛盾為例，張氏翻譯策略行走在徹底與折衷、激進與溫和、大膽與謹慎之間，其女性翻譯詩學因而呈現出了多重張力。拘於篇幅所限，張氏英譯《海上花》之女性翻譯詩學的複雜度和多面性非本篇文章可詳盡，筆者認為，如果我們再進一步把《海上花》和其他張氏英譯作品放在張氏翻譯生涯的完整座標中研究，以此繼續探討張氏女性翻譯詩學，會得出更為豐碩的成果。

注釋

- [1] 張愛玲在1967年申請到哈佛大學雷德克裏夫(Radcliff)女子學院的經費，從而開始翻譯吳語小說《海上花》。1982年張愛玲給夏志清的信表明此時她還在翻譯這部小說。而這部小說的譯稿在張愛玲去世後多年才在其遺物中發現，因此，張愛玲最後完成這部小說的時間並不確定。從這個觀點出發，筆者把張愛玲完成譯稿 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 的時間暫時認為是1995(?)，括弧中的問號表示不確定之意。
- [2] 筆者尚無見到2000年以前論述張愛玲翻譯的文章。不過2005-2010年間，學界對張愛玲的翻譯的關注和研究驟增，僅2009一年就有一篇博士論文、二十多篇碩士論文、十餘篇期刊論文專述張氏翻譯。上述研究中，僅有陳吉榮的文章〈從分離到融合到互生〉（《北京第二外國語學院學報》，2007年第2期，頁1-4）論述了張愛玲、孔慧怡合譯的 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 版本，除此之外，筆者尚未見到對張氏英譯作品 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 的分析。
- [3] 張愛玲在1980年代亦把吳語本的《海上花列傳》翻譯成白話本的《海上花》。不過，此處張氏英譯稿 *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai* 是基於吳語本《海上花列傳》英譯而成的，因此，下文所示之源文例句均出自吳語本的《海上花列傳》。
- [4] 宋以朗把這部手稿捐贈給美國南加州大學圖書館，筆者在2009年得南加州大學圖書館贈送這部手稿的電子版本。
- [5] 張愛玲英譯前後期細節翻譯之詳情請參見拙文《張愛玲的中英自譯：一個後殖民理論的

視點》(《外國語文》2009年第3期,頁125-129)。

[6] 《繸史外編》首句便是“高唐氏有二女,家習朋淫,人求野合。”

參考文獻

- 陳吉榮 (2007),〈論張愛玲女性主義翻譯詩學的本土化策略〉,《外國語》6: 50-56。
- 范伯群 (2006),〈海上花列傳:中國現代通俗小說開山之作〉,《中國現代文學研究叢刊》3: 1-16。
- 韓邦慶 (2006/1894),〈海上花列傳〉,北京:人民文學出版社。
- 胡適 (2003),〈《海上花》序〉,《海上花》,哈爾濱:哈爾濱出版社。
- 林幸謙 (2003a),〈荒野中的女體:張愛玲女性主義批評〉,桂林:廣西師範大學出版社。
- _____ (2003b),〈女性主體的祭奠:張愛玲女性主義批評〉,桂林:廣西師範大學出版社。
- 魯迅 (2006),《中國小說史略》,北京:北京大學出版社。
- 孟悅、戴錦華 (2004/1991),《浮出歷史地表:現代婦女文學研究》,北京:北京大學出版社。
- 單德興 (2009),《翻譯與脈絡》,北京:清華大學出版社。
- 王德威 (2003),《被壓抑的現代性——晚清小說新論》,臺北:麥田出版社。
- _____ (2004),《落地的麥子不死:張愛玲與張派傳人》,濟南:山東畫報出版社。
- 余斌 (2002),《張愛玲傳》,桂林:廣西師範大學出版社。
- 張愛玲 (1992),〈走!走到樓上去!〉,《張愛玲文集(第四卷)》,合肥:安徽文藝出版社。
- _____ (1997a),〈《海上花》的幾個問題——英譯本序〉,《張愛玲文集·補遺》,北京:中國華僑出版社。
- _____ (1997b),〈談音樂〉,《張愛玲作品集》,廣州:花城出版社。
- 張佩瑤 (2003),〈從話語的角度重讀林紓與魏易合譯的《黑奴呼天錄》〉,《中國翻譯》,2: 14-20。
- 周芬伶 (2007)《哀與傷——張愛玲評傳》,上海:上海遠東出版社。
- Bloom, Harold (1973). *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York: Harvard University.
- Chang, Eileen (1995?). *The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai*. South California University library, unpublished manuscript.
- Flotow, Luise von (1991). "Feminist Translation: Context, Practice, Theories". *TTR (Tradution*,

Terminologie, Redaction) 4: 69-84.

_____(2004). *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism"*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Godard, Barbara (1995/1990). "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation". Eds. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Cassell.

Showalter, Elaine (1985). "Towards a Feminist Poetics". *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literary, and Theory*. New York: Pantheon Books.

作者簡介

王曉鶯，女，翻譯學博士，華南師範大學外文學院講師。研究興趣：翻譯與性別，後殖民翻譯理論，傳統翻譯話語。

Deconstructing Comparative Translation: Facts, Myths and Limitations

Alan Tse Chung

Abstract

What is the objective of comparative translation? Andre Lefevere (1992) compares the different renderings of Lysistrata, an ancient Greek play, by different translators at different times and concludes that the translator is often at the mercy of the ideology and patronage. Lefevere's project illustrates the fact that conclusions drawn from comparing and contrasting different translations are very often extraneous to translation per se, and they certainly have nothing to do with the "quality of translation". Likewise, Tse (2003) observes that translation as an act and translations as texts are very often bound up with the socio-political matrix in which they are situated. Thus seen, comparative translation tends to inform us, more than anything else, about the social or personal background against which a particular translation was done, as well as the various constraints which bear on a particular act of translating. This is where we find both the significance and limitations of comparative translation.

A few years ago, I started experimenting with comparative translation in my translation workshop class. We compared, among other things, the two Chinese translations of Dan Brown's *Da Vinci Code*, which had just been made into a movie at the time. What we mainly did was look at the

linguistic differences between the two translated versions, one published in the People's Republic of China and the other in Taiwan. We concentrated on such conventional parameters (conventional at least in English-to-Chinese translation criticism) as diction, sentence structures, fluency and so forth. We attempted to draw a conclusion and a conclusion was actually drawn, which was that the mainland version was better than the Taiwan version. The conclusion was mainly based on accurate comprehension and presentation/language. A few years later, when I looked back at what I did back then, I started questioning the validity of comparing different translations of the same text and the conclusions drawn therefrom. Very few people will contest the criterion of accurate comprehension. A translation riddled with glaring inaccuracies will fail the test at the very outset. It must be a bad translation. However, when it comes to language and presentation, can we actually accept the conclusion that one version is better than the other without reservation? Are there limitations on our claim?

I believe what I have done—comparing translated texts—is called comparative translation studies if done systematically, and I believe it is a popular area of research and it features in many a translation course. In the present paper, I am urging teachers of translation to rethink the limitations of such exercises. How much sense does it make?

First and foremost, let us review the objective of comparative translation studies. Zhang Mengkai argues that an important objective of comparative translation studies is to “improve the quality of translation” in general (2007: 4). In other words, we compare different renderings of the same text and conclude that one version is more effective than the other, or the rest. With such an objective, comparative translation attempts to identify the “best” translation. Zhang draws an analogy between translation and the Olympic Games: the champion comes out through comparison. If there is no first runner-up, there can never be a champion (*ibid.*).

However, I would like to propose that to critique and evaluate

the effectiveness of different translations in a comparative context, the evaluation must be based on a common evaluative framework. It is easy to come up with one. Accuracy, diction, the handling of figure of speech, etc., may form part of such a framework. It is a lot harder, nevertheless, to agree on a common evaluative framework, a framework resulting from the linguistic and socio-cultural matrix which is common to all the texts that are being compared and evaluated. As such, this common evaluative framework is hard to come by. It can only be a theoretical construct, or else we have to operate on the fiction of homogeneity. Zhang's analogy between translation and the Olympic Games will not take us very far. The two differ in two aspects. First, the Olympic Games do have a common evaluative framework. The point-system for diving, for instance, in the Games in Beijing cannot be different from the point-system in the Games in London. Second, the performance of the athletes at the Games is measurable or quantifiable. If you break the world record of 9.58 seconds for 100-meter sprints set by Usain Bolt, you are world's number one, no more and no less. We would be hard put to say the same about translation. The performance of translators is notoriously unquantifiable. Everything is subjective. Everything is a cline. In passing, I would probably fail if I took a translator's accreditation exam in China because there is a sea of differences in many things between the two places while the "most fatal" would be the totally different views on the "leeway" of the translator.

One may argue that we can lay down a set of variables to measure the effectiveness of a translation and thereby make judgmental comparison of different translations possible, something similar to the notion of translation universals (see, for example, Mauranen and Kujamaki 2004; Baker 1993: 243-245). Some of the candidates that come to mind are accuracy (comprehension), diction, variation of sentence structures, cohesion, fluency and flexibility. This is begging the question. First, different types of texts are evaluated differently. Clearly, fluency does not play as important

a role in translating a law as in translating a speech. This may be easier to resolve as we can identify different sets of variables for different types of texts. Second, different systems that share the same language may not subscribe to the same set of variables. Flexibility is a translator's virtue in system A but may be something to discourage in system B. There is no absolute truth. You can argue about it both ways. Once you have taken your position, instinct will kick in and you'll start shooting in the other direction. You may say Language A and Language B are so different structurally and culturally and so the translator should be flexible with the translation to get the message across, etc. Equally, you may say translators are only messengers and we must stay faithful to the original author without making too much alteration, etc., depending on what position you have taken or happen to have taken! Thirdly, apart from accuracy, other variables are probably open to different interpretations in different systems in the infinite chain of significations, as proposed by Charles Peirce, the founding father of semiotics. These systems of the same language are not only delimited spatially, but also temporally. Fluency in eighteenth-century England would be somewhat different from what we understand as fluency today. Trite but true. By understanding how vastly different these systems can be, we will know how difficult it would be to attempt a perfect set of variables for evaluating translations.

At the low end of the evaluative scale, it is true that we can make judgments and conclude that one version is better than the other if the other contains glaring grammatical mistakes and instances of gross misinterpretation. But is it really worthwhile to compare two or more accomplished translators at this unsophisticated level, assuming that if their works are worth comparing, they must be accomplished translators? I think not. One is not likely to compare David Hawkes' rendering of *Hongloumeng* with that of Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang with the sole innocent intention to find out how many grammatical errors have been

made. The comparison, the discussion and the debate must rise above this level. It has to be something higher, something more intellectual. Whatever we discuss at this higher level, we cannot make judgmental statements and say one is better than the other and the quality of translation will become better as a result of the comparison. The two translators have come from different linguistic and socio-political backgrounds. For one thing, Hawkes was a native speaker of English, brought up and educated in England and studied Chinese at Beijing (Lin 1997: 307) while Yang was a native speaker of Chinese, brought up and educated in China though he had studied in England (Lin 1997: 822). As a result of their backgrounds, one of the distinctive features about their translations one would readily find is that Hawkes tends to write more idiomatic English whereas Yang tends to be more faithful to the original. For example, Feng Qinghua argues that Hawkes' version of the translation is characterized by domestication:

We can even say that domestication is the hallmark of Hawkes' translation strategy...Hawkes and Minford had been living in the Western culture all along. In addition, through publishers in the West, they were in fact translating for the readers from their own culture. Therefore, in their sub-consciousness, they were hoping to handle the cultures of other countries through domestication. (Feng 2008: 25; translation mine).

There is definitely a plethora of significant differences between the two translations but these differences do not lend legitimacy to any claim about one version being superior to the other. We can try and explain why a translator translated a work the way she did, the circumstances under which a translation was born. Like many other things, a translation is a social product; translations are products of the times.

Likewise, the translators of the Taiwan's version and the mainland's version of *Da Vinci Code* must have been brought up in different linguistic and indeed socio-political backgrounds. Until and unless we can identify

serious errors in comprehension and the basic use of the target language (e.g. grammar, spelling, malapropisms, etc), we cannot make any valid statement to the effect that one is better than the other. Indeed, can we honestly say that the mainland version is more fluent than the Taiwanese version? On what basis can we draw such a judgmental conclusion if not out of our gut feeling, which is probably the result of our being brought up to believe and accept that Standard Chinese used in the PRC is the standard to adopt? Are we not, in evaluating the quality of the two versions, promoting a certain linguistic norm while rejecting another? Doesn't this border on linguistic chauvinism? Ironically, even if we accept that the quality of the two translations should be measured against Standard Chinese, we would be putting the translator of the Taiwan's version at a disadvantage because there is no level playing field and the validity of the comparison would be called into question.

Zhang Zude (1998: 230–240) compares three Chinese translations of Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. One of the translations was done in the 1930s, and the other two in the 1990s. Most of his analysis concentrates on errors in comprehension, which often lacks sophistication for want of argumentation. It is factual and straightforward. When Zhang ventures beyond the factual, everything becomes abstract and subjective, with clichés like “translations must be faithful to the original” and “the quality of a translation must not exceed that of the original” (231-240). Perhaps, it would be more productive and meaningful to compare the backgrounds of the three translators before he embarked on the comparison of the translations.

Likewise, Xu Jun (1998: 55-82) compares the different renderings of Stendhal's *Scarlet and Black*. Rather than picking on the nitty-gritty, Xu takes a more macroscopic approach. He refrains from making judgmental statements and places more emphasis on how the various assumptions a translator operates with and the constraints he/she has to live with bear on

the translation. For example, he points out that the Chinese translations of *Scarlet and Black* (there are more than 10 of them) amply demonstrate that operating with their own sets of theories, the translators would often come up with a translation which is different from the others in style (1998: 60).

Having said all this, I am not downplaying the significance of comparative translation studies. All I am trying desperately to do is shock some of us out of our intellectual complacency, our comfort zone, and make them take a critical look at some of the assumptions underlying the enterprise of comparative translation studies, which we have taken for granted for too long. First and foremost, it serves a purpose quite different from that of improving the quality of translation. I would propose that the primary objective of comparative translation studies is to study the various circumstances under which translations of the same text were produced in an attempt to account for why one translation was different from the other. These circumstances are many and varied but they are primarily socio-political, or can be subsumed under the socio-political category.

André Lefevere (1992) compares the different renderings of *Lysistrata* by different translators at different times and concludes that the translator is often at the mercy of the ideology and patronage. He specifically looks at the handling of some taboo words like “penis”, which was translated into “lifeline”, “nose”, “leg”, “handle” and so forth because the translators’ ideology has got the better of them. This is what Lefevere says:

Two factors basically determine the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. These two factors are, in order of importance, the translator’s ideology (whether he/she willingly embraces it, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage) and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made. (Lefevere 1992: 41)

Lefevere’s project illustrates the fact that conclusions drawn from comparing

and contrasting different translations are very often extraneous to translation per se, and they certainly have nothing to do with the “quality of translation”. Likewise, in comparing the translation of movie titles in China and Hong Kong, Alan Tse (2003) observes that translation as an act and translations as texts are very often bound up with the socio-political matrix in which they are situated. Thus seen, comparative translation tends to inform us, more than anything else, about the social or personal background against which a particular translation was done, as well as the various constraints which bear on a particular act of translating. This is where we find both the significance and limitations of comparative translation.

On a more optimistic note, there is in fact one scenario I can think of where we can legitimately make judgmental statements on different translations and legitimately claim that by comparing different renderings of the same text we can hopefully improve the quality of translation. I am talking about translation teachers, who do “comparative translation” every now and then for the purpose of assessment, as when we grade our students’ works. Their backgrounds are so similar to each other’s (there are exceptions of course) that we can operate on the fiction of homogeneity and compare their works. In addition, we operate on a common evaluative framework, which makes comparison meaningful, especially when we tell our students what we expect of them before the assessment. Other than this, any claim about the aim of comparative translation studies being to raise the standard of translation is questionable.

References

- Baker, Mona (1993). “Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies”. In *Text and Technology: In Honor of John Sinclair*. Eds. Mona Baker, Gill Francis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- _____, ed. (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Deconstructing Comparative Translation

- Feng, Qinghua (2008). *Myu wenhua xia de yizhe fengge* (The Style of Translators under the Influence of Mother-tongue Culture). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Publishing Co.
- Lefevere, André (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. New York: Routledge.
- Lin, Huangtian, ed. (1997). “Zhongguo Fanyi Cidian” (A Companion for Chinese Translators). Wuhan: Hubei Educational Publishing Co.
- Mauranen, A., and P. Kujamaki, eds. (2004). *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tse, Chung Alan (2005). “Translation of Film Titles: Reflections on the Norms of Translation”. In *Proceedings of International Symposium on Contrastive and Translation Studies between Chinese and English*. Ed. Pan Wenguo. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Educational Publishing Co.
- Xu, Jun (1998). “Hong yu bei Hanyi de lilun yu shijian” (The Theory and Practice of Translating *Scarlet and Black* into Chinese). In *Proceedings of the Conference on Translations into Chinese*. Ed. Jin Shenghua. Hong Kong: Department of Translation, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Zhang, Mengkai (2007). *Bijiao Fanyi Gailun* (An Introduction to Comparative Translation). Wuhan: Hubei Educational Publishing Co.
- Zhang, Zude (1998). “Lijie yu biaoda” (Comprehension and Presentation). In *Proceedings of the Conference on Translations into Chinese*. Ed. Jin Shenghua. Hong Kong: Department of Translation, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

About the Author

Tse Chung Alan is currently Principal Lecturer, Division of Language Studies, Community College of City University, Hong Kong. He has previously published in the *Translation Quarterly*. E-mail: LSALANTS@cityu.edu.hk

Book Review



Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries

Wang Hui

John T. P. Lai: *Negotiating Religious Gaps: The Enterprise of Translating Christian Tracts by Protestant Missionaries in Nineteenth-Century China*. Sankt Augustin: Collectanea Serica, 2012, pp. xvi + 382. ISBN: 978-3-8050-0597-5

The nineteenth century is not only an age of European high imperialism, but also one of fervent Christian missions. To Christian missionaries, the vast territories of “heathen” land are nothing but “mission fields” to be won over for the glory of God. Aiming at nothing less than a radical change of faith, missionaries often found themselves at the forefront of a cultural and religious war with the natives, which necessitates a knowledge of their language, culture, and faiths. Many of them became, often unwittingly, the first generation of Western orientalists, hailed as cultural ambassadors or denounced as agents of imperialism by native scholars, depending on, of course, their varied perspectives.

Many missionaries are prolific writers, and their literary legacy is a huge historical artifact waiting to be sorted out, studied and assessed. And this is a task not only for students of religious and cultural studies but also for scholars of translation studies, for Christian missionaries have produced a vast amount of translations, secular or religious, both from and into the

Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries

European languages.

Though never fully colonized or Christianized, China, as the largest and most populous “mission field”, attracted its own share of Christian missionaries. In the past three decades, the translation activities of China missionaries have drawn increasing scholarly attention, and much light has been shed on their translations of the Bible and several pieces of secular literature which were considered crucial to China’s modernization. These, however, constitute only a small part of their literary enterprise. With regard to the translation of Christian tracts, an activity which involved the energy and zeal of a far greater number of missionaries, precious little attention has been paid thereto.

The gap is now ably filled by John T. P. Lai. Building upon his PhD dissertation at Oxford, Lai’s *Negotiating Religious Gaps: The Enterprise of Translating Christian Tracts by Protestant Missionaries in Nineteenth-Century China* is a solid piece of historical research which brings to light a long-neglected aspect of missionary translation activity. The sheer amount of literature involved is daunting, and Lai’s rich annotation and bibliography attest to his ability to wade through a sea of missionary publications and archives, as well as reports, minutes, and catalogues of various missionary organizations.

The book consists of 6 chapters besides an introduction and a conclusion. Chapter 1 reviews the broad historical context of Protestant missions to China, touching upon a variety of issues such as missionaries’ varied missiological approaches, their perception of Chinese religions, language and linguistic styles, and aspects of their translation activities.

Chapters 2 to 4 constitute a historical survey of the missionaries’ tract translation activity. Instead of a straightforward historical narrative, Lai uses several key words in translation studies to organize his survey and presentation.

Chapter 2 examines the “patronage” factor, or the ideological control behind the production of Chinese Christian literature. Here Lai carefully

traces how Religious Tract Societies (RTS), the foremost patron of tract translation, besides providing lists of standard works eligible for translation, gradually increased its presence through its local branches to “ensure that every Chinese publication complied with fundamental RTS principles – evangelical and interdenominational” (76). By way of illustration, he discusses a doctrinal dispute within the Shanghai Tract Committee over the purchase, with RTS fund, of a translated tract accused of “distinctly favour[ing]” (79) congregationalism. The dispute is so vividly reconstructed that we can feel the heat of controversy among those righteous missionaries. Unfortunately, just as our curiosity is aroused as to the crux of such a controversy, we are told that the controversial preface of the said tract “had already been scrapped prior to public circulation”, and that based on McClatchie’s (the accuser) English translation of the objectionable part, “favouritism towards Congregationalism was more subtle than McClatchie claimed” (80). Since the said tract was published in 1845, and the controversy raised and settled in 1848, we are left wondering whether a copy sold or distributed during the intervening years can be discovered some day. After all, the Shanghai committee could censor and scrap only those copies it bought with RTS fund.

A Chinese Christian himself, Lai seems perfectly at peace with the missionaries’ denigration of the “heathen” Chinese culture. He is, however, unusually critical of their assumption of a dominating role in the “Anglo-Chinese teamwork translation” (116) and lack of acknowledgement of native help. Chapter 3 thus addresses the “invisibility” of Chinese collaborators in tract translation. Since in most cases these collaborators were simply not mentioned, Lai has to fill in the gap with information on famous Chinese collaborators in the translation of either the Bible or secular literature, or on the original writings of Chinese Christians, or the translations produced by Chinese Christians independently. Though he does come up with evidence of a few Chinese collaborators engaged in the translation of certain tracts,

Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries

there is no way of ascertaining their role in the actual process of cooperation. We are left with an informed guess that their contribution was confined to “polishing the Chinese style”(116).

Chapter 4 is a critical survey of “Christian tracts in Chinese costume” (this fashionable chapter title is misleading in that it suggests acculturation as a focal point, which is not at all the case). Here again original writings and translations are lumped together under the more general term “Chinese Christian literature”. Lai classifies these publications into six categories: evangelistic and apologetic tracts, religious allegory, Christian worship, moral instruction and Sunday School textbooks, devotional treatises, and finally, theology and doctrine. Within each category, publication details of representative tracts are provided, sometimes with indication of their reception. Though the lists are only selective, Lai provides us with a more exhaustive list of “Chinese Translation of Christian Literature, 1812-1907” as Appendix C. With an impressive 441 titles of translation listed therein, nearly all with their source texts tracked down, one wonders why Lai feels the need to insert original writings, many undistinguished, in his survey of missionaries’ translation enterprise. This chapter also provides some information concerning the publication and distribution of the tracts, but ends with a rather bleak note: “it was estimated that, for many decades, only meager and disappointing results followed the very extensive distribution of books”(150).

In chapters 5 and 6, Lai endeavours to add depth to his broad historical survey with two case studies. Lai’s textual analysis, however, compares poorly with his contextual work.

Chapter 5 compares *The Peep of Day*, a Sunday School textbook, with its four Chinese versions produced by three missionaries with their respective Chinese collaborators. In section III of this chapter, he gives us one example, in which a perfectly simple line (“One morning very early, when Jesus had only been dead two days...”) is translated into Chinese

with some complication by William Burns, who specified the exact days of Jesus' death and resurrection according to the Jewish calendar, and with further complication by Sally Holmes, who juxtaposed both the Jewish and Gregorian calculations of these days. With this single example, Lai sees a "foreignized strategy" (160) in these two translations, and their unnecessary or even confusing complications—for a source text which "deliberately omitted biblical and Jewish cultural allusions"(158)—are interpreted as "bridging ... the cultural gaps that the adjustment of the Christian message to Chinese idiom constantly entailed."(160). But to me the translators are digging gaps, or at least revealing gaps which the original tries to bypass.

The next section proceeds to analyze "the contextual factors which determine these strategies" (161), presumably meaning the strategies uncovered through that single example. But with the unfolding of contextualization Lai appears to attribute different "strategies" to these translations: Burns' version is now considered "more of a paraphrase than a translation" (165), and Holmes is found to manifest a "tendency towards a more acculturating approach" (169). Clearly there is something confusing about Lai's use of the term "strategy". I am not suggesting that he should stick to the definition of Venuti, to whom he makes frequent reference, but a strategy is supposed to concern the overall plan or orientation of a translation, and as such can be demonstrated only by revealing the regular recurrence of certain translation methods or techniques. But Lai all too often builds his judgment on a single example, which may not be sufficient in itself. For example, he sees a strategy of "acculturation" in Holmes' translation of "bread" as 饅頭. But to reach such a conclusion, one not only needs more examples to substantiate it as a "strategy", one should actually take trouble to find out whether the less "assimilated" term 麵包 was coined by then. If the answer is no, then Holmes might simply be following a common translation of "bread"; even if the answer is yes, we still expect to be told how "bread" is translated in the other three versions

Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries

so as to perceive a contrast between their “strategies”. The question is, if 饅頭, in all likelihood, appears also in Burns’ version, would that lead to yet another change of judgment on his “strategy”?

Chapter 6 investigates William Muirhead’s two versions of *The Anxious Inquirer*, which Lai intends as examples of missionary “domesticating for Chinese literati” (chapter title). After a lengthy introduction to both the source text and its Chinese translator, which again attests to Lai’s admirable command of related literature, we come to the “detailed comparison of the 1856 and 1882 versions” which promises to “illustrate several major issues and strategies: the Confucian frame of reference, ... Buddhist overtones in phraseology, ... as well as political self-censorship” (186).

This sounds really exciting. After all, isn’t the book entitled “Negotiating Religious Gaps”? But it is here that we find Lai equally capable of speculation. Concerning the “Confucian frame of reference”, he offers us the example of one paragraph and its translations. In the 1856 version, “corrupt by nature” is rendered as 惡性, and this triggers a two-page introduction to Mencius’ 性善論 and Xunzi’s 性惡論. The appearance of the phrase 至善 in turn elicits an elaboration of not only “the three basic principles” 三綱領 but also “the eight specific points” 八條目 of the *Daxue*. To Lai, these constitute sufficient evidence that Muirhead consciously adopted a Confucian frame of reference, and he “was obliged” to do so because he was “addressing the Confucian scholars” (208).

But this is far from convincing. For one thing, instead of 性惡, Muirhead used 惡性, a phrase which does not appear in the Confucian canon. For another, the phrase 至善 appears in 至善之意, which is intended as a paraphrase of 善意 appearing in the previous sentence. Seen in this light, it is used as an adjective and is distinctively different from the ideal of 至善 in the *Daxue*. The fact that a phrase has entered into Confucian terminology should not rule out the possibility of its being used in a common, non-technical sense. In a similar vein, Lai’s designation of 惡念 as distinctive

Buddhist is questionable.

Lai believes that in using the term 至善, Muirhead “explicitly recognized the legitimacy of the Chinese pursuit of this ideal, but pointed at a different way of achieving perfection” (192). This is problematic because even if we take this 至善 in the technical Confucian sense, Muirhead would not recognize its legitimacy as an ideal without redefining it in a Christian sense.

In using 惡性, Lai believes Muirhead “took into account of the aforementioned debate” (192), meaning “the Christian-Confucian debate” or rather their “differing notions” (188) on human nature. If we agree with such a speculation about the translator’s intention, our logical conclusion should be that Muirhead used translation as debate, as assertion of Christian “truth” and refutation of “the incubus of Confucianism” (186). Lai, however, comes to the conclusion that “by domesticating the work through a Confucian frame of reference... Muirhead made strenuous efforts to narrow the cultural and religious gaps that separated him and his readers” (208). While this must be his intended conclusion, as the title of the book suggests, his textual analysis clearly fails him.

Lai frequently highlights Muirhead’s “literary approach of translation” as an effort to “increase a work’s textual reception and reduce the cultural antagonism of Chinese literati” (207). While the distaste of China’s men of letters for the vulgar style is widely known, it is highly questionable whether refined language alone would lessen their antagonism towards “heresy”. Furthermore, judging from the examples provided, the more “literary” 1956 version can hardly be regarded as stylistically elegant. For one thing, its condescension towards the reader, seen in the less than respectful second person pronoun 爾 (325) would certainly be offensive to educated Chinese readers. Muirhead himself is aware of its stylistic shallowness, as stated in the preface: “此書所載，文辭意旨，皆尚卑淺” (186). And directly contradicting Lai’s judgment that the translation targets Chinese literati and often intentionally refutes their beliefs, the preface also states: “此書之作，非與他教滋其辯難也，我所與言之人，已能信耶穌之教，真

Revisiting the Literary Enterprise of Protestant Missionaries

純無偽...”(186). These lines are quoted by Lai at the beginning of his textual analysis, but he seems to lose track of them as speculation gathers momentum.

In the Conclusion, Lai measures the missionary enterprise against three yardsticks: converting the heathen, removing the prejudice of the educated class, and educating the believers. After much nuanced analysis, he allows that “it could be argued that Protestant missionaries largely failed in their primary aim in converting China” (218). He then proceeds to put the China enterprise into a global perspective and ends up raising “the fundamental question” of the suitability of English Christian tracts for “audiences of other cultures” (224). According to him, due to the cultural foreignness of the tracts, the domination of foreign missionaries in translation, and China’s anti-Christian sentiment, “the introduction of a foreign model of Christianity through tract translation seemed doomed to failure” (225). This sounds like a critique of missionary translators’ lack of accommodation to native cultures, but then only two pages later Lai reaches another conclusion: “the missionary undertaking of tract translation adopted an approach in the right direction” (227). After all the complicated twists and turns, one is at a loss whether Lai judges the general missionary approach/strategy in tract translation to be “domesticating” and accommodating, or “foreignizing” and confrontational.

In spite of its weaknesses in revealing how missionary translators “negotiate religious gaps”, Lai’s book is a substantial contribution to our understanding of the literary enterprise of protestant missionaries, and it opens up a rich mine for translation studies. Students of translation will find here many exciting topics for further investigation, and they will certainly be helped by the rich materials Lai so painstakingly uncovered.

About the Author

Wang Hui (1971-) is a professor of English at Shenzhen University.

稿約凡例

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

一、稿件格式

1. 請以電郵傳送來稿之電腦檔案。
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. 來稿每篇以不少於八千字（約16頁）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、贈閱本

從 2009 年夏天開始，作者可於 EBSCO 資料庫下載已發表的論文。如有需要，亦可向編輯部申領贈閱本。

八、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。

九、來稿請寄：香港屯門嶺南大學翻譯系轉《翻譯季刊》主編陳德鴻教授。電郵地址：chanleo@ln.edu.hk。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. *Translation Quarterly* is a journal published by 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 to 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 one to the manuscript, together 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 earlier issues 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 editors available, as well as the date and place of publication, to facilitate use by the readers.
7. All contributions will be first reviewed by the Editorial Board members and then anonymously by referees for its suitability for publication in *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves. Submissions written in a language which is not the author's mother-tongue should preferably be checked by native speaker before submission.
8. Electronic files of contributions should be submitted to Professor Leo Tak-hung Chan, c/o Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong. Email address: chanleo@ln.edu.hk
9. Given the accessibility, from summer 2009, of the journal via the EBSCO database, authors will no longer receive complimentary copies unless special requests are made to the Chief Editor.

《翻譯季刊》徵求訂戶啓事

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

中文大學出版社

地 址：香港 新界 沙田

香港中文大學

中文大學出版社

電 話：+852 2946 5300

傳 真：+852 2603 7355 / +852 2603 6692

電 郵：cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk

網 址：www.chineseupress.com

Subscribing to *Translation Quarterly*

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

The Chinese University Press

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

Tel: +852 2946 5300

Fax: +852 2630 7355 / +852 2603 6692

Email: cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk

Website: www.chineseupress.com

Subscription Information

- Subscriptions are accepted for complete volumes only
- Rates are quoted for one complete volume, four issues per year
- Prepayment is required for all orders
- Orders may be made by check (Payable to **The Chinese University of Hong Kong**) in Hong Kong or US dollars, or by Visa, MasterCard or American Express in Hong Kong dollars
- Orders are regarded as firm and payments are not refundable
- Rates are subject to alteration without notice

➤ Orders and requests for information should be directed to:

The Chinese University Press
 The Chinese University of Hong Kong
 Sha Tin, New Territories, Hong Kong
 Tel: +852 2946 5300
 Fax: +852 2603 7355
 E-mail: cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk
 Web-site: www.chineseupress.com

TO: The Chinese University Press Fax: +852 2603 7355

Order Form

Please enter my subscription to
Translation Quarterly, beginning with No. 63 to 66 (2012).

Subscription and order	Rates
1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> HK\$624 / US\$80
2 years*	<input type="checkbox"/> HK\$1,123 / US\$144
3 years**	<input type="checkbox"/> HK\$1,498 / US\$192
Back issues (No.1 – No.62)	<input type="checkbox"/> HK\$180 / US\$23 each (Please list issue no. _____, total _____ issues.)

Please circle your choice.
 Prices are at discount rate, delivery charge by surface post included.

* 10% discount.
 ** 20% discount.

- Attached is a check in HK\$ / US\$* _____ made payable to
 “**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**”. (*circle where appropriate)
- Please debit my credit card account HK\$ _____. (Please convert at US\$1 = HK\$7.8)
- I would like to pay my order(s) by: AMEX VISA MASTER CARD

Card No. (including the 3-digit security code): _____

Expiry Date: _____

Cardholder's Name: _____

Cardholder's Signature: _____

Please send my journal to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ E-mail: _____

Ref: 20120213



The Chinese University Press
 The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, Hong Kong
 Tel.: +852 2946 5300 Fax: +852 2603 7355 E-mail: cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk
 Web-site: www.chineseupress.com