Translation Quarterly

Special Issue:
The Outward Translation
of Chinese Classics

香港翻譯學會出版

翻譯季刊

二〇一九年
第九十二期

ↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅ

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 *Translation*

Quarterly can be found on EBSCO Publishing's databases.

ↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↀↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅↅ

編者的話：

　　本期為"中國古典之外譯"（The Outward Translation of Chinese Classics）特刊，主要探討中國古典作品英譯的相關問題，由陳德鴻教授及郭婷博士擔任客座編輯，共收錄四篇文章。

　　張保紅《以西方文學、文化傳統重構中國古詩——翟理斯漢詩英譯探微》一文深入研究了翟理斯的漢詩英譯問題，並指出譯者的翻譯與其傳統息息相關。作者指出，翟理斯的翻譯符合維多利亞時期的主流詩學規範，從文學手法、樣式、主題、人物、認知視角和敘事策略等方面對漢詩作了重構，並打上了譯入語文化的鮮明烙印。研究發現，翟譯的歸化策略旨在喚起讀者的閱讀興趣，激發讀者情感的共鳴，從而獲取更 高效的傳播效果。李俐借用布迪厄的"習性"概念，著重從譯者的習性入手，詳盡探討了導致華茲生和倪豪士所譯《史記》兩個版本差異的原因。通過考察兩個不同譯本產生的背景，譯者的漢學訓練以及他們所處的特定社會歷史環境，作者指出兩譯本不僅受限於當時的社會文化，也受到譯者自身"習性"的影響。張智博一文對《老子》第六十七章"三寶"英譯的九個譯本做了比較和分析，並在這基礎上綜合得出自己的翻譯版本。最後一篇文章作者為Paul G. Fendos, Jr.，主要探討《易經》隱喻翻譯的問題。作者以其著作《易經：現代的適應與解釋》為例子，闡明自己所採用的翻譯方法和原則，主要著眼于《易經》中爻辭的隱喻問題。作者引入了"適應性解釋"和"逆向適應性解釋"兩個術語，並說明《易經》中某些文本在翻譯解讀中不但可以被視作本體，亦可當作喻體。最後，作者把自己對《易經》第十五卦謙卦爻辭的翻譯與其他五位譯者做了對比和綜合。

　　本特刊也收錄了劉靖之教授書寫的回憶錄"香港翻譯學會的發展

（1991-2018）"第三部分，內容包括這期間香港翻譯學會所組織的各種活動，譬如講座、翻譯比賽、獎學金頒發等等。回憶錄也談到了《翻譯季刊》的辦刊歷程。正如劉教授所說，這份學報的所有編輯人員從創刊開始全部是義務的，堅持了近半個世紀，實屬難得！我們也將繼續秉持這一精神，努力辦好《翻譯季刊》這一刊物，立足香港這一中西薈萃之地，促進中外文化交流，推動翻譯學進一步發展。

劉康龍

二〇一九年六月

Translation Quarterly No. 92, June 2019

目錄 CONTENTS

回憶錄 Memoir

以西方文學、文化傳統重構中國古詩
——翟理斯漢詩英譯探微

張保紅

Abstract

A Study on H. A. Giles's Reconstruction of Ancient Chinese Poems in Terms of the Western Literary and Cultural Traditions (*by* Zhang Baohong)

Herbert Allen Giles was a leading British translator who excelled in rendering ancient Chinese poems into metrical English during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. His Chinese-English poetry translations, while influential and praiseworthy in his lifetime, are now labelled as western-style reconstructions. However, little research has been done on his perceptive ways of reconstructing ancient Chinese poems in terms of the Western literary and cultural traditions. Based on a close reading of Giles's English translations of ancient Chinese poems, traditional Western poetics as well as viewpoints on translations, the present paper investigates the details of Giles's reconstruction of ancient Chinese poems from five major aspects, namely, paraphrasing the titles of Chinese poems, domesticating their poetic details, intensifying their poetic emotion, rewriting their ways of thinking, and shifting their perspective. It aims to unveil the contributions and implications of Giles's poetry translation for translation studies and intercultural exchange and popularization.

翟理斯（Herbert Allen Giles，1845-1935），英國著名翻譯家，西方漢學現代奠基人之一，與理雅各（J. Legge，1815-1897）、德庇時（J. F. Davis，1795-1890）並稱英國漢學三大家。翟理斯終身潛心研究漢學，研究範圍涉及中國歷史、宗教、繪畫、哲學、文化、語言等諸多領域，先後發表了大量漢學著述與譯作。比如，關於中國文學的有《中國文學史》（1901）、《古今詩選》（1898）、《聊齋誌異》（1909）等；關於中國文化的有《中國札記》（1876）、《中華文明》（1911）和《中國與中國人》（1928）等；他編撰的工具書有《古今姓氏族譜》（1898）和《華英字典》（1912）等。翟理斯因卓越的漢學成就曾於1897年與1911年先後兩次獲得法國漢學界頒發的最高榮譽獎——儒蓮獎。"在英國本土，他也獲得了當時一位漢學家所能得到的所有殊榮。"（吳伏生，2012: 104-105）站在中西文化交流的高度來看，"翟理斯的研究與翻譯成果，為20世紀初葉的西方文化界認識和瞭解中國傳統思想文化，理解和欣賞中國古典詩歌，進而推動在西方學習和翻譯中國古詩的第一次高潮，做出了重大的歷史性貢獻。"（朱徽，2009: 36）

就漢詩英譯而言，翟理斯是格律體譯詩的代表譯家，其譯作在當時影響很大，受到各界讀者的廣泛讚譽。英國作家、批評家斯特拉奇（Lytton Strachey，1880-1932）曾撰文稱讚他的譯文"不僅新奇，而且美麗、富有魅力"，（許淵沖，1984: 18）"在世界文學史上佔有獨特的地位"。（同上，27）關於翟理斯譯詩基本特色的研討，比較文學學者朱徽在其著作《中國詩歌在英語世界——英美譯家漢詩翻譯研究》中闢出專章"翟理斯：以西方傳統重構中國古詩"進行了研究，並在隨文中指出："他是以西方傳統重構中國古詩，將中國古詩裝入維多利亞時期的英詩模式中，讓英美讀者感覺不到是在閱讀翻譯的中國古

詩，……。"（朱徽，2009: 43）翟理斯如何以西方傳統重構中國古詩的呢？朱文未及細說，鑑於此，本文擬通過細讀翟理斯的漢詩英譯文，結合西方詩學傳統與相關翻譯理觀點，從以下五大方面進一步闡說"以西方傳統重構中國古詩"內涵的豐富性、多樣性與層深性，以揭示其之於翻譯研究與文化交流與傳播的價值與意義。

一、原詩題名的意譯

翟理斯在翻譯上主張採用意譯的方法，在他看來，譯詩首先要確定意義，意義至關重要，傳達原詩的意義是詩歌翻譯的基本任務。（Giles，1923: preface）這不僅體現在他對詩作正文的翻譯上，更為突出地體現在他對每首詩作題名的翻譯上。他的譯詩題名與原詩題名形式上逐一對應的不多，通常是基於原詩題旨大意另起爐灶，重鑄新名。比如，李白詩《獨坐敬亭山》、《山中問答》、《月下獨酌》分別被譯為"COMPANIONS（伴侶）"、"THE POET（詩人）"與"LAST WORDS（遺言）"；杜牧詩《金谷園》、《贈別》、《秋夕》分別被譯為"THE OLD PLACE（老地方）"、"THE LAST NIGHT（最後的夜晚／昨夜）"與"LOVERS PARTED（離別的戀人）"。顯而易見，讀者若僅以這樣的英文譯名去找出對應的漢語原詩，其難度是較大的。這些譯名多是"得意忘言"的翻譯，也就是說，翟理斯並未遵循原作題名的語言形式，而是追求另擬的題名在內容上與原作題旨相關聯與呼應。他這樣意譯原詩題名有無一定的理據呢？檢視其所譯詩集中的題名，可看到如下幾個方面的特點。

首先，翟理斯重鑄的譯詩題名往往與譯文中的局部細節或整體蘊含相關聯或呼應，換言之，他直接或間接重塑了詩作題

名與正文彼此呼應的關繫，引導讀者更好地參讀文本大意或主題。例如，韓偓詩《效崔國輔體四首》（淡月照中庭）的詩題被譯為"CONTEMPLATION"，而在其譯文中可見到這樣的詩句"On the terrace steps, <u>contemplative</u>, I sit,"（獨立俯閒階）；宋之問詩《渡漢江》的詩題被譯為"HOMEWARD"，在其譯文中則可見到詩句"I tremble as I <u>draw near home</u>,"（近鄉情更怯）；陳陶詩《隴西行》的詩題被譯為"AN OATH"，在其譯文開篇處即可見到"They <u>swore</u>…"。等等。擬譯題名採取"點面結合"、靈活應對的方式，與正文形成彼此互動或照應，這是其重要的翻譯策略之一，也是其倡導意譯的特色之一。

其次，翟理斯不時從自身文學文化傳統尤其是文學經典名篇中擷取名言片語作為譯詩題名，以突顯原詩題旨與西方文學文化趨同或相似的一面，從而激發讀者的閱讀興趣與認同感。比如，宋代詩人朱淑真之詩《落花》，他將此題名譯為"ROUGH WINDS DO SHAKE THE DARLING BUDS OF MAY"，很顯然，這一題名直接取自莎士比亞詩"Sonnet 18"中的第三行詩句，為了在譯文中突出風雨摧花的意味，不惜在語言形式上捨簡就繁，將原詩的獨詞式題名譯為句子式題名，這種"以句譯詞"的做法在其整個漢詩英譯集中時有所見。對比之下，翟理斯翻譯詩作題名時引經據典，"以詞譯詞"的情況更為常見。據傳是唐代杜秋娘所作的《金縷衣》，他將其詩題譯為"GOLDEN SANDS"，這一譯名是"以詞譯詞"，只是替換了原詩題名中的語詞意象，語詞意象的替換雖消解了原作題名"金縷衣"與其正文"勸君莫惜金縷衣"彼此呼應的功能，但該語詞意象表達了時光寶貴、珍惜時光的意思，與原詩題旨還是吻合的。讀一讀英國詩人彭斯（R. Burns）的詩句"While the sands of life shall run"與美國詩人朗費羅（W. Longfellow）的詩句"leave behind us / Footprints on the sands

of time"，翟理斯如此翻譯的用心就不難理解了。

　　如果說以上這些詩名翻譯的例子之於整個譯文文本還只是偏向於"詩性點綴"的話，那麼完全以西方文學中的文學主題直接或間接地進行詩作題名的翻譯，則是其另一大特點。比如，翟理斯將古詩十九首之一的《生年不滿百》的詩題直接譯為"CARPEDIEM（及時行樂）"，我們知道，"Carpe Diem"是西方文學中的一大主題，它表現的是西方文藝複興以來反神權、張人性，奉勸青年男女享受青春、消費青春的時代思潮。而漢語原詩中雖然也含蘊"及時行樂"的因子，但該詩產生的語境是漢末社會動盪不安，人命危淺，人們生活苦悶，人生毫無出路，企盼解脫的現實。很顯然，這裡譯者已從前文所說的"藉西表中"演變成了"以西化中"了。

　　再次，西方傳統中素有的觀察外物、認知外物的方式也影響著翟理斯詩作題名的選擇與翻譯。靜止的空間表現是西方傳統繪畫空間表現的特點之一，它是"畫家站在一個固定的位置，從一個角度透視現實空間的所得，畫面空間是現實空間的一個時間段的真實寫照。"（馮民生，2007: 123）這種表現空間的方式也是西方詩人觀察世界與認知世界的方式之一。翟理斯重鑄譯詩題名的方法也鮮明地體現出這一特點。一是選擇從某一固定位置進行觀察或透視的方式來另立原作題名。例如，李白詩《秋思》、《玉階怨》與《秋浦歌》的詩題分別被譯為"FROM　A　BELVIDERE"、"FROM　THE　PALACE"與"IN A MIRROR"等等。二是選擇空間的一瞬間或某一時間段來重鑄原作題名。例如，宋之問詩《和趙員外貴陽橋遇佳人》、李白詩《丹陽湖》以及楊巨源詩《艷女詞》的詩題被分別譯為"A VISION"、"A SNAPSHOT"與"A　GLIMPSE"。如此看來，其譯詩題名形式的凝定也是有著鮮明的理據。

　　理論上說，離開原詩題名的語言形式，另立譯詩題名的方式與方法可以是無限多樣的。然而，從翟理斯的翻譯實踐看，其翻譯的方式與方法明顯受到了西方文學、文化、思維等傳統的影響，在這一意義上，其翻譯的題名無論是在內容的選擇上還是形式的凝定上都是事出有因、頗富理據的，因而其意譯的範圍也是有限的。

二、情景細節的歸化

　　施萊爾馬赫（F. Schleiermacher）提出了著名的異化與歸化兩種翻譯方法：〝一種是譯者要麼儘可能地讓作者安居不動，而引導讀者去接近作者；另一種是儘可能讓讀者安居不動，而引導作者去接近讀者。〞（Schleiermacher 2004: 149）引導作者去接近讀者的情形就是歸化，其目的是使外國作者像目的語作者那樣寫作，採取目的語讀者所習慣的表達方式來傳達原文的內容，與目的語讀者對話。在翟理斯的年代，〝在文化上，英國對中國還處於幾乎一無所知的境地，……。〞（朱振武等，2017: 10）鑑於這樣的時代語境，身為外交官且熟諳中華文明的翟理斯擔當起了向西方傳播中華文化拓荒的任務。因而，〝翟理斯寫作與翻譯的對象不是研究中國語言文化的專家與學者，而是那些對中國及其語言文化所知甚少或一無所知的普通讀者。〞（吳伏生，2012: 106）他的出發點〝是要讓那些普通讀者通過自己的翻譯直接面對中國文化，以便清除當時在西方流行的各種對中國的誤解與偏見。〞（同上，433）有學者評價他所譯的《中國文學選珍：詩歌卷》時說：〝其（翟理斯）文化想像模式表現出對英語本土文化的熱愛和保護，是用'親近'和'熟悉'的方式爭取普通讀者認可的經典譯本。〞（楊柳等，2013: 257）概而言之，他的翻譯儘可能追求

語言上的雅俗共賞，形式上的喜聞樂見，主題上的似曾相識，不斷強調中西文化的相通之處，儘可能"引導作者去接近讀者"，其目的是"要激發人們對中國人民的文學、歷史、宗教、藝術、哲學和風俗更為廣泛、更為深刻的興趣。"（Giles1997: 85）而翟理斯達致這一目的方法之一是，基於情景細節及其審美功能的相似性，多以西方讀者所熟悉的文學、文化情景細節來歸化原詩中的情景細節。簡言之，就是將漢文化中的情景細節英國化或本土化。例如：

> 原文1：青青河畔草
>
> 　　青青河畔草，鬱鬱園中柳。
> 　　盈盈樓上女，皎皎當窗牖。
> 　　娥娥紅粉妝，纖纖出素手。
> 　　昔為倡家女，今為盪子婦。
> 　　盪子行不歸，空床難獨守。
>
> 譯文1：NEGLECTED
>
> 　　Green grows the grass upon the bank,
> 　　The willow-shoots are long and lank;
> 　　A lady in a glistening gown
> 　　Opens the casement and looks down.
> 　　The roses on her cheek blush bright,
> 　　Her rounded arm is dazzling white;
> 　　A singing-girl in early life,
> 　　And now a careless roué's wife. . . . . .
> 　　Ah, if he does not mind his own,
> 　　He'll find some day the bird has flown!

在這篇譯文中，至少有四處是西方讀者尤為熟悉的情景細節。第一處是"A lady in a glistening gown / Opens the casement and looks down."這一情景與濟慈（J. Keats）名篇《夜鶯頌》（Ode to a Nightingale）中

的情景頗為相仿：The same that oft-times hath / Charm'd magic casement, opening on the foam / Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn. 就這一情景細節，胡家巒注釋說："中世紀傳奇和民間故事中常常描寫位於海中被魔法鎮住的城堡。如果有一位勇敢的騎士衝破驚濤駭浪，前來相救，並抵製住任何巫師的引誘而保持自己的品德，他就能贏得被幽禁公主的愛。casement此處實際上並不是指某一城堡或窗戶，而是指被幽禁在城堡中的公主，她站在窗前，遙望大海，等待勇敢的騎士前來搭救，解除魔法。"（胡家巒，2008: 245）比讀之下會發現，翟理斯的翻譯意在激起英美讀者對自身文學傳統的聯想，應是他的翻譯預設。有論者指出："（譯者）增加了'穿著閃光的長袍'這個意象，該裝束意象更符合西方女子的著裝習慣，與古代中國女子的著裝習慣不太相符。"（余蘇凌，2015: 112）基於前面的注釋說明，這樣的論述不無道理。第二處是以"The roses on her cheek blush bright"來譯"娥娥紅粉妝"，以"rose"來指代美麗女性或健康膚色是英詩的一貫傳統。最為讀者熟悉的也許是蘇格蘭詩人彭斯（R. Burns）的名篇"A Red, Red Rose"。第三處是以"Her rounded arm is dazzling white"來譯"纖纖出素手"，翟理斯如此翻譯意在緊承前文從多角度來共同營構出一位貴婦人的形象，看一看新古典主義畫家安格爾（J. A. D. Ingres）的畫作《莫第西埃夫人》（Madame Moitessier）中貴婦人白皙、豐腴而圓潤的手臂及其著裝樣式，或許能窺見翟理斯審美取向的淵源。翟理斯這麼翻譯"素手"並非孤例，"素手"在詩句"素手玉房前"中也被譯為了"white arm（白皙的手臂）"，其相應譯文是："Hark to the rapturous melody! / her white arm o'er the lute she flings…"在英國文學中，我們也可見到用類似的甚或是同樣的表述來描寫美人的例子。且看下例：

> Around her form a thin robe twining,
> Nought conceal'd her bosom shining;
> Through the parting of her hair,
> Floating darkly downward there,
> <u>Her rounded arm shew'd white and bare:</u>
> And ere yet she made reply,
> Once she raised her hand on high;
> It was so wan and transparent of hue,
> You might have seen the moon shine through.
>
> (G. G. Byron: The Siege of Corinth)

例詩中雖然也寫到 "raised her hand",但文中的劃線處將 "her arm" 描寫為 "rounded and white" 似已成為英詩刻畫美人的必選之項,由此也可窺見,西方人頗為趨同的審美傾向。第四處是以 "the bird" 來代指 "盪子婦",這一點相信西方讀者也並不會陌生。因為在西方文學中,以鳥來類比愛情中的男女,我們可讀到雪萊(P. B. Shelley)的名篇 "A Song" 中的詩句 "A widow bird sate mourning for her Love / Upon a wintry bough." 就此譯文有學者評論道:"以 the bird has flown(小鳥飛走)譯 ' 空床難獨守 ',可以叫做把古代心理現代化。因為把婦女看做 ' 小鳥 ' 是西方現代主義社會的觀念。"(張今、張寧,2005: 160)此言不虛,事實上,不只是在西方,在今天的中國我們也能聽到流行歌曲《愛情鳥》中這樣唱道:"我的愛情鳥 / 她還沒來到 / 我愛的人 / 已經飛走了"。所需補充一說的是,在《詩經》中用鳥指代婦人的情形也是有的,只是更為具象:"哲夫成城,哲婦傾城。懿厥哲婦,為梟為鴟。"《詩經・大雅・瞻仰》將婦人比喻為代表兇兆的梟與鴟,而翟理斯的譯文將其泛化為 "Though woman's wit is sometimes heard, / She's really an ill-omened bird",其 "以西表中" 的譯詩特色由此可見一斑。翟理斯譯

文中的西化的情景細節顯然無需一一指認，若要進一步彰顯其"西化"意圖，將該譯文與其散體譯文進行比讀會更為直接而有效。

> Green grows the grass on the river-bank,
> Luxuriant the foliage of the willows in the garden.
> A lovely girl in the upper storey,
> A vision of beauty at the window.
> Fair is her pink-powdered face,
> And slender the white hand which she shows;
> Formerly she was among a troupe of singing-girls,
> And now she is the wife of a roué.
> But as he has gone off and does not come back,
> It will be difficult for her to live alone in her empty room.

與原詩進行對比，這裡的散體譯文在意義上不可謂不準確，細節上也不可謂不忠實，但翟理斯的詩體譯文中卻沒有保留其散體譯文中諸多忠實的語言成分，而是進行了多方面的揚棄，其特有目的與用心應是顯在的。

　　除了翻譯中置換人物形象及其特徵外，置換原作中的人物關繫是翟理斯進行歸化的又一特點。人物關繫的置換看似細枝末節，但它在譯詩中所起的作用則是"牽一髮而動全身"，可直接引發讀者意識中歷史文化情景或場景的轉換，帶來別樣的詩意聯想。比如，張籍詩《節婦吟》中的詩句"妾家高樓連苑起，良人執戟明光裡"，被譯為"For mine is a household of high degree, / My husband captain in the King's army;"原詩中"妾"之丈夫"良人"是皇宮的衛士，譯詩置換為"captain"，是國王軍（the King's army）中出海遠征的首領。做如此替換時，翟理斯心中的底本應是英國家喻戶曉的民謠"Sir Patrick Spens（The Sailing）"中船長（skipper）與妻子（lady）愛情忠貞、矢誌不渝的情景以及船長（Sir Patrick Spens）忠誠於國王（our king）的社會文化語境。如此看來，中

英詩歌表達的情感是趨同的，但各自的情景則是大不相同的，進一步說，漢詩的內陸文化情景被置換為英詩的海洋文化情景了。翟理斯翻譯中類似這樣歸化的例子時有所見，往往是其有意而為的結果。

俗話說，細節決定成敗，說的是研究細節能決定事件的走向。在這裡，跨文化細節的使用則決定了譯文詩意生發的走向，詩美的特質及其傳播效果。

三、情感的顯化與強化

"感人心者，莫先乎情。"（白居易）漢詩如此，西詩亦然。在翻譯中，情感理所當然應該得到優先傳達，而且應該得到強弱程度相當與表現方式恰切的傳達。原文熱情奔放，譯文就不能不溫不火，更不能冷若冰霜。原文含蓄內斂，譯文就不應豪情滿懷，直白誇飾。道理說起來容易，實踐中操作起來就不那麼簡單。由於譯者在翻譯過程中受到自身知識結構、情感經驗、情感個性、文學文化傳統或詩學規範等因素的影響，譯文的情感表現與原文相比往往會呈現出強度上過熱或過冷、速度上超前或滯後、蘊含上多維並存等現象。（張保紅，2016: 182-196）翟理斯的漢詩英譯深受維多利亞詩風的影響，其譯文也因之打上了那個時代長於抒發強烈個人情感的浪漫主義印記，這鮮明地體現在以下兩大方面：

3.1 感嘆詞的頻繁使用

浪漫主義詩歌的語言特點之一是較多使用感嘆詞，以表達強烈的主觀情感。其中較為常用的感嘆詞有"O"、"Ah"、"Oh"等。比如，維多利亞時期的桂冠詩人丁尼生（A. Tennyson）之詩"Break, Break,

Break"中有五處使用了感嘆詞"O",表達了詩人失去摯友哈勒姆
(A. Hallam)之後的強烈悲痛與深情告白。浪漫主義詩人雪萊的詩
作"A Lament"中起句即為"O world! O life! O time!",一句之中三次使
用感嘆詞"O",數量上佔了整個詩句的"半壁江山",也因之將詩人對
世界人生的深沉思索與喟嘆推到了情感的製高點。翟理斯的譯詩中運
用較多的感嘆詞有"alas"、"O"、"ah me",這些感嘆詞的運用並非是對
原作中字面上存在類似感嘆詞的對等傳譯,而是出於對原詩情感表現
的自創與浪漫主義詩學規範的呼應。例如:

> 原文1:花開堪摘直需摘,莫待無花空摘枝。──杜秋娘《金縷衣》
> 譯文1:<u>Alas</u>, upon the withered stem
> no blooming flowers remain!
> 原文2:君問歸期未有期,巴山夜雨漲秋池。──李商隱《夜雨寄北》
> 譯文2:You ask when I'm coming: <u>alas</u>, not just yet……
> How the rain filled the pools on that night when we met!
> 原文3:人面不知何處去,桃花依舊笑春風。──崔護《題都城南莊》
> 譯文3:But <u>alas</u> the pink cheeks are now far far away,
> Though the peach-blossoms smile as they smiled on that day.

為了說明問題的普遍性,不妨將其譯例一並羅列如上。以上羅列的諸
譯例中,翟理斯均"創造性地"使用了感嘆詞"alas"對原文的情感進
行了顯化或強化,這也成為其翻譯實踐中的一貫做法。從這些譯例
來看,感嘆詞"alas"顯然都不是原文表層形式所有的,均是翟理斯對
原文可有的深層情感的"選擇性點化",對原文情感流動到某一節點的
"爆發式"表達。翟理斯筆下這一感嘆詞的頻繁使用,一方面昭示出
他個人的用詞風格或個性化的情感表達特色,另一方面可謂是對英國
浪漫主義時期"詩歌是強烈情感的自然流露"(W. Wordsworth)這一

論斷的生動演繹。然而所需指出的是，若從以上譯文中將 "alas" 全部刪除，譯文的表情達意效果似乎也不受太大影響，譯文的通順流暢也沒什麼不一樣。那麼翟理斯對該詞 "情有獨鍾" 的原因恐怕更多是出於音韻上的考量："alas" 一詞一來可湊足音節，協調不同詩行之間的音節數；二來可協調抑揚等步格，實現詩行的音韻和諧。在這一意義上，"alas" 一詞成為了一個不折不扣 "應景的" 添加語。

漢詩以含蓄勝，行文中這種長籲短嘆的現象實不多見。翟理斯的譯文中不時長籲短嘆、"一驚一乍" 的情感直露表現，既折射出他個人的情感特性，也折射出維多利亞時代的表情特性。

3.2 表情形容詞的增譯

表情形容詞帶有個人主觀性、描寫性與誇飾性。翟理斯善於根據所描寫對象的本質特性及其在語境中的作用，來選擇與使用表情形容詞。通過增譯出文本字面上沒有的表情形容詞，一方面增強了句式建構的彈性，便於和諧安排音韻節奏，另一方面使譯文映現出鮮明的浪漫主義色彩。例如：

原文1：雨前初見花間蕊，雨後全無葉底<u>花</u>。——王駕《雨晴》
譯文1：No rain, and <u>lovely</u> flowers bloom around;
　　　　Rain falls, and <u>battered</u> petals strew the ground.
原文2：<u>春色</u>滿園關不住，一枝紅杏出牆來。——葉適《遊園不值》
譯文2：Yet bolts and bars can't quite shut in the
　　　　<u>spring-time's beauteous pall;</u>
　　　　A pink-flowered almond-spray peeps out
　　　　athwart the envious wall!
原文3：常恐秋節至，涼風奪<u>炎熱</u>。——班婕妤《怨歌行》
譯文3：And yet I fear, ah me! that autumn chills,
　　　　Cooling <u>the dying summer's torrid rage,</u>

以上諸例原文中下劃線的名詞意象前均無修飾詞，而從譯文下劃線的短語中可以看到，翟理斯在相應的名詞意象前均增譯了表情形容詞，將原文的泛稱意象均改寫成了特稱意象，將原文的自然景物均敷上了一層人情色彩，如此譯法典型地折射出維多利亞時代詩人們創作中的共同追求：“浪漫主義與維多利亞時代的詩人堅信詩應該捕捉具體的、特指的和個性化的而不是泛稱的、典型的東西。”（Barber1983: 35）但從翻譯效果來看，譯文與原文在審美功能上已有很大不同：一是改變了原文簡潔凝練的行文風格，二是使自然呈現的物象轉化為了情化的物象，定型了讀者閱讀過程中的想像。

詩言志，詩緣情，傳情達志是詩歌翻譯的核心目標。探討詩歌情感的傳譯，從譯者主體移情角度來進行是一條有效的途徑，而從時代詩學的視角來透視作品情感的傳譯，則可進一步發掘譯者移情的歷史維度與詩學特色。

四、思維方式的改寫

中西思維方式的差異及其蘊含與各自民族的文化發展與認知世界的方式關繫密切。體現在人與自然的關繫問題上，中國人有著自己獨特的看法，堅持有機聯繫的整一宇宙觀，以認識的主體與客體的合一為認識的基本前提，即“天人合一”。所謂“天人合一是指人對自然物象採取的相調和、相統一的文化態度，即人不站在自然界之外，而就處於自然界之中，把自然界看成一個與自己渾然一致水乳交融的統一體。”（朱立元，1995: 43）這種認知世界的方式體現在詩作中，就是人往往只是詩作中的一景，與詩作中的其他各景一道形成戲劇式演出。相比之下，西方文化的突出特徵是長於對事物作本質區別，細心

地分解萬事萬物，以獨立主體的確立作為認識的基本前提，在人與自然的關繫問題上，強調人與自然的對立關繫，在認識論上表現為主客體的對立二分，亦即天人相分。也就是說，具有主體意識的人總是站在自然客體之外，將自然作為一個純客觀的認識、研究和改造對象，將自然視為人類活動的背景或心智沉思的對象。這樣認知世界的方式體現在詩作中，就是人往往成為詩作之外的一個觀察者，指引著讀者的視線，侵擾著景物的自主獨立性和客觀性。翟理斯的譯詩中，以天人相分思維方式對漢詩天人合一思維方式進行傳譯的例子時有所見，從而使譯文語篇整體結構上呈現出鮮明的西方運思特色。且看下例：

> 原文1：絕句　杜甫
>
> 　　　兩個黃鸝鳴翠柳，一行白鷺上青天。
>
> 　　　窗含西嶺千秋雪，門泊東吳萬裡船。
>
> 譯文1：A LANDSCAPE　DU FU
>
> 　　　Two orioles sit in the green willows singing;
>
> 　　　<u>See</u> egrets in flight to the blue sky are winging!
>
> 　　　From my window the snow-peaks eternal <u>I spy</u>,
>
> 　　　And an ocean-bound vessel is anchored hard by.

原詩四句，一句一景，各景自然天成，彼此獨立，像戲劇演出一樣逐一或共時呈現出來。對漢英兩文進行比讀，從譯文第二行開頭的劃線詞語 "See" 處，讀者不難想像到有一個外在的 "觀察者"，緊接著第三行中更是直接點明 "I spy"。很顯然，在翟理斯的筆下原詩中自然呈現的各景，大多變成了 "我（I）" 眼中所見各景，景物的自主獨立性和客觀性受到了 "我" 的侵擾，譯詩遂變成了對 "我（I）" 的一次生活經歷的記敘。

　　由於受到天人相分思維方式的影響，翟理斯在翻譯實踐中多習慣性地 "譯出" 一個外在的 "觀察者"，這個外在 "觀察者" 的介入往往使

詩歌的意象邏輯或想像力邏輯演化為理性邏輯或語義語法邏輯，從而強化了詩作的客觀敘事性與經驗寫實性。例如：

> 原文2：怨情　李白
> 　　　　美人捲珠簾，深坐顰蛾眉。
> 　　　　但見淚痕濕，不知心恨誰。
> 譯文2：TEARS
> 　　　　A fair girl draws the blind aside
> 　　　　　And sadly sits with drooping head;
> 　　　　I see her burning tear-drops glide
> 　　　　　But know not why those tears are shed.

原詩中的"但見淚痕濕"，是指"美人"臉上的斑斑淚痕尚未變乾，據此可以從想像上回溯"美人"為心上人精心梳妝打扮，耐心等待多時，而心上人久久不來，"美人"失望落寞，傷心落淚多時的情景。原詩就是以這樣的表現手法讓讀者由結果推想過程，細細回味其景其情，顯得蘊含豐贍。不僅如此，原詩四句，句句與意象"美人"緊密相關，整首詩由意象"美人"的行動、表情、儀態輻射而成，因而"美人"意象有著統領詩作全篇的地位，發揮著貫通詩作整體的功能。譯文中頭兩行保持了"美人"意象的中心位置與話題起點的特點，而後兩行改變了話題的起點，甚至遮蔽了"美人"意象，分散了讀者對"美人"儀態、舉止的注意，不利於詩作中"美人"意象自然、流暢的自我演出與詩作詩意的焦點營構與形成。合而觀之，譯詩中加入了"觀察者""I（我）"，凸顯了現場紀實，強化了譯文的敘事性，因之減損了原詩含滋蓄味的意趣，也使譯作主題顯得不如原作突出、集中。

　　譯詩中增加外在"觀察者"的做法，還包括突顯原詩中作為其中一景的已有"觀察者"，並使之從整體情景中獨立出來，如此一來，容

易使譯作的謀篇佈局圍繞著"觀察者"的視線逐一展開，從而進一步強化詩作的敘事特徵與客觀寫實性。這一點在其所譯的王績詩《野望》等作品中表現的尤為突出。

五、視點的轉換

用思維方式與視點轉換來討論翻譯的運思方式，兩者有趨同的一面，也有各具側重的另一面。從觀照外物視點的角度看，中西傳統審美觀照方式各具自身的特色，其顯在的差異主要表現在："在觀照方式上，中國採取仰觀俯察，遠近往還的散點遊目，西方運用的是選一最佳範圍，典型地顯示對象的焦點透視。"（張法，1997: 288）散點遊目的觀照方式在詩歌中的體現，是詩人選擇與安排詩句內容或情景時可以自由騰挪、前後跳躍，不必鎖定在單一的時空範圍內按理性邏輯逐一描繪。焦點透視的觀照方式在詩歌中的體現，是詩人選擇與安排詩句內容或情景時往往限定在某一具體時空內，並沿著觀察者視點向前延伸做直線推進與流動，這一點在西方詩歌中表現得頗為突出。翟理斯自幼接受英國教育，在西方文化語境中長大，沐浴西方文學傳統，翻譯實踐中潛移默化地將焦點透視這一西方傳統審美觀照方式帶進譯文，從而使其譯文的表情達意方式在局部的具體細節與整體的詩意蘊涵上呈現出鮮明的西方運思特色，這可體現在三大方面：

5.1 意象的增刪與功能的改寫

意象是詩歌表情達意的基本單位，意象及其組合與繫列呈示形成詩作的文本系統。一定的觀照方式形成的文本系統規範著意象的功能與作用，因而翻譯過程中改變了觀照的方式便會在很大程度上改變意象的

功能與作用，就會對意象的系列呈示做出重新選擇與編排。焦點透視的觀照方式是直線向前推進，散點遊目的觀照方式是曲線回環的，兩者的交匯勢必會造成意象的增刪及其功能與作用的改變。例如：

> 原文：送友人　李白
>> 青山橫北郭，白水繞東城。
>> 此地一為別，孤蓬萬裡徵。
>> 浮雲遊子意，落日故人情。
>> 揮手自茲去，蕭蕭班馬鳴。
>
> 譯文：A FAREWELL LI PO
>> Where blue hills cross the northern sky,
>>> Beyond the moat which girds the town,
>> 'Twas there we stopped to say Goodbye!
>>> And one white sail alone dropped down.
>> Your heart was full of wandering thought;
>>> For me, --- my sun had set indeed;
>> To wave a last adieu we sought,
>>> Voiced for us by each whinnying steed!

從譯文中不難看出，翟理斯將朋友間送別的地點選定在"白水（the moat）"邊，所以就順勢譯出了下文乘舟遠行的情形——And one white sail alone dropped down（一片孤獨的白帆順流而去），而不是原詩句所說的"孤蓬萬裡征（您就要像孤飛的蓬草一樣踏上萬裡征程）"，對緊隨其後的"浮雲遊子意，落日故人情"的翻譯，翟理斯繼續沿著這一思路直線向前推演，前一句譯文表現的是"友人（Your heart）"遠去漂泊的心緒，很顯然譯文自然而然地刪去了原詩句中跳脫藉來的意象"浮雲"，後一句譯文表現了"我"的感受，譯文中雖有"落日（my sun had set indeed）"的意象，但"落日"更像是一種象徵——友人的遠去宛如我心中太陽的消逝，而不是詩人跨越時空從天邊攫取而來的表情意

象。總體來看，譯文雖然也能在相當程度上傳達原作中友人之間的深情厚誼，但由於以直線思維方式代替了原作中跳躍回環的運思方式，造成了對原作意象的增刪與功能的改變，一方面大大縮小了原作的審美意象空間，另一方面也消解了李白之詩豪放、飄逸的風格特色。

5.2　詩藝表達方式的改寫

詩歌藝術成就的高低，不在於說了什麼，而在於是怎麼說的。不同的表達形式與技巧昭示著作者不同的用心與目的，也昭示著作品本身是否有獨到的藝術表現特色及其潛在的豐沛蘊含。翻譯中觀照方式的不同造成的詩藝改寫與詩美的呈現，可能是局部的（如上例），也可能是全局性的。例如：

> 原文：　夜雨寄北　李商隱
> 君問歸期未有期，巴山夜雨漲秋池。
> 何當共剪西窗燭，卻話巴山夜雨時。
>
> 譯文：　SOUVENIRS　LI SHANG-YIN
> You ask when I'm coming: alas, not just yet……
> How the rain filled the pools on that night when we met!
> Ah, when shall we ever snuff candles again,
> And recall the glad hours of that evening of rain?

原詩的藝術表現手法尤為高明。詩人開篇不寫遠在他鄉的自己思念家中的妻子，而是反過來說家中妻子來信"問歸期"，寫妻子對自己的遙念，用雙方的共同思念來強化彼此的愛戀深情。三、四兩句用"共剪"、"卻話"呼應前文，將心心相印、靈犀與共的愛戀深情進一步表現得深刻而強烈。合而觀之，"四句詩運用電影中的'蒙太奇'手法，時空轉換，巧為剪接，妙合無隙，堪稱天設地造之作。"（朱炯遠

等，1995: 175）從譯文來看，譯者因受直線思維的影響將原詩中兩處具有不同詩學功能的"巴山夜雨"進行了改寫對接，如此一來，譯文完全轉變為詩人思念親人的個人懸想與自我情感的表白，這顯然與原作的詩藝表現技巧判然有別，也因此大大改變了原詩呈現出來的詩美。

5.3　主題蘊涵的攝取

　　一首詩作的主題雖有一定傾向性，但其蘊涵還是豐富多樣的，是多樣性的統一，而且其蘊涵的表現方式也是獨具特色的。翻譯中以焦點透視觀照方式來應對原作中的散點遊目觀照方式，勢必會形成對原作主題蘊涵的部分攝取，從而損失其間的某些蘊涵。例如：

> 原文：　竹裡館　王維
> 獨坐幽篁裡，彈琴復長嘯。
> 深林人不知，明月來相照。
> 譯文：　OVERLOOKED　WANG WEI
> Beneath the bamboo grove, alone,
> 　I seize my lute and sit and croon;
> No ear to hear me, save my own;
> 　No eye to see me, save the moon.

原詩前兩句寫了詩人自在自得的一面，後兩句寫了詩人孤獨淒清的另一面，顯示的是詩人內心複雜而矛盾的情感。這種複雜情感的呈現來自原詩中前兩句與後兩句的不同視角情景畫面的組接，而譯文採用了同一視角的直線推進——詩人"獨坐幽篁裡，彈琴復長嘯"，緊接而來的是既無人聽（No ear to hear me），也無人看（No eye to see me），如此一來，譯詩選擇性地凸顯了詩人孤獨淒清的一面，譯文重新擬定的題名"OVERLOOKED"也點出了這一面，而原詩中詩人恬淡的心境與隱

居的樂趣也就被切掉了。

六、結語

　　文以代變，一代有一代的文學，說的是文學風氣或詩學規範會隨著時代的變遷而變遷。而置身於文學風氣或詩學規範共時或歷時大背景中的文學翻譯，往往會受製於或叛逆於其時文學風氣或詩學規範，從而導致譯者採取不同的翻譯策略與技巧。艾略特說："一個作家不能脫離其傳統進行創作。"（黃杲炘，1999: 123）仿照此句，我們也可以說，一個譯者不能脫離其傳統進行翻譯。檢視翟理斯的譯詩，我們尤為明顯地注意到他的譯詩與其傳統息息相關。翟理斯的漢詩英譯遵循了維多利亞時期的主流詩學規範，從文學手法、樣式、主題、人物、認知視角和敘事策略等方面對漢詩進行了重構，使所譯的漢詩打上了譯入語文化的鮮明烙印。翟理斯之所以採取這樣的歸化策略，旨在將相對陌生的中國詩歌融入英語讀者熟悉的西方文學框架與文學經驗中，尋找一種熟悉感與認同感，以求更好地喚起讀者的閱讀興趣，激發讀者情感的共鳴，從而獲取更為高效的傳播效果。如此歸結翟理斯的古詩英譯實踐直接呼應著他畢生致力於漢學譯介的宏大心願，他晚年時在《回憶錄》中說道："自1867年起，我此生有兩大主要心願：第一，幫助人們更加容易、更加正確地掌握和理解漢語，包括書面語和口語；第二，激發人們對中國人民的文學、歷史、宗教、藝術、哲學和風俗更為廣泛、更為深刻的興趣。"（Giles1997: 85）

　　翟理斯對自己的翻譯實踐有著清醒認識，他在《中國文學選珍：詩歌卷》前附上自己創作的詩篇進行了詩意闡述："親愛的華夏，請原諒我從／你閃閃詩庫中摘取數首，／加以扭曲使之成為一書，／儘管它

們無法配奏異琴。……。但是眾人在他路競馳中，/ 會間接，但欣然地體會到，/詩魂那遙遠微弱的跳動，/ 其氣息彌漫在華夏之邦。"（吳伏生，2012: 120）從這裡可以看到翟理斯的譯文之於原詩不僅是間接的再現，而且還有強行的曲解；他的譯詩可能隻會讓你聽一聽詩人心靈的泛音，嗅一嗅華夏之邦詩意的氣息。這應是其詩作一開篇就乞求華夏民族諒解的原因，也應是我們從共時語境來認知與評價其翻譯目的與功用的重要理據。

　　站在翻譯歷時的視角看，這種"以西格中"或"以中格西"的現像是兩種文學文化傳統初期交流、碰撞與融合的突出現實寫照。韋努蒂（L. Venuti）說："翻譯的功用不是其他什麼，而是對異質的吸納和同化，是將外源文本根據本土的領會和興趣加以書寫。"（Venuti，1988: 11）翟理斯的翻譯實踐從形式到內容對漢詩進行了多維同化，也按本土的興趣進行了生動演繹，有效地注解了這一論斷。從文化交流與傳播的視角看，這既是認知的起點，也是傳播與接受的基礎。這一點對於今天認知傳統文化如何走出去的現實訴求不無啟迪意義。最後需要說明的是，跳脫翟理斯所處的歷史文化語境及其翻譯認知來審視其翻譯實踐與策略，難免會看到其間遊弋著"種族中心主義（ethnocentrism）"的影子以及在此觀念左右下譯者所進行的有意文化誤讀與改寫，進一步說，有意淡化或西化漢詩的民族文化特色，這或許可以成為另文探討的話題。

參考文獻

Barber, Charles (1983). *Poetry in English – An Introduction.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giles, Herbert Allen (1923). *Gems of Chinese Literature: Verse.* Shanghai: Wellp and Walsh, Ltd.

_____ (1997). "The Memoirs of H. A. Giles." In *East Asian History*. Ed. Aylmer Charles. Institute of Advanced Studies, Australian National University.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1992). "On the Different Methods of Translating." In *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. Ed. and trans. André Lefevere. London: Routledge. 141-166.

Venuti, Lawrence (1988). *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.

方漢泉（2002），《英詩論集》，廣州：花城出版社。

馮民生（2007），《中西傳統繪畫空間表現比較研究》，北京：中國社會科學出版社。

胡家巒（2008），《英美詩歌名篇詳注》，北京：中國人民大學出版社。

黃杲炘（1999），《從柔巴依到坎特伯雷——英語詩漢譯研究》，武漢：湖北教育出版社。

吳伏生（2012），《漢詩英譯研究：理雅各、翟理斯、韋利、龐德》，北京：學苑出版社。

許淵沖（1984），《漢英對照唐詩一百五十首》，西安：陝西人民出版社。

楊柳等（2013），《文化視域中的翻譯理論研究》，北京：人民文學出版社。

余蘇凌（2015），《目標文化視角：英美譯者英譯漢詩之形式與意象研究（1870-1962）》，上海：上海外語教育出版社。

張保紅（2016），《詩歌翻譯探索》，北京：清華大學出版社。

張法（1997），《中西美學與文化精神》，北京：北京大學出版社。

張今、張寧（2005），《文學翻譯原理》(修訂版)，北京：清華大學出版社。

朱光潛（1997），《詩論》，合肥：安徽教育出版社。

朱徽（2009），《中國詩歌在英語世界：英美譯家漢詩英譯研究》，上海：上海外語教育出版社。

朱炯遠等（1995），《唐詩三百首譯注評》，沈陽：遼海出版社。

朱立元（1995），〈中西古代藝術類型差異之文化探源〉，《上海文化》5: 42-46。

朱振武等（2017），《漢學家的中國文學英譯歷程》，上海：華東理工大學出版社。

基金項目

作者簡介

張保紅，廣東外語外貿大學高級翻譯學院教授、博士、博士生導師。中國英漢語比較研究會理事，翻譯學研究中心研究員，《翻譯界》雜誌編委。主要研究方向為文學翻譯理論與實踐。E-mail: zhangbao1969@126.com

忠於個人志趣　融合現實關懷
──《史記》不同英譯本
成因之譯者因素探析

李俐

Abstract

Translators in the Making of the English Translations of *Shiji* (*by* Li LI).

The two English translations of the Shiji, *one by Burton Watson and the other by William H. Nienhauser, Jr. and his team, are distinctively different. Drawing on Bourdieu's concept of "habitus", this paper attempts to investigate the reasons leading to the differences between the two English translations by laying emphasis on the habitus of the translators. It contextualizes the production of the two translations, explores the translators' experience and their Sinological training, their encounter with the* Shiji, *and the socio-historical environment in which they lived. The research shows that the two translations have been influenced not only by the culture of the time when they were produced, but also by the translators' own habitus. Both translators have remained devoted to their aspirations and interests and at the same time revealed their practical concerns, which inevitably resulted in the differences between the two translations.*

一、引言

《史記》是西漢時期的史官司馬遷（前145或135-約前86）集畢生精力著述而成的第一部紀傳體通史，其中蘊含的史學思想和文學藝術對中國的史學與文學產生了深遠的影響。作為正史之首，《史記》在西方的傳播對中國史學走向國際史壇意義重大。

在美國，將《史記》譯介到英語世界的主要譯者有兩位，一位是美國漢學家、翻譯家華茲生（Burton Watson, 1925-2017），一位是美國漢學家倪豪士（William H. Nienhauser, Jr., 1943-）。[1] 華茲生於上世紀五十年代開始研究、翻譯《史記》，其三卷本《史記》（Watson 1993a; 1993b; 1993c）共譯出原著130篇中的78篇，其中67篇為全譯，11篇為節譯。1980年代末開始，倪豪士帶領一個團隊譯註《史記》（Nienhauser 1994-），至2019年已出版八卷（卷一、二、五（一）、七、八、九、十，以及卷十一），完整譯出原著中的92篇，該項目尚在繼續。

兩種譯本採用了不同的翻譯方法。華茲生的節譯本改變了原著的篇章順序，未保留史遷首創的五體結構（本紀、世家、書、表，和列傳），突出《史記》的文學價值，譯者用平白、流暢的語言，少用註腳，盡量多地譯出《史記》原文，一般讀者和專業讀者可以閱讀這部節譯作品，領略史遷之文采。倪譯本的目標是依照原著的篇章順序、全譯《史記》，除翻譯外，還收入《史記》研究的內容，有著豐富的序言、註腳等副文本，學術性突出，專業讀者可以從中窺探中國文史傳統，了解《史記》學的最新進展。

兩種譯本的顯著不同引起了學者的興趣。[2] 例如，侯格睿（Grant Hardy）在其書評文章中比較了兩個譯本，指出"兩種譯著差異顯著，恰能互為補充，研究中國古史的學者可以得益於兩種譯本各自所長"。[3]

他對華譯抱有感情，亦高度認同倪譯本的學術價值（1996: 150）。

　　不過，從翻譯史研究的視角出發，還可進一步追問，為什麼半個世紀里，會在美國出現這樣風格迥異的《史記》譯本？對此，李秀英與汪榕培的文章已經做出了部分回答。他們對華茲生譯作成因作了較為深入的研究，所惜該文以倪譯本為次要對照，作者委婉指出倪譯本的行文不及華譯本自然、流暢，且特別指出其文章"不考慮'專門的研究參考文獻、考據、註釋'等'學術'因素……"（Li & Wang 2011: 96），這樣一來，難免忽略研究《史記》翻譯時不容忽視的一點——該典籍的史學價值，而遮蓋了這個面向，便不易展現倪譯本的"學術"價值，因為參考文獻、考據、註釋等正是倪譯本的重要內容。另外，李秀英（2007）從20世紀中後期美國對外文化戰略的變化來解釋這兩種《史記》英譯的不同，有助於我們理解譯本產生的時代、政治背景。可是，華譯本和倪譯本從1990年代至今同時並存、互為補充，說明兩種譯本都契合社會文化環境的需求，似乎單從政治、文化背景來看難以透徹地解釋這個重譯現象。

　　倘若能結合身處社會歷史環境中的譯者這個重要因素，則可更為具體地把握兩種譯本的成因。譯者華茲生和倪豪士同是生於二十世紀上半葉的美國漢學家，都是主要在美國接受漢學訓練、獲得博士學位，可他們翻譯《史記》的方法卻如此不同，這同中之異值得探索。

二、譯者習性探微

　　關於觀察譯者的方法，布迪厄社會學理論中的"習性"（*habitus*）這一概念給予我們頗多啟發。他將"習性"定義為一個"性情系統，它是持久的，也是可變換的，這個性情系統是被建構而成的結構，同時，作為一種結構，它又具備建構的功能"（Bourdieu 1977: 72）。即是說習

性這個系統融合了過去的經驗，每時每刻作為直覺、欣賞、行為的母體發揮作用。布迪厄強調"習性"不是被動、消極的，它既被建構，也有建構功能。他指出，習性的形成很大程度上有賴於家庭環境潛移默化的熏陶（包括家庭的道德規範、養育、品味等）（Bourdieu 1977: 78），而"將這種無意識圖式系統〔習性〕有意識地傳輸給個體的則是教育機構……"（Mander 1987: 428）。西米奧尼（Daniel Simeoni）指出借鏡"習性"概念去研究翻譯行為，其中一個側面就是去看譯者從什麼文化群體接受訓練（轉引自Hermans 1999: 135）。

　　基於以上理解，本文從譯者的"個人志趣"和"現實關懷"兩個方面來觀察社會歷史語境中的譯者，嘗試將譯作產生的外在因素和譯者這個關鍵角色聯繫起來，從譯者個人志趣和現實關懷的雙重視角來描摹譯本的生成，並以兩種譯本生成的歷史來觀照文本背後美國傳統漢學的變遷。[4] 下文將依次討論：譯者的人生經歷、漢學訓練、前期《史記》研究，以及譯者結合現實需求選取的《史記》翻譯策略。

2.1　譯者的人生經歷與《史記》英譯

　　華茲生幼時與中國文化的接觸使他早早地對中國文字和文化產生了興趣，大學期間，曾有志於文學創作，但未取得樂觀進展，後投身中、日文學翻譯事業。青年時代的華茲生受當時時局影響，沒有機會進入中國學習，亦未能在美國謀得教職，但是他把握了時代的需求，在文學翻譯領域找到了用武之地，對中國古典文學譯介做出了重要貢獻。就其漢學事業的機緣而言，華茲生的一生可謂生不逢時，又生逢其時。

　　華茲生1925年出生於美國紐約州的新羅謝爾市（New Rochelle），在那兒完成了大部分中學學業，與中國文化的最初接觸源於當地中國人開的洗衣店（Balcom 2005: 7）。1943年，高中畢業後，自願參加美國海

軍，期間隨其服役的船隻駐扎於日本，停留了六個月，初次接觸日本文化。1946年退役，獲得一筆退役軍人教育津貼，申請入哥大學習漢語。在哥大求學期間最初想要嘗試做作家，所以也選修了幾門創意寫作的課程，不過最終沒有在文學創作方面取得樂觀進展（Watson 2001）。1951年碩士畢業後他前往日本工作，主要從事中、日文獻的翻譯，並完成了博士論文的初稿。1955–1956年重返哥大攻讀博士學位。1956年博士畢業時，適逢哥大需要翻譯中國早期哲學思想的著作，華茲生接受了這個項目的資助，開始了他的翻譯事業（Watson 1995: 200）。

　　倪豪士早年經歷中引人注意的是他對歷史和中國文化的興趣，這為他後來翻譯、研究《史記》埋下了種子。他恰逢美國漢學高速發展的時代，受到較好的漢學學術訓練，畢業后獲得大學教職，成為漢學教授，在中國文學研究領域取得了豐碩的研究成果。倪豪士的人生經歷可以說是生逢其時，又才盡其用。

　　倪豪士生於1943年，根據他自己的介紹，他"直到16歲才見過第一個中國人，對中國的興趣產生於高中時期，當時熱衷於學歷史，讀了很多傳記與傳記文學"（徐公持，2002: 126）。1961年底，中學畢業不久的他當了兵，進入了陸軍語言學校，得到了不錯的語言訓練，為後來的研究打下了基礎。1965年1月退伍，進入印第安納大學東亞語言文學系，專修中國文學。1968獲印第安納大學碩士學位，1973年從印第安納大學（Indiana University）東亞語言文學系獲得博士學位，同年到威斯康辛大學麦迪 分校（University of Wisconsin-Madison）執教，教授中國文學。他是《中國文學》（*Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews*）刊物創辦人之一。

　　1989年，倪豪士得到台灣文建會的資助，開始傾注大量心血翻譯、研究《史記》。他曾多次到德國訪學，近年來與各國學者合作

致力於《史記》翻譯，其學術交流的足跡所至包括：美國、德國、日本、中國大陸，及台灣、香港等，《史記》翻譯與研究是其國際化的學術交流與合作之主要內容。與華茲生《史記》翻譯相比，這次翻譯活動與學術研究的聯繫更為緊密。

　　透過上述兩位譯者的人生軌跡，我們看到兩個時代的政治、人文剪影。他們的翻譯活動聯結的不同地理空間從一個側面反映出美國的《史記》翻譯與研究由非常倚重日本，變得更加全球化、多元化。

　　結合他們各自的經歷來看他們的《史記》翻譯，我們能夠更好地理解他們在翻譯中對《史記》底本的選擇，以及他們不同的翻譯模式。

　　華茲生在日本學習、工作的經歷使他的《史記》翻譯較為倚重日本學者的研究成果，選用了瀧川資言1934年在日本出版的《史記會注考證》為底本。他指出，這是因為該版本 "可讀性強"（readable），"使用方便"（convenient）；而參考其他底本時亦主要是為了選取他認為 "更加合適的解讀"（adopted what appear to be better readings…）（Watson 1993: xxi）。倪豪士則選取了1959年中華書局版的《史記》，同時參考了百衲本和景祐本《史記》，參考多個底本的目的是在翻譯的同時進行多文本的比較研究。他們所選的底本在文本內容上差異不是很大，但是他們使用底本的方法不同，因而使兩個譯本呈現出完全不同的樣貌。

　　此外，華茲生一生的主業是作為獨立譯者，專注於中、日文學翻譯。他開始翻譯《史記》時，剛剛博士畢業，獨自在日本遊學。倪豪士作為大學教授，一直致力於中國文學研究，教授學生，傳承漢學方法，這使他更有可能召集一支團隊來完成《史記》全譯的浩大工程。

2.2 譯者的漢學訓練與《史記》英譯

　　上文已經指出，"習性" 建構過程中，教育的作用非常重要。的

確，兩位譯者在大學時代受到的漢學訓練對他們譯者習性的形成起到了決定性的作用。

　　華茲生在哥倫比亞大學求學的年代，美國漢學的建制階段基本完成，進入傳統漢學向現代中國學轉型的時期（熊文華，2015: 211-271）。這時，美國漢學研究的基礎還比較薄弱。從他對大學課業的回憶中可見，華茲生所受到的漢學訓練偏重語言能力的培養。

　　對他影響至深的幾位老師包括：曾在四川做過傳教士的陸義全（Rev. Lutley）牧師，出生於中國通州，1926年起任教於哥大的富路特（L. Carrignton Goodrich, 1894-1986）教授，以及第一位將《紅樓夢》節譯、介紹到英語世界的華人王際真（Chi-chen Wang，1899-2001）教授。陸義全牧師是他大學一年的老師，主要教授漢字書寫。

　　大學期間，華茲生就顯示出對詩歌的興趣。他記得，大學二年級時，富路特教授有時會在黑板上抄一首唐詩，解釋其意思，華茲生還記得回到寢室後嘗試翻譯這些詩歌的情景。後來還曾經將自己翻譯的《玉臺新詠》中的部分詩歌寄給龐德（Ezra Pound, 1885-1972），請他指教（Balcom 2005: 8）。華氏一生翻譯了大量中國詩歌，成果豐碩。

　　對華茲生的翻譯思想產生重大影響的則是王際真教授。王際真生於山東省，兒時曾隨父親在廣東生活，11歲考入清華附中，1922年畢業於清華大學留美預備學堂，同年赴美國哥倫比亞大學求學。其為人熟知的成就是兩次節譯《紅樓夢》，畢生致力於向西方介紹中國文學。1929年，他節譯的《紅樓夢》出版後獲得極大好評，因此獲得哥倫比亞東亞系的教職，之後一直在哥大任教，1965年退休。

　　1950年，華茲生在哥大的第五年，王際真教授給華茲生開設了類似指導閱讀的課程，他請求王教授指導他閱讀《史記》和《漢書》中與"遊俠"相關的兩篇文章。這段時間的訓練給華茲生留下了深刻的印象。他說：

> 王際真教授希望他的學生不僅能閱讀漢語文章，還要掌握這樣的本領：那
> 就是，能用流暢、地道的英語來表述這些文章的內容。……那些日子裡，
> 我在王教授的指導下閱讀漢語文章，他的教誨使我深信在翻譯這些文本
> 時，僅僅達意是不夠的，還要能用自然、地道的英語來轉述原文的意思。
> 我後來做漢語、日語翻譯時一直謹記這個翻譯理念。我當然明白翻譯之事
> 尚有他法，各種方法也都自有其合理性，但是我自己一直不曾改變這一翻
> 譯理念。（Watson 1995: 199）

王際真強調譯文需流暢自然，這一理念對華茲生的翻譯思想影響深
遠。他翻譯《史記》時，非常強調譯文的可讀性。試比較下面兩個譯
文，可以明顯見得華茲生追求譯文自然、流暢的翻譯理念。

> 例1. 廣出獵，見草石中，以為虎而射之，中石沒鏃，視之石也，因復更射
> 之，終不能復入石矣。（《史記·李將軍列傳》，中華書局，1959：2871-2872）
> 1a. 華譯本：Li Guang was out hunting one time when he spied a rock in the
> grass which he mistook for a tiger. He shot an arrow at the rock and hit it
> with such force that the tip of the arrow embedded itself in the rock. Later,
> when he discovered that it was a rock, he tried shooting at it again, but he
> was unable to pierce it a second time. (Watson 1993b: 121-122)
> 1b. 倪譯本：[Once] when Kuang went out hunting, he spotted a rock
> amidst the grasses. He thought it was a tiger and shot at it. [The arrow]
> hit the rock [so hard that] the arrowhead disappeared. [Only upon closely]
> observing it, [Kuang realized] it was a rock. Accordingly, he shot at it again
> repeatedly. [Note 77] [But] in the end, he was unable to penetrate [*2872*]
> the rock again. (Nienhauser, IX: 217)

這是《史記》中的名句，余光中曾引這句，對比華茲生的譯文來說明漢
語的濃縮、精煉。當然，他對華茲生的譯文評價也很高，認為“就英
文論英文，簡潔有力，實在是上乘的手筆”。他說，華茲生“使用音節
短小、意義單純的字眼”（2000: 94），盡量簡明地追摹司馬遷樸素、剛

勁的文筆。倪譯本則力求字面對應，傳遞出源語的異質性，且多用文中夾註和腳註，提醒讀者譯者的存在，譯文帶給讀者完全不同的閱讀體驗，將我們帶入一個《史記》學術研究的場域。

回顧華茲生的漢學訓練，可以看到華茲生的大學教育激發了他對文字的興趣，培養了他的文學素養。富路特的詩歌教學，點燃了華茲生對詩歌的熱情，王際真引導其閱讀與翻譯中國經典的教學，使他形成了一生信守的翻譯思想。這些特質體現在華茲生的《史記》翻譯中，就是他選擇用平白、流暢的語言翻譯史遷的文字，注重用簡潔的文字傳達原著的音樂性（Watson 1995: 206）。[5]

較之於華茲生的大學時代，倪豪士求學的大學時代，美國漢學研究專業化程度更高了。倪豪士的漢學訓練學術性更為突出，大學期間紮實的漢學學術訓練為倪豪士後來致力於《史記》學術性翻譯打下了基礎。除了在美國印第安納大學求學外，他還多次到德國進修，浸潤於德國漢學古典文學研究的優良傳統。

他在漢學研究上的學術素養也得益於他所問學的諸位漢學名師。對他影響較大的有波恩大學（the University of Bonn）精於宋代詩詞研究的霍布理（Peter Olbricht, 1909-2001）教授，研究中國詩歌和賦的畢少夫（Friedrich Alexander Bischoff, 1928-2009）教授，導師柳無忌教授（1907-2002），以及羅郁正（Irving Y. Lo, 1922-2005）教授等。

倪豪士在印第安納求學期間獲得了較好的學術訓練，已經具備了開展學術研究的良好素養。例如，1969年，倪豪士請求柳無忌開設"柳宗元研究"課程。倪豪士和他的同學修習了柳無忌開設的中國文學研究課程，並合作完成了《柳宗元》一書（1973年出版）（葉雪芬1992: 98-112）。

他還在大學期間習得了"相當管用"的研究方法。他說"在印第安

納我開始開始接觸歐洲和日本漢學成果，並學會了利用大量參考書細讀古典作品的方法"（徐公持，2002: 126）。他進一步解釋說："對文本要採用細讀精研的方法。我自己的方法可以說是新批評觀點與形式主義批評的結合體。因為我在每年秋季的研究生基礎課上要講授這種方法，我自己得以逐漸精益求精。這種方法並非特別適合於每一個在西方研究中國文學的人，但我相信對我相當管用"（徐公持，2002: 129）。

從他訓練學生的方法中，也可看到他所指的這個"相當管用"的方法。在接受鐘彩鈞的採訪中，他詳細介紹了自己講授"中國文學史"課程的方法：首先讓學生大量熟悉日本、西洋學者對一部典籍（如《詩經》）的研究，然後翻譯研讀《詩經》中的一些詩歌，討論詩歌的意思，接著就結合中西學者的研究文章，分析這些學者的說法是否言之有理（鐘彩鈞，1991: 120-121）。

在對學生的課堂訓練中，他很重視對原著的翻譯。他說西方漢學家喜歡做翻譯，倒不是喜歡做翻譯，"是非做翻譯不可。要不然怎樣評論中國古典文學？多半美國人不懂中文，所以翻譯很重要。……如果你留學會很快地就發現，最重要的研究基礎就是翻譯"（倪豪士，2013: 115）。

了解到倪豪士這種閱讀文本的方法以及他看重的漢學翻譯之功用，我們便能更好地理解他和他的團隊翻譯《史記》的方法。他們翻譯《史記》的方法和他閱讀文本的方法極為相似（倪豪士，2003: 111-115）。以下僅以一例說明倪豪士翻譯《史記》時採用文本細讀的方法：

> 例2：高祖為人，隆準而龍顏，美須髯，左股有七十二黑子。仁而愛人，喜施，意豁如也。常有大度，不事家人生產作業。（《史記·高祖本紀》，中華書局，1959: 342）

2a. 華譯本: Kao-tsu had a prominent nose and a dragonlike face, with beautiful whiskers on his chin and cheeks; on his left thigh he had seventy-two black moles. (Note 2) He was kind and affectionate with others, liked to help people, and was very understanding. He always had great ideas and paid little attention to the business the rest of his family was engaged in. （Watson, 1993a: 51）

Note 2: Seventy-two, the multiple of eight and nice, is a mystic number in Chinese thought.[6]

2b. 倪譯本（譯者倪豪士）：Kao-tsu was a man (Note 11) who had a high nose and a dragon＇s brow, a handsome beard, (Note 12) and seventy-two (Note 13) black spots on his left thigh. He was humane, (Note 14) loved people, was fond of largesse, (Note 15) and openhearted. (Note 16) He usually had great plans and did not serve in the productive enterprises of his family. (Note 17)

Note 11: *Wei-jen* 為人, literally "to act as a man," is used primarily to describe the behavior of powerful political figures such as the First Emperor of Ch'in or Yü the Great—see *Shih chi*, 2.51 (*Grand Scribe's Records*, 1:22): "Yü was a man both diligent and indefatigable"; *Shih chi*, 6.230 (*Grand Scribe's Records*, 1:131) [Ssu-ma Ch'ien's description of the First Emperor is here put in the words of Liao of Ta Liang]: "The King of Ch'in was born with a prominent nose, elongated eyes, the breast of a bird of pry, and the voice of a jackal; he seldom extends favor and has the heart of a tiger or wolf. When in straits, he can submit to others, but when he was in his way, he can easily eat you alive";….[7]

Note 12: *Lung yen* 龍顏 became a cliché for the imperial visage … It literally refers to the space above the eyebrows….

Note 13: In Chavannes' personal copy of his translation … he added a handwritten comment on the symbolic value of the nuber 72….

Note 14: *Han shu* (1A.2) reads *k'uan jen ai jen* 寬仁愛人"benevolent, human and loved people" for *jen erh ai jen* 仁而愛人here….

Note 15: *Hsi shih* 喜施, which we read as "fond of charitable acts, largesse" following Wu and Lu (8.281), is omitted in the *Han shu* account (1A.2).

Note 16: As is common in these wei-jen 為人 descriptions, here we find reference to both Kao-tsu's physical features and his character….
Note 17: I am grateful to Michael Loewe for an alternate reading of *ta-tu* 大度 as "had great plans" (personal communication dated 29 February 2000)…. (Nienhauser, 2002: vol. 2, 5-6)

對比兩種譯文，看到文中對"為人"、"龍顏"、"仁而愛人"、"喜施"、"意豁如也"、"常有大度"，及"不事家人生產作業"等詞句的翻譯都有不同。註腳的使用差異非常突出。華茲生僅用一個註腳，補充說明數字72在中國古代思想中是一個神秘的數字。倪豪士的譯文共有7個註腳，註11提出"為人"二字，在古代文獻中多用來引出重要政治人物的行為。這一意義的確不同於今日白話文"為人"二字的意義。此處可見西方學者研讀中國文獻時的敏銳，會注意到中國學者容易忽略的東西。註12指出"龍顏"二字的涵義和用法，並區分了"須"和"髯"的意思。註13引用了法語《史記》譯者沙畹譯文手稿上對數字72的解讀，另引了聞一多等中國學者的相關研究。註14、15指出《漢書》平行文本的文字差異。註16分析對劉邦體貌的描寫意在將他和其傳說為龍的生身父親建立聯繫，並列舉《史記》中此類相似的敘述方式。註17指出"常有大度，不事家人生產作業"另外可能的理解。

上例中，兩種譯著在翻譯手法上大相徑庭：華茲生主張用平白、流暢的英文翻譯《史記》（Watson 1995: 199），多用意譯；主編及譯者倪豪士偏好用直譯的方法，盡量忠實地傳遞原文的旨趣（Nienhauser 1994: vol. 1, xviii），倪譯本採用直譯與大量加註的手法。

　　無獨有偶，與倪豪士的漢學翻譯方法甚為相似的還有與他同時代的漢學家奚如谷（Stephen H. West）。奚如谷提到，在70年代占主導地位的是華茲生的流暢翻譯，而他則偏愛那種註釋繁複的學術翻譯，也

指導他的學生從這種繁複的翻譯中領略中國文化（West 1995: 132）。
似乎此時漢學翻譯風尚也經歷了由注重語言流暢、易於閱讀到注重經
典內涵、融入學術研究的轉變。

　　通過追溯倪豪士重考據、善於利用參考書精讀古典作品的漢學訓
練及其對中國文學的研究取徑，我們能更好地理解為什麼他翻譯《史
記》時，會選擇忠於原典、貼近原文、大量加註的學術性翻譯策略。
借用奚如谷的話，倪豪士的"翻譯即是研究"（Translation as Research）
（West 1995: 131）。把握了倪譯本《史記》中這種翻譯與研究緊密交
織、互為推動的狀態，方能全面理解該譯本的價值。

2.3　譯者的《史記》前期研究與《史記》英譯

　　以上的分析，已經較為清晰地顯示出華茲生的翻譯活動有著突出
的文學性，而倪豪士的翻譯習性有著顯著的學術性。他們各自的翻譯
偏好，從他們對《史記》的前期研究中，也可窺見一斑。

　　華茲生開始翻譯《史記》，並從此和司馬遷接下不解之緣多少有
些偶然。1950年秋，他為選擇碩士論文題目，廣泛閱讀，偶然遇到了
"遊俠"一詞（Watson 1995: 199），後來碩士論文就是翻譯〈史記・遊
俠列傳〉。這是華茲生第一次深入閱讀《史記》。1953年他獲得福特基
金資助，在日本繼續閱讀、翻譯《史記》，1956年完成了博士論文《司
馬遷：偉大的中國歷史學家》，1961年出版兩卷本翻譯《史記：漢朝部
分》，這些則更多是必然的結果了。

　　華茲生對《史記》的興趣一直偏重其文學與思想價值。在博士
論文摘要中，華茲生寫道："該研究的目的是要盡量全面地介紹《史
記》這部著作的性質，突出其在中國文學和歷史思想中的重要價值"
（Watson 1956: Abstract）。所以他"有意選擇了避開《史記》中的一

些史學問題,比如司馬遷著述所用的資料,以及歷代中國學者評論
《史記》的問題等"(Watson 1956: 5)。他在後來的文章中亦再次指
出:"……人們往往只將著名的歷史作品看作有趣的、有用的資料,一
旦提取了其中的資料,就置之不理了。而實際上,中國的這些歷史著
作是在整個文學脈絡之中的,對整個國家的思想和表達模式都有重大
的影響"(Watson 1995: 205)。因此,他選擇了節譯的方式,譯出《史
記》中故事性很強、敘事精彩的篇章,而且沒有保留史遷的五體結構。

　　有趣的是,華茲生在博士論文中第二章中翻譯〈史記・太史公自
序〉和〈漢書・司馬遷傳〉都有豐富的註釋,共有147個尾註(Watson
1958: 40-69),這同他後來出版的《史記》翻譯盡量少用註釋的風格
截然不同。他後來翻譯的〈史記・李廣將軍列傳〉全篇僅有5個註腳
(Watson 1993b: 117-128)。他這樣特意將學術研究的翻譯和面向大眾
讀者的翻譯區別開來的做法也說明華茲生並非不能做註釋豐富的學術
性翻譯,而是更注重通過翻譯幫助英文讀者領略《史記》的文學風貌。

　　華茲生似乎有意將譯者角色與研究者角色區別開來,而倪豪士在
《史記》翻譯項目中體現出的是恰恰是譯者角色與研究者角色的完美
結合,他的《史記》翻譯和學術研究呈現緊密交織的狀態。

　　較之於華茲生通過翻譯將經典作品送給大眾讀者的理念,倪豪士
所從事的《史記》翻譯更在於其學術研究的功用。這一方面是有意與
華譯形成互補(Nienhauser 2014: 50),另一方面也是回應漢學界《史
記》研究的學術需求。

　　在他的《史記》翻譯項目開始不久,倪豪士就提出,西方的《史
記》研究還存在三個迫切需要處理的學術任務:一是對《史記》與《漢
書》的關係進行徹底的梳理;二是深入研究《史記》歷史版本流變;三
是推出英語全譯本(Nienhauser 1996: 44)。倪譯本《史記》也圍繞這幾

大問題添加丰富的註釋，並因為這種翻譯與研究緊密結合的特性而成為繼華譯本之後的另一部英語《史記》名山之作。譯者及主編倪豪士在翻譯與研究上的這種完美結合與他對《史記》的前期研究密切相關。

在初次接觸《史記》的博士研究階段，倪豪士已經顯示出對中國文學獨特的研究視角。其博士論文《〈西京雜記〉中的文學和歷史》（*An Interpretation of the Literary and Historical Aspects of the Hsi-ching Tsa-chi (Miscellanies of the Western Capital)*）第四章專門討論了《西京雜記》中與史學相關的文篇。在這一章，他在翻譯原文的基礎上，梳理了《西京雜記》中對《史記》的作者、編撰、體例、文本來源、以及司馬遷受到前人的影響等方面的問題（Nienhauser 1972: 117-172）。可見，早在1970年代，他對《史記》研究的學術問題已經有了初步的了解。不過他與《史記》的緣分要等到1989年，46歲的他帶領一個團隊開始翻譯《史記》時才變得更加深厚，這時他廣闊的學術視野和豐厚的知識積累可謂是用當其時。

2.4　譯者的現實關懷與《史記》英譯

當然，"翻譯不是產生於真空之中的"（translations are not made in a vacuum）（Lefevere 1992: 14），翻譯產生於譯者、譯文讀者所處的社會文化環境之中。譯者選取不同的翻譯策略亦是對當時社會文化環境作出的回應。

華譯本醞釀於上世紀50年代初期，1961年首次出版。當時的美國在二戰之後迅速進入全盛時期，成為全球事務的主導力量，引用《時代》（*Time*）雜誌的出版商亨利·盧斯（Henry Luce）的話，這是"美國的世紀"（American Century）（Clack et al., 2009: 186）。不同於1929年大蕭條之後的孤立主義思潮，美國開始制定全球戰略，急切希

望了解包括中國在內的亞洲國家，尤其需要研究這些國家的現狀。李秀英指出，由於美國在政治、經濟上的顯赫地位，美國政府出台了以美國文化為主導的對外文化戰略方案。（2007: 126）

　　華茲生的《史記》翻譯項目從一開始就有著非常明顯的務實目的。二戰後美國急切需要了解中國的需求反映在教育上就是設立東亞學系，開設漢語課程，注重實用型研究（魏思齊，2007: 30-40）。與《史記》翻譯直接相關的是：需要大量關於中國的教學素材。哥倫比亞大學東亞語言文學系的發展簡史中還記錄了這個情況："為了解決本科生東亞文明諸多課程英文材料匱乏的問題，1950年，狄百瑞（Wm. Theodore de Bary, 1919-2017）和華茲生、唐納德・基恩（Donald Keene, 1922-）共同開始了一項浩大的翻譯亞洲著作的工程……該翻譯系列為本系本科課程教學打下了堅實的基礎"（"Department History," n.d.）。

　　到了倪豪士決定再譯《史記》的1980年代末，束縛學術研究的冷戰格局開始瓦解，全球化的趨勢日益明顯，"文化多元論已經逐漸成為人文、社會科學界的共識"（余英時，2010: 110）。隨著中美建交與中國實行對外開放，兩國學界的交流增多，美國學者的觀察視角產生了重大的變化，從事中國研究的西方學者逐漸主張從中國歷史內部來理解中國。例如，柯文（Paul A. Cohen）在其著作《在中國發現歷史》（*Discovering History in China*）中回顧了美國20世紀中後期以來在中國研究領域的思潮流變，梳理了從以"沖擊—反應"論逐漸轉向"中國中心"為指導思想的研究取徑。

　　在西方中國古史研究領域，美國學者越來越關注中國豐富的史學傳統。繼華茲生（1958）的專著《司馬遷：中國偉大的歷史學家》（*Ssu-ma Ch'ien, Grand Historian of China*）後，杜潤德（Stephen Durrant）與哈迪又相繼出版了《史記》研究的專著（Durrant 1995; Hardy 1999），

美國的《史記》研究開始呈現出繁榮的局面，這為倪豪士《史記》英譯的產生與持續開展提供了良好的學術環境。

這些現實因素，在很大程度上影響了他們翻譯策略的選擇。華茲生翻譯《史記》有很強的實用目的，服務於普通讀者。為了在有限的時間與資助條件下，盡可能多地翻譯《史記》的文字，為普通讀者服務，他選取了用平白流暢的語言翻譯《史記》。用他自己的話說，選取了一些與當時主流的漢學翻譯方法不同的策略來翻譯《史記》。倪豪士為了幫助英語讀者深入理解《史記》，發現研究議題，在翻譯策略上選擇詳實加註的方法，所加的腳註是為英語讀者服務的，他相信只有這樣才能妥當地呈現出原作的全貌（Nienhauser 1995: 19）。

綜上所述，可以看到：華茲生對《史記》的研究為他的翻譯工作打下了基礎，而他對文字的關切、對詩歌的偏好，及其受到的漢學訓練又為其《史記》譯著的風格奠定了基調。華氏選擇凸顯《史記》的文學面貌不單是順應時代潮流的結果，譯者心中自有其對《史記》的體認與堅持。

倪豪士的《史記》翻譯項目有著非常鮮明的學術特性，他將自己所堅持並精益求精的文本細讀方法運用於《史記》翻譯，豐富了漢學研究的方法。其《史記》翻譯與學術研究緊密結合，是譯者的個人志趣與現實關懷融合的結果。

三、結語

正如氣勢磅礴的漢武時代孕育了司馬遷這位偉大的歷史學家，風雲際會的美國漢學時代也造就了華茲生和倪豪士兩位英語《史記》翻譯家。從譯作來反觀譯者所處的時代及其為之默默奉獻的漢學事業，令

我們對這兩部名山之作抱有更多的溫情與敬意。因為他們的努力，兩種芳姿各異的《史記》譯本在英文世界互為補充，使司馬遷和《史記》在英語世界的形象漸趨豐滿，《史記》研究在西方學界不斷深入，作為中國正史之首的《史記》成為西方學者瞭解中國文史傳統的重要文本，而翻譯在其中扮演了重要角色。

他們的翻譯個案也呼應了布迪厄"習性"概念中固有的"建構"之意，即習性通過譯者主體的實踐書寫著新的歷史。譯者"習性"這一視角使我們得以將譯者這一翻譯活動的主體與文本和社會歷史環境聯繫起來，在語境化的環境中描摹譯本的生成，展示翻譯與社會的互動。

短短半個世紀，在美國產生了兩種芳姿迥異的《史記》英譯，它們又恰恰呈現出通俗翻譯與學術翻譯兩個對比鮮明的面向，這一個案研究，為我們觀察美國漢學中的重譯現象、深入探究美國漢學翻譯傳統打下了基礎。

注 釋

[1] 倪豪士的翻譯項目是由他帶領一個團隊來完成的，團隊成員並非固定不變的，但作為主編和主要譯者的倪豪士始終是該項目的核心人物，倪豪士本人亦指出，該《史記》譯著中所有未註明作者的副文本內容（如《史記》英譯卷一、卷七）都是他主筆的（筆者與倪豪士教授筆談記錄，2017年7月2日）。另外，以倪豪士為核心的研究取徑便於把握該譯著的特徵。基於此，本文以「倪譯本」來指稱該《史記》譯著。倪譯本的團隊合作翻譯及其他譯者的貢獻則需另文討論。

[2] 歐美學者以及長期在歐美從事學術研究的中國學者評《史記》譯著的文章集中出現於上世紀五、六十年代和九十年代至今兩個時期，主要形式是書評，也有數篇譯者自己談《史記》翻譯的文章，作者多為漢學家和歷史學家。中國大陸學者對《史記》翻譯的研究始於九十年代，著力於《史記》英譯介紹及文本翻譯特徵對比分析。

[3] 本文中所引英語原文，除特別註明，皆由本文作者譯入漢語。

[4] "漢學"這一概念本身很是複雜，"傳統漢學"則是在"漢學"當中的一種細分。這裡依

閻純德所指出的："傳統漢學（Sinology）……是以文獻研究和古典研究為中心，它們包括哲學、宗教、歷史、文學、語言等……"（2006: 12）。

[5]　倪豪士《史記》譯著的第二卷即是獻給華茲生，向華茲生譯本優美的音樂性致意。

[6]　《高祖本紀》的兩種英譯文，華譯本共有27個註腳，都極為簡短；倪譯本有630個註腳，且大多篇幅較長。

[7]　限於篇幅，倪譯本的註腳未能全部抄錄在此。

參考文獻

Balcom, John (2005). "An Interview with Burton Watson". *Translation Review* 70 (1): 7-12.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clack, George, Neely, Mildred Sola, and Hamby, Alonzo, eds. (2009). *Outline of US History*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Cohen, Paul. A. (2010). *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Department History of the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Columbia University. Retrieved Apr. 10, 2017, from http://ealac.columbia.edu/department/short-history/

Durrant, Stephen (1995). *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writing of Sima Qian*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hardy, Grant (1996). "His Honor the Grand Scribe Says…". *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 18: 145-151.

—— (1999). *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo: Sima Qian's Conquest of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hermans, Theo (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Lefevere, André, ed. (1992). *Translation/History/Culture:* A Sourcebook. London & New York: Routledge.

Li, Xiuying, and Wang, Rongpei (2011). "Writing *Shi Ji* into World Literature: on Burton Watson's Translation". *Across Languages and Cultures 12* (1): 95-134.

Mander, Mary S. (1987). "Bourdieu, the Sociology of Culture and Cultural Studies: A Critique". *European Journal of Communications* 2: 427-453.

Nienhauser, William. H. Jr. (1972). *An Interpretation of the Literary and Historical Aspects of the Hsi-ching Tsa-chi (Miscellanies of the Western Capital).* Bloomington: Indiana University.

——, ed. (1994). *The Grand Scribe's Records.* Vols. 1, 2, 5.1, 7, 8, 9, 10. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

——, ed. (2019). *The Grand Scribe's Records.* Vol 11. Bloomington & Nanjing: Indiana University Press & Nanjing University Press.

—— (1995). "Ssu-ma Ch'ien's Implied Reader". In *Translating Chinese Literature.* Eds. Eugene Eoyang & Y. Lin. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 15-40.

—— (1996). "A Century (1895-1995) of *Shih chi* 史記 Studies in the West". *Asian Culture Quarterly (Asian-Pacific Culture Quarterly)* 1: 1-52.

—— (2014). "Sitting with Sima Qian: Recollections of Translating the *Shiji* (1988-2011)". In *Two Voices in One: Essays in Asian and Translation Studies.* Eds. Laurence K. P. Wong, John C. Y. Wang & Chan Sin-wai. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Watson, Burton (1956). *Ssu-ma Ch'ien: The Historian and His Work.* Unpublished Ph. D dissertrtation, New York: Univ. of Columbia.

—— (1958). *Ssu-ma Ch'ien: Grand Historian of China.* New York & London: Columbia University Press.

——, trans. (1961). *Records of the Grand Historian of China: Translated from the <u>Shih chi</u> of Ssu-ma Ch'ien,* vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press.

—— (1981). "Some Remarks on Early Chinese Historical Works." In *The Translation of Things Past: Chinese History and Historiography.* Ed. George Kao. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 35-48.

——, trans. (1993a). *Records of the Grand Historian.* Vol. 1. Rev. Hong Kong & New York: Chinese University of Hong Kong & Columbia University Press.

——, trans. (1993b). *Records of the Grand Historian.* Vol. 2. Rev. Hong Kong & New York: Chinese University of Hong Kong & Columbia University Press.

——, trans. (1993c). *Records of the Grand Historian: Qin Dynasty*. Vol. 3. Hong Kong & New York: Chinese University of Hong Kong & Columbia University Press.

—— (1995). "The Shih Chi and I". *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 17: 199-206.

—— (2001). "The Pleasures of Translating". (Lecture given May 1, 2001 as the Donald Keene Center's Soshitsu Sen XV Distinguished Lecture on Japanese Culture.). Retrieved Jan. 31, 2018, from http://www.keenecenter.org/download_files/Watson_Burton_2001sen.pdf .

West, Stephen. H. (1995). "Translation as Research: Is There an Audience in the House". In *Translating Chinese Literature*. Eds. Eugene Eoyang & Y. Lin. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 131-155.

李秀英 (2007)，〈20世紀中後期美國對外文化戰略與《史記》的兩次英譯〉，《大連海事大學學報 (社會科學版)》，1：125-129。

瀧川資言(1966)，《史記會注考證》，臺北：藝文印書館。

倪豪士 (2013)，〈與司馬遷對坐：談《史記》的翻譯 (1988-2011)〉，《王夢鷗教授學術講座演講集》，臺北：國立政治大學中國文學系，111-151。

司馬遷 (1959/2014)，《史記》，北京：中華書局。

魏思齊 (2007)，〈美國漢學研究的概況〉，《國際漢學》2：30-40。

熊文華 (2015)，《美國漢學史 (上冊)》，北京：學苑出版社。

徐公持 (1992)，〈一生一世的賞心樂事——美國學者倪豪士教授專訪〉，《文學遺產》1：126-130。

閻純德 (2015)，〈序二：漢學歷史和學術形態〉，熊文華 (著)，《美國漢學史》，北京：學苑出版社，1-14。

葉雪芬 (編)(1992)，《柳無忌年譜》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社。

余英時 (著)，邵東方 (編)(2010)，《史學研究經驗談》，上海：上海文藝出版社。

鐘彩鈞 (訪問)，黃錦珠(整理)(1991)，〈專訪美國漢學家倪豪士先生〉，《中國文哲研究通訊》3：120-124。

作者簡介
李俐，女，香港中文大學翻譯系博士研究生，博士研究課題為《史記》英譯研究。電子郵件：lili8@link.cuhk.edu.hk

《老子》"三寶"英譯：
九種對勘與譯本綜合

張智博

Abstract

Translation Clinic: An Eclectic Translation of *Laozi* Based on Comparative Study of Nine Translations of "Three Treasures" (*by* Chiang Chipo)

The Mawangdui Laozi and Guodian Laozi ushered in a new chapter of Taoist studies. Importantly, comparative studies on different Chinese versions of the Laozi *have proved to be a highlight. There has been comparative research on a hundred-odd translations of the* Laozi. *With respect to some studies, however, comparative analysis of the translations is rather subjective, ad hoc and far from satisfying. This study comprises* Laozi's *"Three Treasures" (san bao) and its nine classic translations by James Legge, Arthur Waley, Lin Yutang, Raymond B. Blakney, D.C. Lau, Gia-Fu Feng and Jane English, Paul J. Lin, Robert G. Henricks, and Xu Yuanchong respectively and compares them at the word level. The translations are then criticized mainly from the perspectives of musicality and philosophy. Based on the analysis of the nine classic translations, I propose an eclectic translation of the "Three Treasures". Finally, the eclectic translation is further revised to pave way for an ideal translation of the* Laozi. *This study thus attempts to chart the process of producing an ideal translation based on classic translations of the* Laozi.

一、引言

　　《老子》微言大義，流傳歷時久，各版本之間的文字出入眾多。兩千年來，多少道家學者、文人墨客對其作注，共同建構了一個以《老子》為淵源的道家思想空間。現代學者結合古代名家的注釋，對其進行訓詁。然而經文難解之處眾說紛紜，同一位學者的結論也在不斷跟進、完善，如：《老子今注今譯》（陳鼓應，1970，1973，1996，1999，2002）。老子竹簡本、帛書本的考古發現更是為研究"版本（version）和文本（text）的演變提供了一個跨越兩千年的'天然實驗'"（劉笑敢，2007）。

　　與此同時，還有一股力量也從未停止對《老子》的解讀，那便是翻譯。《老子》有上百種譯本，可謂百家爭鳴。老子不在人世，這世上便沒有絕對的《老子》，世人抄寫、作注、翻譯，這些都是《老子》，都是人們順著老子的足跡盡力去描述和刻畫那些可道之道；研究世人抄寫的《老子》，研究世人作注的《老子》，研究世人翻譯的《老子》，這些便都是研究《老子》，都是通過欣賞用不同方式表達出來的"道"嘗試向"道"更進一步。本文便屬於第三類研究的範疇。

二、研究內容

　　微觀比較研究是從譯者角度解讀《老子》、探求《老子》翻譯方法的基礎，本文以第六十七章"三寶"為例。

> 我（恒）有三寶，持而保（寶）之：一曰慈，二曰儉，三曰不敢為天下先。慈故能勇；儉故能廣；不敢為天下先，故能（為）成器長。今舍慈且勇；舍儉且廣；舍後且先；死矣！夫慈，以戰則勝，以守則固。天將救之，以慈衛之。

全書八十一章中，"三寶"一章在翻譯研究上有著相當獨特的地位，理由有三：

第一，在哲學內涵上，"三寶"是老子哲學的心理基礎和具體做法。這一點在多個道家學者的研究著述中均有印證。這裡僅列舉劉笑敢在《老子古今：五種對勘與析評引論》析評引論67.5中對"三寶"的詮釋：

> 總起來說，"三寶"的"慈"是對天下萬物、百姓的根本態度和心理基礎；"儉"主要是對自己的約束，表現為內向的無為；"不敢為天下先"是對外物的態度和原則，表現為外向的無為。"三寶"是老子"輔萬物之自然而不能為"等原則的具體化表述。這是嘗試從老子自身理論理解、總結老子的"三寶"，算是對"三寶"的一種道家立場的詮釋。

老子放下道家的核心概念，反其道而行之，字面上不談"道"不談"德"，採用比"自然""無為"更加具體的表述，將自己的處世之道傾囊相授。

第二，在謀篇佈局上，"三寶"是多章的總起、總結。第一寶提到"慈故能勇"，第七十三章進一步探討"勇於敢"和"勇於不敢"，使"勇"的內涵更深刻。按照劉笑敢的理解，"老子推崇'勇於不敢'的精神，而'不敢'就是'無為'的一種具體表現。'勇於不敢'的宣導就說明實行'無為'直到是需要足夠的勇氣的，這是一般研究老子思想還沒有注意到的。'無為'、'不敢'需要很高的勇氣，因為需要抵禦世俗潮流"（2007）。第二寶"儉"，各說均認可其與第五十九章"治人事天，莫若嗇"中的"嗇"同義。陳鼓應指出，"老子提出'嗇'這個觀念，並非專指財物上的，乃是特重精神上的。'嗇'即是培蓄能量，厚藏根基，充實生命力"（2002）。第三寶"不敢為天下先"，第六十六章有呼應："其欲先民也，必以其身後之……不以其無爭與？故天下莫能與爭"。講完三寶，老子繼續將"慈"引申到用兵，第六十九章也與之呼應："禍莫大於於無（侮）敵，無（侮）敵近亡吾寶矣"。

第三，在翻譯研究上，"三寶"翻譯的微觀比較研究具有典型性。首先，從"我有三寶"到"以慈衛之"，《老子》原文各版本之間不存在重大文字出入；[1] 其次，字面上不涉及"道"、"德"、"自然"、"無為"等符號性非常強的概念，翻譯時不涉及音譯的問題，研究空間充足。

因此，"三寶"的翻譯具有代表性和典型性，對於《老子》多譯本的微觀比較研究有重要意義，本文遂以"三寶"為例。

三、比較對象

辛紅娟、高聖兵（2008）對《道德經》英譯本的歷時性描述提到"《道德經》文本在英語世界的三次翻譯高潮"，當中涉及十個（組）譯者。其外，本研究參考其他《道德經》翻譯研究相關論文提及較多的幾個譯本，並嘗試搜索最新出版的《道德經》譯本。考慮到中西譯本數量上的平衡，最後採用四位西方譯者，四位中國譯者，一組合作譯本。

四、對勘舉要

本文從老子"三寶"的英譯入手，將以上提到九個譯本對勘舉要、分類描述，主要從音樂性和哲學性兩個角度進行翻譯批評；針對譯者個性化的哲學解讀，則援引最新的《老子》研究著述作輔證。最後，在微觀對比的基礎之上，對九種譯本進行梳理和整合，得到思想內涵、遣詞造句、語言張力、音韻節奏、畫面等方面都比較理想的綜合譯本，初探《老子》經典譯本與理想譯本之間的辯證關係。本文在綜合譯本的基礎之上，再次權衡中英文在文學性、哲學性上的平衡，嘗試修改，向理想譯文更進一步，也為探求《老子》全文的理想譯本積累經驗。

　　"在思想史和哲學史研究中，以王弼本使用最多"（劉笑敢，2007），從"三寶"開始的六句，各本出入不大，故引王弼本做參照，只在必要時用括弧補充其他版本用字。

　　　1. 我（恆）有三寶，持而保（寶）之
　　　　　譯本一：But I have three precious things which I prize and hold fast.
　　　　　譯本二：Here are my three treasures.
　　　　　　　　　Guard and keep them!
　　　　　譯本三：I have Three Treasures;
　　　　　　　　　Guard them and keep them safe:
　　　　　譯本四：I have to keep three treasures well secured:
　　　　　譯本五：I have three treasures
　　　　　　　　　Which I hold and cherish.
　　　　　譯本六：I have three treasures which I hold and keep.
　　　　　譯本七：I have three treasures
　　　　　　　　　To be kept and treasured;
　　　　　譯本八：5. I constantly have three treasures;
　　　　　　　　　6. Hold on to them and treasure them.
　　　　　譯本九：I have three treasures
　　　　　　　　　which I hold and keep:

底本無論是"保之"還是"寶之"，都與"三寶"同音，僅從這個角度看，譯本七、八對於節奏的呼應來說最為周到。譯本八對每句譯文進行標號，對應馬王堆出土的帛書《老子》，其底本顯然是帛書本。另外，該譯者針對殘缺的竹簡本也採用標號的形式進行了句對句的翻譯。逐句標號使譯文在形式上與一般的翻譯作品區別開來。從讀者的角度，標號似為對考古文獻句對句的翻譯，暗示其翻譯的特殊性，可能使讀者閱讀時對譯本體現的中文語言習慣更包容。譯本三將"三寶"這一概念大寫——"Three Treasures"，通覽其譯本，幾乎無一例外

對關鍵概念進行詞首大寫以突出強調。相比之下，譯本四將兩個句子合二為一"I have to keep three treasures well secured"，"three treasures"前後都沒有停頓而原文是有逗號的，因此節奏上可能略顯倉促。

八個譯本都採用"I"做主語，順理成章；譯本二則另闢蹊徑，雖然調整了主語形式，但是祈使句、感嘆號的配合使用，句子簡潔有力，銜接自然。所有譯本都將第一個小句做為主句，或單獨成句，在第二個小句的處理則稍有不同。四個譯本採用定語從句；三個譯本用祈使句；譯本七用後置定語。雖然定語從句的使用有時形式上稍有拖遝，但此處原文前後只有兩句，主從關係明顯，使用從句順理成章，語意流暢；相比之下，後置定語的使用並沒有出彩。譯本二、三、八都使用祈使句似突出了老子以"三寶"警醒世人的語氣，然而三者在連貫性上稍有差別。

選詞上，八個譯本不約而同採用"three treasures"，譯本五則為"three precious things"。相比之下，前者節奏更琅琅上口。對於"持而保（寶）之"中兩個動詞的處理上，四個譯本直接對應為並列的兩個英文動詞；四個譯本配合使用了副詞、形容詞、介詞；只有譯本七採用了過去分詞。相比之下，明顯名詞和動詞同時選用"treasure"與原文"三寶"和"保（寶）"音韻更加契合。

> 2. 一曰慈，二曰儉，三曰不敢為天下先
>> 譯本一：The first is gentleness; the second is economy; and
>> the third is shrinking from taking precedence of others.
>> 譯本二：The first is pity;
>> The second, frugality;
>> The third, refusal to be "foremost of all things under heaven."
>> 譯本三：The first is Love.
>> The second is, Never too much.
>> The third is, Never be the first in the world.

譯本四：The first, compassion; next, frugality;
And third, I say that never would I once
Presume that I should be the whole world＇s chief.

譯本五：The first is known as compassion,
The second is known as frugality,
The third is known as not daring to take the lead in the empire;

譯本六：The first is mercy; the second is economy;
The third is daring not to be ahead of others.

譯本七：One is compassion.
The second is thriftiness.
The third is not daring to be ahead of the world.

譯本八：7. The first is compassion;
8. The second is frugality;
9. And the third is not presuming to be at the
forefront in the world.

譯本九：the first is magnanimity,
the second is frugality,
and the third is humility to be the last of the world.

僅從原文三個小句的簡潔性以及兩短一長的節奏感上來看，譯本二和四對重複謂語"is"做了不同程度的省略，更琅琅上口。相比之下，譯文五採用"is known as"而且重複三次則稍顯拖遝。

句子結構上，絕大多數譯本都保留了原文的簡單句。譯本四將"不敢為天下先"譯為"I say that never would I once presume that I should…"，兩個賓語從句，形式上雖稍顯拖遝，然而口語化的表達配合從句內的倒裝也似能還原"不敢"二字的語氣。相比之下，譯文三"Never be the first in the world"語氣上則顯得過於絕對，不符合老子的語氣，也不能涵蓋所有實際情況。

關於選詞。第一，"慈"。四個譯本選用"compassion"；其他五

個譯本則各不相同："gentleness"、"magnanimity"、"love"、"pity"和"mercy"。

第二，"儉"。五個譯本選用"frugality"；兩個譯本選用"economy"；譯本七選用"thriftiness"；譯本三用短語"Never too much"，而且前面用逗號隔開以示強調。

第三，"不敢為天下先"。其中"不敢"，三個譯本選用"not daring to"或"daring not to"；譯本八選用"not presuming to"；譯本三選用"Never (be)"；譯本四選用"I say that never would I once presume that I should…"；三個譯本反話正說，分別選用"humility to"、"shrinking from"、"refusal to"。相比之下，譯本九明顯改變了原意，整句翻為"and the third is humility to be the last of the world"，把不敢為天下先，調整為甘願做天下後，然而兩者內涵有本質差別，選詞上的分析不再贅述。對於"天下"，五個譯本都使用"world"相關搭配；兩個譯本採用"others"，去掉了中文"天"的意象，傳達了意思；譯本五採用"empire"；譯本二採用"heaven"。最後，"先"的翻譯可謂爭奇鬥豔。

嘗試對五種"慈"的翻譯做出評判。

首先，"mercy"意思上和"慈"偏差稍遠，據Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 5th Edition (SOED 5)第一條："Forbearance and compassion shown to a powerless person, esp. an offender…"，其對犯錯之人的饒恕意味較重，而"慈"的心態適用應更廣。第二，"compassion"語氣過強。參照Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 11th Edition (MWCD 11)中"pity"詞條下的近義詞辨析："Compassion implies pity coupled with an urgent desire to aid or to spare"，"compassion"暗含施與援手的衝勁，而"慈"在意境上是清靜無為。"Compassion"雖然受青睞，有四個譯本選擇，但也未過半數，不足之處如是。那"pity"合適嗎？詞意不如

"慈"純粹。"慈"無論儒釋道三家都並不涉及"後悔、遺憾"之意，詞意獨立性強。而"pity"則明顯有一個常見的意思表示"後悔、遺憾"，不適合翻譯"慈"這樣純粹的概念。第四，"magnanimity"的古意與現代常用意不對等，而且這個詞比較高階。"慈母手中線"從小就會說，"慈"並非高階漢字。儘管詞根上看，"magnanimity"是"the greatness of soul"，被亞里士多德認為其是"the crowning virtue"，對應老子"三寶之首"，似乎曲徑通幽。然而，據SOED5，"magnanimous"的詞根意思屬於古詞，現代英語其更多表示"generous in feeling or conduct"，因此不妥。第五，"love"則反其道而行之，直接"以愛譯慈"，似不夠准，但婦孺皆知的小詞"love"簡潔、空泛、直接。參考劉笑敢的解讀，"慈"是作為老子對萬物、百姓的根本態度和心理，"以愛譯慈"包羅萬象，至於其內涵邊界，翻譯無法為讀者包辦一切。最後是"gentleness"。一個"gentle"的派生詞，看似不起眼，其詞典定義裡心理層面的意味也最弱，中文直譯起來好像也和"慈"差得遠；但是若考慮到"gentle"、"gentleness"日常生活中的使用語境，可能畫面感十足。

　　老子之前孝慈並舉，後者形容長輩對晚輩的愛。這裡單字一個"慈"，雖然適用範圍得到的推廣，但仍保有可能存在的和父母、長輩的聯想。

　　嘗試對四種"儉"的翻譯做出評判。

　　"Frugality"相比"economy"更純粹，相比"thriftiness"更常見，相比"Never too much"更無為，似更能體現"儉"的特點。陳鼓應把"儉"解讀為五十九章的"嗇"的同義詞，"'嗇'即是培蓄能量，厚藏根基，充實生命力"。若按此說，"frugality"、"economy"、"thriftiness"和"儉"在字面上、內涵上都對應得很好，三者也幾乎是同義詞。

然而，其中"economy"可能容易引起金錢方面的聯想。將"儉"譯為"Never too much"，與下一句"Never be the first in world"相呼應，字面上都繼承了"無為"的否定形式，共同構成"無為"的內向和外向表現，而且正話反說，亦能規避關於錢的聯想。然而，"never too much"意思上不如"frugality"的程度重，因此後者在程度上似更接近於"儉"。

嘗試對"不敢"的翻譯做出評判。

多個譯本"不敢"的處理在各方面都恰如其分，可能"shrinking from"在畫面感上更有"不敢"二字的神韻。"不敢不敢"、"不敢當"也都成為現代漢語常用的自謙的說法，這樣考慮的話，譯本九直接改用"humility to"也並不過分，但是這裡的"不敢"似乎不只是自謙那麼簡單。相比之下，三個譯本照直翻譯為"not daring to"或"daring not to"似最穩妥。據 SOED 5，"presume"的兩個主要意思是："a. Undertake without adequate authority or permission; venture on. b. Take the liberty or be audacious enough to do"，可見，"not presuming to"表達不擅自、不自作主張的意思，基本也是準確的。相比之下，"Never be"語氣則過了，忽略了為而不敢為、如履薄冰的情形。相比之下，"shrinking from"出其不意，畫面感很強，節奏乾淨利索，似能傳達"不敢"的神韻；相比之下，"I say that never would I once presume that I should…"則稍顯拖遝。最後，"refusal to"在意思上稍有偏離。據 MWCD 11，"refuse"的第一個詞條是"to express oneself as unwilling to accept"，故"refusal to"主要表達不願意接受，然而"不敢"的意思，除了不受至少還包括不爭。

嘗試對"天下"的翻譯做出評判。

"Whole world"似在語氣、音韻上更能體現原文"天下"的特點。因為"天下"這樣一個很有中國味道的小詞在譯文中只採

用 "world" 或者 "others" 似乎只傳達了意思，少了幾分 "天下" 的坦蕩。相比之下，譯本四的 "whole world" 做了強調，押了頭韻；"天下" 二字在語感上亦稍有韻尾。譯本二則別出心裁，將 "天下先" 對應的翻譯打上了引號，引號裡將 "天下" 照直翻為 "under heaven" 似乎為我們提供了翻譯此類語義上無足輕重但有中國特色詞彙的一個新的可能性。譯本五這裡採用同化的策略，將中國的 "天下" 對應為西方的 "帝國" 似乎也是無奈之舉。

嘗試對 "先" 的翻譯做出評判。

從表達的具體性，音節數，爭先的語氣上綜合考慮，"the first" 等似最符合原文 "先" 字的特點。大部分譯本都照直翻譯，基本上都流暢準確，似乎沒什麼繼續比較的必要，可能簡潔性稍有差別。相比之下，"take the lead" 和 "chief" 則把 "先" 字解讀為領導，不但丟失了老子哲學中先後、上下空間概念，亦似把包羅萬象的 "先" 字局限化了。

> 3. 慈故能勇；儉故能廣；不敢為天下先，故能（為）成器長
>
> 譯本一：With that gentleness I can be bold; with that economy
> I can be liberal; shrinking from taking precedence of others,
> I can become a vessel of the highest honour.
>
> 譯本二：For only he that pities is truly able to be brave;
> Only he that is frugal is able to be profuse.
> Only he that refuse to be foremost of all things
> Is truly able to become chief of all Ministers.
>
> 譯本三：Through Love, one has no fear;
> Through not doing too much, one has amplitude (of reserve power);
> Through not presuming to be the first in the world,
> One can develop one＇s talent and let it mature.
>
> 譯本四：Given compassion, I can take courage;
> Given frugality, I can abound;

> If I can be the world＇s most humble man,
> Then I can be its highest instrument.

譯本五：Being compassionate one could afford to be courageous,
　　　　Being frugal one could afford to extend one's territory,
　　　　Not daring to take the lead in the empire one could afford
　　　　to be lord over the vessels.

譯本六：From mercy comes courage; from economy comes generosity;
　　　　From humility comes leadership.

譯本七：Through compassion, one can be brave.
　　　　Through thriftiness, one can be expansive.
　　　　Not daring to be ahead of the world,
　　　　One can be the master of the vessels.

譯本八：10. Now, it's because I'm compassionate that I therefore
　　　　can be courageous;
　　　　11. And it's because I'm frugal that I therefore
　　　　can be magnanimous;
　　　　12. And it's because I don't presume to be at the forefront in
　　　　the world that I therefore can be the head of those with
　　　　complete talent.

譯本九：The magnanimous can be courageous,
　　　　the frugal can be generous,
　　　　the humble last of the world can become leader of the people.

僅從流暢性、簡潔性、節奏感上看，譯本六別出心裁，用 "humility" 指代 "daring not to be ahead of others"，對 "不敢為天下先" 做了簡化後構成了三個 "from… comes…" 結構，賞心悅目，似更琅琅上口，但是原文三個句子兩短一長的節奏體現得不明顯。相比之下，譯本二、三、八則稍顯拖遝。

　　句子結構上，除了譯本六採用倒裝，絕大多數譯本照直翻譯 "故能"，而且六個譯本都用到了 "can"，超過半數。原文是三個 "話題評

述"句，因此，七個譯本對主語進行補充，超過半數：四個譯本採用第三人稱；三個譯本採用第一人稱。相比之下，第三人稱把這句解讀為老子將三寶理論推而廣之，在語意上似乎更為妥當，因為老子形容自己"勇、廣、成器長"顯得有些違和。而譯本六和九則不補充統一的主語：譯本九直接把三個"話題"分別作為主語，頻繁更換主語；相比之下，譯本六則因巧用倒裝，流暢自然。

關於選詞。對於"勇"，六個譯本採用形容詞"courageous"、"brave"、"bold"，兩個譯本採用名詞"courage"。譯本二則正話反說譯為"no fear"。

"廣"的意思比較空泛，九個譯本爭奇鬥豔。五個譯本採用了五個不同的形容詞，"generous"、"expansive"、"liberal"、"profuse"、"magnanimous"；譯本九採用了名詞"generosity"；譯本七採用了動詞"abound"；其他兩個譯本選擇進一步解讀：譯本一為"extend one's territory"，譯本二為"amplitude (of reserve power)"。

對於"成器長"，譯文大致可以分為三類：四個譯本出現了有"器"相關的字眼；四個譯本只出現和領導相關的表達；譯本三解讀成個人層面："develop one's talent and let it mature"。

嘗試對"勇"的翻譯做出評判。

"No fear"、"courage"把老子哲學中"勇"與"敢"的差別體現得更明顯。如前述，原文七十三章有對"勇"的進一步解讀，出現"勇於敢"、"勇於不敢"的對舉，"勇"和"敢"的差別也便不言而喻，並不是現代漢語中的一個"勇敢"作罷。"老子推崇'勇於不敢'的精神，而'不敢'就是'無為'的一種具體表現。'勇於不敢'的宣導就說明實行'無為'直到是需要足夠的勇氣的，這是一般研究老子思想還沒有注意到的。'無為'、'不敢'需要很高的勇氣，因為需要抵禦世俗潮流"（劉

笑敢，2007）。因此，相比之下，"no fear"正話反說，將"勇"解讀為無畏，"courage"將"勇"理解成勇氣，語感上均比直接選用形容詞更無為。

　　嘗試對"廣"的翻譯做出評判。

　　"Amplitude"和"expansive"更能體現"廣"的簡單、純粹；前者更強調內向性。"廣"是對範圍的一種大體描述，此處"儉故能廣"所提供的語境也是不具體的，是一種宏觀判斷。除了譯文七將"廣"照直譯為"expansive"（據SOED 5，"tending or able to expand, spread out, or occupy a larger space"）之外，各本均對其做了不同程度的解讀。各種解讀中，"profuse"和"abound"側重多；"generous"、"magnanimous"、"liberal"的古意形容出身貴族；現代英語中前兩者側重"大方"，後者詞意豐富不純粹。相比之下，"extend one's territory"的解讀則顯得具體強勢，有過分解讀之嫌。譯本三的"amplitude(ofreservepower)"可能最令人費解。"Amplitude"，物理上用來表示振幅，似乎與"廣"相差千里。實際上，據SOED 5："Physical extent; largeness; bulk; esp. width, breadth"，可見"amplitude"意為物理上的程度、大小、量、寬度，詞意基礎，寬泛，與"廣"契合。而且物理上的振幅、幅度等讓人聯想到波，想到能量，和括弧中的"reserve power"結合起來，把"儉故能廣"解讀為儉故能積蓄內在力量，亦與劉笑敢將"儉"解讀為"內向的無為"不謀而合。

　　嘗試對"（為）成器長"的翻譯做出評判。

　　儘管九種譯文皆不盡完美，相比之下，"the master of the vessels"的直譯方式暫時更為穩妥。"樸散則為器"、"天下神器"、"兵者不祥之器，非君子之器"，可見"器"字不只局限於具象的器皿，也發展出了抽象的、宏大的含義。四個譯本裡均出現了"器"的意象，其中三個都不約而同選擇了具象的表達，"highest instrument""lord over the vessels"、"the master of the vessels"、"a vessel of the highest honour"。

儘管 "vessel" 兼有具象和抽象的用法，據 MWCD 11，"a. a container (as a cask, bottle, kettle, cup, or bowl) for holding something. b. a person into whom some quality (as grace) is infused"，但是後者，即形容人的時候，依賴語境，從不單獨出現。多位譯者將 "器" 直譯為 "vessel" 儘管穩妥，但意思上仍稍顯不足。相比之下，"Chief of all Ministers"、"the head of those with complete talent" 進行了一定程度的解讀。但是此處的 "成器" 應訓為 "大器"（劉笑敢，2007）。早在馬王堆帛書老子出土之前，便有學者推斷 "成" 字前應補足動詞 "為" 字，帛書老子剛好印證了此推斷。因而此處的 "minister" 和 "complete talent" 太過具體，後者亦似對 "成器" 稍有誤解。而 "leadership"、"leader of the people" 則脫形抓意，很好的傳達了意思，只是稍顯乏味。只有譯本三將 "成器長" 解讀成個人層面——"develop one's talent and let it mature"。這種個人層面的解讀不但未在其他學者的觀點中有呼應，而且此句和該譯本上一句 "one has amplitude (of reserve power)" 似有相當程度的語意重複。愚意以為，此處似為譯者的失誤。

　　4. 今舍慈且勇；舍儉且廣；舍後且先；死矣
　　　　譯本一：Now-a-days they give up gentleness and are all for being bold;
　　　　　　　　economy, and are all for being liberal; the hindmost place, and
　　　　　　　　seek only to be foremost; — (of all which the end is) death.
　　　　譯本二：At present your bravery is not based on pity,
　　　　　　　　Nor your profusion on frugality,
　　　　　　　　Nor your vanguard on your rear; and this is death.
　　　　譯本三：If one forsakes love and fearlessness,
　　　　　　　　forsakes restraint and reserve power,
　　　　　　　　forsakes following behind and rushes in front,
　　　　　　　　He is doomed!
　　　　譯本四：Bravery today knows no compassion;

> Abundance is, without frugality,
>
> And eminence without humility:
>
> This is the death indeed of all our hope.

譯本五：Now, to forsake compassion for courage,

to forsake frugality for expansion,

to forsake the rear for the lead, is sure to end in death.

譯本六：Nowadays men shun mercy, but try to be brave;

They abandon economy, but try to be generous;

They do not believe in humility, but always try to be first.

This is certain death.

譯本七：Now to abandon compassion and to be brave,

To abandon thriftiness and to be expansive,

To abandon the rear and to be in front -

That means death!

譯本八：13. Now, if you abandon this compassion and

yet try to be courageous,

14. And if you abandon this frugality and yet try

to be magnanimous,

15. And if you abandon this staying behind and yet

go to the fore,

16. Then you will die.

譯本九：For courage without magnanimity,

generosity without frugality,

the front without the rear

are doomed to failure.

節奏上，四個句子在節奏上三長一短，最後的 "死矣" 二字衝擊力強。僅從流暢性、簡潔性、節奏感上看，譯本二和六更琅琅上口。相比之下，譯本三、五、七、八因三個 "舍" 字，將同一個實意動詞重複三次，節奏上顯得拖遝，也不符合英文實詞 "變化求雅" 的審美原則。其他五個譯本都多少變化求雅，超過半數。

　　句子結構上，相對於上一句，此處中文特色的"話題評述"結構
更為典型，前面三個小句都是充當話題，因此同樣涉及是否補充同一
主語的問題。九個譯本大致可以分為兩類：五個譯文以話題為主語；
四個譯文則調整為統一主語。兩種處理中都有部分譯文在結構上存在
頭重腳輕的問題；還有兩個譯本因為"if"的使用，不但結構上頭重
腳輕，還增加了假設的語氣；將老子對時局的描述調整為"假設"，不
能算是準確。原文用三個"且"字做前後銜接，這裡明顯有轉折對比
的意思，六個譯本採用了各自不同的方式表現這一點。相比之下，另
外三個譯本中轉折對比的感覺則不太明顯，單純採用"for"或"and"，
而且譯本三前兩句裡的"and"前後並列的是名詞，語法上共用一個動
詞"forsake"，但是意思上並不如此。愚意以為此處為譯者的失誤。

　　本句在選詞上與上文多有重複，然而，"舍後且先"中的"先"與上
文的"不敢為天下先"的"先"語境不同，所有譯者在兩處的"先"字都
做了不同處理，在此處的選詞亦可謂爭奇鬥豔。多數譯者基本都是照直
翻譯。相比之下，另外三個譯本對其進行了不同程度的解讀：譯本二採
用"vanguard"，譯本四"eminence"，譯本五"the lead"。無論是上句"不敢
為天下先"，此處的"舍後且先"，還是第六十六章老子對其進一步的發
展，都是利用空間概念對"不爭"思想的具體直觀描述，是老子樸素哲學
的本質，譯者若因過度解讀不體現這種空間的直觀性，可能捨本逐末。

　　5. 夫慈，以戰則勝，以守則固
　　　　譯本一：Gentleness is sure to be victorious even in battle, and
　　　　　　　　firmly to maintain its ground.
　　　　譯本二：But pity cannot fight without conquering or guard without saving.
　　　　譯本三：For love is victorious in attack,
　　　　　　　　And invulnerable in defense.

> 譯本四：In battle, 'tis compassion wins the day;
> Defending, 'tis compassion that is firm:
> 譯本五：Through compassion, one will triumph in attack and
> be impregnable in defence.
> 譯本六：Mercy brings victory in battle and strength in defense.
> 譯本七：Compassion, in attack, will bring victory;
> In defense, it will hold firmly.
> 譯本八：17. If with compassion you attack, then you'll win;
> 18. If you defend, then you'll stand firm.
> 譯本九：The magnanimous will be victorious in war
> and steadfast in defence.

僅從原文節奏簡潔明快、音節數分佈均勻的特點來看，譯本三、四、六更琅琅上口。譯本四中的"'tis"是"it is"在詩歌中的縮寫，而且第一句為了平衡節奏有意省略了強調句的"that"。

　　句子結構上，相對於上一句，此處話題簡短，後面並列了兩個評述句。七個譯本選擇直接用話題"慈"做主語，超過半數。譯本五和八則補充了主語，而且譯本八補充了四次"you"，再加兩次"If…then…"的結構，相比之下則稍顯拖遝。從思想內涵的角度重新看，"If…then…"操作性意味較強的表達與老子從宏觀上對用兵定性的判斷有本質不同。此句出現"戰"和"守"，與其後不遠的六十九章"無（侮）敵幾喪吾寶"相呼應，將"慈"延伸到用兵。援引《老子古今：五種對勘與析評引論》析評引論69.4中區別《老子》與兵書的論斷：

> 作為哲學著作，《老子》講的是一家之言，針對的是一種普遍的情況。但是兵家的一家之言卻必須同時考慮戰爭中的各種情況，以不同的策略應對不同的情況……《孫臏兵法‧威王問》中分別討論"我強敵弱，我眾敵寡"，"敵眾我寡，敵強我弱"，"我出敵出，未知眾少"等不同情況下的策略。而《老子》絕沒有這種針對不同情況來討論用兵之道。

愚意以為，翻譯《老子》中常見的對普遍情況的宏觀描述時，應該避免 "if…then…" 等具體方法論的、操作性意味強的表述。

　　各本關於 "戰、守" 的選詞大同小異；關於和 "勝、固" 使用到的形容詞、動詞似均能傳神達意，似沒有一一甄別的必要。

> 6. 天將救之，以慈衛之
>> 譯本一：Heaven will save its possessor,
>> 　　　　　by his (very) gentleness protecting him.
>> 譯本二：Heaven arms with pity those whom it would not see destroyed.
>> 譯本三：Heaven arms with love
>> 　　　　　Those it would not see destroyed.
>> 譯本四：Compassion arms the people God would save!
>> 譯本五：What heaven succours it protects with
>> 　　　　　the gift of compassion.
>> 譯本六：It is the means by which heaven saves and guards.
>> 譯本七：When heaven is going to save a person,
>> 　　　　　It will protect him with compassion.
>> 譯本八：19. When Heaven's about to establish him,
>> 　　　　　20. It's as though he surrounds him with
>> 　　　　　the protective wall of compassion.
>> 譯本九：Heaven would favor them
>> 　　　　　and protect them with magnanimity.

節奏韻律上，譯本六、七押了韻，似更符合原文的特點，琅琅上口。相比之下，譯本八音節數過多，節奏稍顯拖遝。唯獨譯本四出現了詞首大寫的 "God" 字樣，其餘譯本均以 "heaven" 譯 "天"。二十五章有 "人法地，地法天，天法道，道法自然"，此處暫不置評。

　　關於句子結構和選詞。原文將慈與天連接，將慈的地位推到全新的高度。七個譯本遵照原文以 "heaven" 為主語，超過半數；另兩

個譯本繼續以慈做主語，譯文亦流暢自然。相比之下，譯本五"What heaven succours it protects with the gift of compassion"句式上稍顯拖遝。比較有意思的是，兩個譯本在結構上做了比較大的調整，詳細刻畫了"救"和"衛"的對象——"those whom it would not see destroyed"——而且結果驚人的一致，句子結構精簡明瞭。其他六個譯本均照直將"救、衛"翻譯為兩個動詞，超過半數。相比之下，"救"的選詞中，"favor"的力度稍顯不足；"衛"的選詞中，"arm"的畫面感更強。

五、譯本綜合

老子"三寶"這一章很好地體現了老子樸素哲學的特點：描述宏觀而不具體；定性判斷而非方法論；解讀空間大；"話題評述句"多，平行結構多；"半文半詩"，節奏明快；對立概念對舉頻繁；某一個或幾個核心概念在相鄰幾句話裡反復出現，不同章節亦遙相呼應。

基於《老子》以上特點，嘗試對九種譯本進行綜合：

節奏音韻上，充分利用《老子》多譯本的優勢，綜合各本的遣詞造句，盡可能還原了原文在音節數上"均勻"、"兩短一長"、"三長一短"的節奏變化。借鑑各本零星出現的韻腳，並增加頭韻，因此基本還原了原文在"故能……"、"舍……且……"、"救之、衛之"的幾處在音節上的回環往復，譯文琅琅上口。

句子結構上，繼承和發揚了西方譯者譯文中更為明顯的省略和變化求雅原則。另外，從字數上看，九個譯本中句構最簡潔的分別為87和91字，前者頻繁更換主語，後者有多處巧思，更為流暢自然。

選詞上，充分利用了《老子》譯本百家爭鳴的優勢，嘗試綜合不同譯本中比較出彩的解讀。首先，多處"慈"和"儉"的翻譯分別鎖定

在了 "gentleness" 和 "frugality"，內涵傳達更精確，概念更突出。第二，三處 "先"、兩處 "勇" 和 "廣"，三處 "曰" 和 "舍" 的翻譯，在選詞上出現了變化；一是因為語境不同，二是在翻譯同一概念時適當換用不同表達可以保留不同角度解讀《老子》的可能性。如 "先" 的翻譯綜合了五個譯本；"勇" 的翻譯換用 "no fear" 和 "brave"；"廣" 的翻譯換用 "amplitude" 和 "expansive"。有適當的重複強調，也有適當的變化求雅，集各家之所長，以翻譯解老。

以此得綜合譯本如下：

> Here are Three Treasures that I hold and treasure: the first is Gentleness; the second, Frugality; the third, Not daring to be the first of the whole world. From gentleness comes no fear; from frugality comes amplitude; shrinking from taking precedence, one can be the master of the vessels. Now, one knows no gentleness but tries to be brave; abandons frugality but expansive; forsakes following behind and rushes in front; he's doomed! For gentleness is victorious in attack and invulnerable in defence. Heaven arms with gentleness those it would not see destroyed.

綜合譯文在關鍵概念的選詞上更能還原老子思想的清靜無為、樸素直觀，句子結構上照顧到了《老子》散文詩式的音韻節奏，思想內涵上不隨意解讀或縮小概念的範圍。在保留反復出現的核心思想的同時，表達上也照顧到了英文實詞變化求雅的審美原則。因此，嘗試綜合多個經典譯文不失為探索老子理想譯本的一條可行之路。

在綜合譯本的基礎之上，筆者權衡中英文《老子》在文學性、哲學性上的平衡，嘗試向理想譯文更進一步：

節奏韻律上，將 "固" 精簡為 "secure"。綜合譯文中 "invulnerable" 正話反說，意思的傳達似乎基本過關。但是，一方面音節數為五，與

中文相比，節奏上稍顯拖遝；另一方面，"vulnerable"有很正面的心理學意義，因此"invulnerable"不如小詞"secure"來的純粹。此處將"固"直譯為"secure"更簡單直接。

選詞上，首先將"儉"進一步內在化為"moderation"。"儉"字在哲學層面的內在性在"frugality"的選擇過程中已經做過詳細討論。《說文解字注》寫到："儉，約也。約者、纏束也。儉者、不敢放侈之意。"（段玉裁，1808）因此，筆者以"moderation"嘗試進一步脫離外在的物質，接近"儉"字的本意與哲學意涵。第二，將第一處"先"美化為"spearhead"。修辭上，"spearhead"的畫面感與直觀性，能更好的傳達"先"的空間感，語言更有張力。另一方面，"spearhead"也與"挫其銳"的形象相映成趣。第三，將"廣"直譯為"reaching far"，將"成器長"解讀為"the head of the whole world"。前者直譯，後者意譯，手段不同，但都是為了保持中文的廣遠、大器之感，可謂殊途同歸。意思更通透，簡單直接，後者亦與前文相映成趣。

句子結構上，將"慈故能勇，儉故能廣，不敢為天下先，故能為成器長"直接對應的英文重複結構利用"leads to"進一步做了省略，使譯文更加簡潔明快。

以此嘗試進一步接近理想譯本：

> Here are Three Treasures that I hold and treasure: the first is Gentleness; the second, Moderation; the third, Not daring to be the spearhead of the whole world. Gentleness leads to no fear; moderation, reaching far; shrinking from taking precedence, the head of the whole world. Now, one knows no gentleness but tries to be brave; abandons moderation but expansive; forsakes following behind and rushes in front; he's doomed! For gentleness is victorious in attack and secure in defence. Heaven arms with gentleness those it would not see destroyed.

理想譯文在綜合譯文的基礎之上，對重複結構進行省略，對大詞進了簡化，節奏上最大程度的還原了原文的簡潔明快；重要概念的選詞上心思更細膩，但是深入淺出，簡單直接；思想內涵在文字形式的重複與變化中更加立體。

六、結語

　　常言道：是藥三分毒。在劑量限度內，不良反應尚且占三分，過度用藥，更是由藥變毒。譯者如醫，難亦難在"知輕重"。翻譯《老子》不得不說是件苦差事，而《老子》多種經典譯本的對照研究則可謂沒有最苦，只有更苦。但良藥苦口，九種譯本相互對照之後，輕重中的輕重得以彰顯。鑒賞九種譯作在輕重拿捏上的力道，綜合譯文便可水到渠成。筆者的"譯商"亦在這苦中作樂中有所長進，也為"理想譯文再探"埋下了伏筆。

　　醫者，不能自醫也，譯者面對自己的譯文也有相似困境，而翻譯微觀比較研究則不失為打破這一困境的一種嘗試。面對綜合譯文，筆者在最後也做了從內在打破的嘗試，醫前人之作，創今人之新。可以說，本文很好的體現了知輕重的三個層次：首先，揣摩古文輕重；第二，掂量不同譯文、訓詁的輕重；第三，打磨掉原文和綜合譯文在輕、重、緩、急之見的差別，精益求精。

　　《老子》寫作於中華民族思想初期的、後經過數百位譯者拿捏，而今綜合前車之鑒的理想譯本無疑能使其中的道、德和自然，煥發新的活力。儘管所謂理想，就意味著達不到，但是最大程度的接近理想，無論過程還是結果，無論對于英文讀者、中文讀者、還是譯者本人，可能都有意外收穫。

參考文獻

Lao Tzu, Blakney R. B. (1955). The Tao Te Ching. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://terebess.hu/english/tao/blakney.html

Lao Tzu, Feng, G. F., English J. (1972). The Tao Te Ching. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://terebess.hu/english/tao/gia.html#1972

Lao Tzu, Goaddard, D., Borel, H., Crowley, A., Legge J., Giles L., Gorn-Old W., Mears I. (2012). Tao Te

Ching: Six Translations. Start Publishing LLC.

Lao Tzu, Henricks R. G. (1989). The Tao Te Ching. https://terebess.hu/english/tao/henricks.html

Lao Tzu, Legge J.(1891). The Tao Te Ching. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://terebess.hu/english/tao/legge.html

Lao Tzu, & Lin P. J. (1977). The Tao Te Ching. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://terebess.hu/english/tao/Lin.html

Lao Tzu, Waley, A., 1934. The Tao Te Ching. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://terebess.hu/english/tao/waley.html.

Wikipedia. Retrieved July 30, 2018, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gentleness.

段玉裁（1808），《説文解字注》。Retrieved July 30, 2018, from http://www.zdic.net/z/15/sw/4FED.htm.

陳鼓應（2012），《老子今注今譯》。北京：商務印書館。

劉笑敢（2007），《老子古今：五種對勘與析評引論》。北京：中國社會科學出版社。

林語堂（2009），《老子的智慧》。北京：外語教學與研究出版社。

老子、劉殿爵（2011），《偉大的思想（第三輯）道德經》。北京：中國對外翻譯出版有限公司。

辛紅娟、高聖兵（2008），追尋老子的蹤跡──《道德經》英語譯本的歷時描述。南京農業大學學報（社會科學版），81，79-84。

許淵沖（2011），《道德經：漢英對照》。北京：五洲傳播出版社。

作者簡介

張智博，學士，華中科技大學翻譯系2018年畢業，台灣大學口譯碩士學位學程2018年入學。電子郵件：r07147013@ntu.edu.tw

Metaphorical Translation:
The *Book of Changes* (*Yijing* 易經)

Paul G. Fendos, Jr.

Abstract

This article is an attempt to clarify the author's approach to interpretation and translation as applied in his recently published book, The Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation. *It does so in two main steps. First, reference is made to metaphor theory, a perhaps under-appreciated tool for framing* Book of Changes *text materials—especially the line texts. Two new terms are introduced, 'adaptative interpretation' and 'reverse adaptative interpretation,' concepts which help demonstrate how the same text materials in the* Book of Changes *can at times be seen functioning both as tenor and vehicle. Emphasis is placed on showing how the line text materials can be read as vehicle, with an analysis provided of the author's translation and interpretation of the line texts for Hexagram #15,* Qian 謙 (Humility). *This analysis aims to demonstrate one way to uncover underlying meanings or patterns of change in these materials. Second, a comparison of the author's translations with those of the same line text materials by five other translators is carried out. The goal of such a comparison is to show how this author's approach to translation and interpretation of* Book of Changes *text materials measures up to others in the field, with very general conclusions suggesting that the author's position, like*

those others in the field, might best be understood within the context of 1) whether one sees the Zhouyi *more as a divinatory text or as part of a philosophical canon, and 2) whether one approaches it from the perspective of a Traditionalist or a Modernist.*

> *"Metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else."*
> *(Aristotle, Poetics, Chapter 21, 1457b)*

1. Introduction:

Metaphor is generally understood as a figure of speech, something commonly found in poetry or literary writing, and the main function of which is to embellish a text. In the classical rhetoric that originated with Aristotle and Cicero, however, metaphor was seen as much more than simple verbal ornamentation or part of the trappings of writing or style. It was, instead, a form of expression, a trope of resemblance that operated through displacement (Guldin 3), something that allowed the use of one word or phrase when referring to another because of a similarity between the two that seemed to justify the comparison or transfer (Caplan 342-343). Modern discussions on metaphor often start with I. A. Richards and his concepts of tenor and vehicle; the former referring to the underlying idea or principle subject being dealt with, the latter being that to which the subject is compared (Richards 100).[1] This distinction was further developed by Lakof and Johnson, who expanded and refined the theoretical framework for understanding metaphors by introducing the idea of 'conceptual metaphor' and the two related 'domains' between which understanding was transferred. The target domain, equivalent to tenor, is the 'concept area' to which a metaphor is being applied, the domain one is trying to better understand or wants to know more about, and something that is usually more general or

abstract. The source domain, corresponding to vehicle, is the 'concept area' from which a metaphor is drawn, that used to further describe the target, and often something relatively concrete and physical (Guldin 17). As a rule, the source domain is understood as being mapped onto or projected into the target, with the biggest difference between the explanations for metaphor offered by Richards and Lakof/Johnson being the interaction between domains emphasized by the latter.

In the West, the process of translation has often been compared to that of the metaphor. The parallel is most obvious in translation theory and its use of the terms 'source/subject language text' and 'target language text.' However, the link between translation and metaphor is much older and goes deeper. It can be traced back as far as Cicero (106-43 BCE), who noted that the Latin word for metaphor, *translatio*, shared a common root meaning with the word for translation, *transfero*—meaning to bear across, bring over, or transfer (Caplan ibid.). Both metaphor and translation, then, have been seen as following a similar process, one that entails carrying over or transferring something from one place, condition, or language to another (or transforming one thing into another) (Macadam 747-748).

In the field of classical Chinese literature, the idea of translation as metaphor is also an old one. Simple metaphors, both what some have called indirect (*xing* 興) and direct (*bi* 比) metaphors, were an important part of the *Book of Odes* (*Shijing* 詩經). However, more complex examples of metaphorical expression can be found in the early commentaries attached to a number of ancient Chinese texts, including Mao Heng's 毛亨 (fl. 3rd-2nd cent. BCE) purported commentary to the *Book of Odes* as well as works like the 4th-3rd cent. BCE *Zuo Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals* (*Chunqiu Zuo zhuan* 春秋左傳). Those commentaries took relatively simple poems and historical facts or narratives and placed them within the context of didactic and political meanings and interpretations, especially those that were related to specific historical persons and events, with the goal being to establish paragons or exemplars of virtue that could be used to show proper thought and behavior (or their perfidious and recreant opposite apostates, who stood

as examples of what not to be like). Such metaphors can be seen as a form of translation. Not the usual <u>inter</u>-lingual kind of translation, which is carried out between two different languages and involves two equivalent messages in two different codes, but <u>intra</u>-lingual translation. A concept first set forth by Roman Jakobson, intra-lingual translation, a process sometimes simply referred to as a 'rewording' of texts that involves the use of more or less synonymous words, often times also resorts to some kind of circumlocution in transferring meaning (Jakobson 233)—in the case of those ancient Chinese commentaries, a form of circumlocution that usually replaced the context of the subject language text with one that allowed for comparisons with ideal circumstances in an ideal society (or their opposites).

Perhaps nowhere is the use of metaphor more important in understanding a classical Chinese text (and translating it) than with *the Book of Changes*. However, surprisingly, some text materials in the *Book of Changes,* in fact, many such text materials, can be seen to function as both tenor and vehicle. This article, therefore, takes aim to shed some light on metaphor and translation as they apply to *The Book of Changes* and explain how this can be possible—in very general terms as seen in the received version of the text itself, but also specifically as was introduced by this author in a recently published book, *The Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation* (Fendos 2018). Limited only to the space of an article, it does so by concentrating on this author's translations of text materials for one specific hexagram, Hexagram #15, *Qian* 謙 (Humility), and comparing them with translations of the same materials done by five scholars: James Legge, Richard Wilhelm, Edward Shaughnessy, Stephen Karcher, and John Minford. The goals of this endeavor are many, but effort is made to focus on showing readers that there are different ways to both understand and use what has long been thought of as a book of divination, at the same time demonstrating what, if anything, about this author's translations in his book are new or perhaps insightful.

The reader should note two assumptions made by the author in his interpretations and translations of the *Book of Changes*.

First, the *Book of Changes* consists of two main parts, the Basic Text

(*Zhouyi* 周易), compiled from what is generally thought to have been a collection of ancient *ad hoc* divination passages, and the Ten Wings (*Shi yi* 十翼), commentaries attached to this Basic Text. 'Text materials' is a term generally used to indicate the hexagram texts (*Tuan* 彖/*Gua ci* 卦辭) and line texts (*Yao ci* 爻辭) found in the Basic Text. In the *Zuo Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals* and the 3rd cent. BCE *Discourses on the States* (*Guoyu* 國語) these hexagram texts and line texts are both referred to using the same term, *yao* 繇 (Fendos 1988: 20). That said, in the received version of the *Book of Changes*, along with other early variants of it, hexagram texts are usually placed near the head of hexagrams, leading some to conclude that they occupied a more important or superior position and were perhaps even older than line texts. In addition, hexagram texts often serve either to comment on a hexagram as a whole or a theme being developed in its line texts (or at least one or more of its line texts). This suggests that hexagram texts were added to what was probably an early version of a *Zhouyi*-like divination manual when that manual was either still being compiled or after such a compilation had already been completed. This would argue for the primacy of line text materials.

Second, divinatory materials in the Basic Text portion of the *Book of Changes* are usually traced back to the late Shang (1576-1045 BCE) and Western Zhou (1045-771 BCE) periods. However, by the Western Han (206 BCE-9), some 1,000 years later, the divination manual that they later came to form, along with the Ten Wings commentaries that gradually developed and became attached to that manual, had coalesced into the philosophical canon we now know as the received version of the *Book of Changes*. How one approaches the study of such a complex work depends much on one's linguistic abilities, philological knowledge, overall understanding of historical periods and their cultures, and probably even personal ambitions, biases, and temperament. There is not, then, just one correct or better vantage point from which to view and study the *Book of Changes*.

Nevertheless, mostly because it makes it easier for me to see and understand the goals and methods they have adopted in their approaches

to the study of the *Book of Changes*, I often plug scholars of this work into one of two categories—Traditionalist or Modernist. For those readers unfamiliar with these terms, Traditionalists, some of whom still adhere to ancient theories on the origins of the *Book of Changes*, generally focus their energies on the practical divinatory applications of the work or on developing a greater understanding of it as an important philosophical text dealing with change. Modernists, on the other hand, concentrate on original meanings, and attempt to explain materials in the *Book of Changes*—especially its Basic Text—from the perspective of the language and culture of the time(s) in which those materials are thought to have been written.

This simple system of classification is not a perfect fit. Some people, searching for answers to pressing questions or issues, do indeed just see and use the *Book of Changes* as a divination manual. Others, viewing it as a philosophical text, one that evolved into a complex correlative-based system of change, look to it to better understand the unique world view of the Chinese. And still others might believe that, like other ancient texts, the Book of Changes can serve as a window to China's past, a repository of customs and culture, a source of history now long gone. Most, however, wear more than one hat. It is possible, for example, to imagine someone beginning a day by reading a part of one of the many philosophical commentaries on the *Book of Changes*, hoping, while doing so, to add a sense of calm and order to a changing life. Then, in the afternoon, this someone might turn to perusing a study on ancient bamboo strips, a study that introduces phonetic variations of Chinese characters in hexagram or line texts, thus offering new insights into the possible meanings of those text materials. And finally, in the evening, looking for an answer to an urgent question or issue, this same person may pull out and begin counting the yarrow stalks used in the divinatory ritual. In fact, if we look closely, we would probably discover that most only really gravitate more toward one category than the other. The result being that it is not too difficult—maybe even best—to place all scholars of the *Book of Changes* on a continuum, the opposite ends of which would be the Traditionalist and the Modernist. In the comparisons of translators given below, I try to do just

this, believing that any inconsistencies generated by such pigeonholing are outweighed by the structure it provides.

2. Metaphor and Understanding the *Book of Changes*

2.1 Transformed Imagery and Adaptative Interpretation

The application of simple metaphor theory or concepts is perhaps an underappreciated approach to understanding the *Book of Changes*. Many seem to agree that metaphorical interpretation is an important part of the Ten Wings commentaries attached to the *Zhouyi* Basic Text—as well as the myriad other commentaries on the *Book of Changes* as a whole. As was alluded to above, this type of interpretation, a form of intra-lingual translation, can be understood as a process whereby the hexagram texts and line texts of the *Zhouyi* are first posited as tenor or target dominion, then refocused or mapped as vehicle by a source domain that provides a new context for understanding them—usually one with a moral, often Confucian, bent.

Richard Smith seems to be referring to a similar process with his use of the term 'transformed imagery.' However, where Smith sees only transformations, I often see transformation and metaphorical interpretation, an important distinction. The difference between the two is best understood by more closely examining Smith's translations of the line texts for Hexagram #1, *Qian* 乾, which he used when discussing the idea of transformations of *Zhouyi* line text imagery (Smith 36-38).

> **Hexagram #1, Qian (Expansion) – Line Texts** (Smith 37)[2]
>
> **1. 潛龍。勿用。**
>
> A submerged dragon; don't use [the outcome of this determination].
>
> **2. 見龍在田。利見大人。**
>
> A dragon sighted in a field; it will be favorable to see a great man.
>
> **3. 君子終日乾乾, 夕惕若。厲无咎。**

> The noble person throughout the day is vigorous, but at night he is wary; threatening but there will be no misfortune.

4. 或躍在淵。无咎。

> Sometimes [the dragon] leaps in the deep; no misfortune.

5. 飛龍在天。利見大人。

> A dragon flying in the sky: it will be favorable to see a great man.

6. 亢龍。有悔。

> A gorged dragon: there will be trouble.

The main imagery in these line texts is that of the dragon, thought originally to be a reference to the Azure Dragon of the East, one of the four large regions or 'palaces' in the sky occupied by seven of the Twenty-eight mansions in the Chinese system of constellations. Within that context, the different line texts mentioning dragons are to be understood as pointing to the varying positions of those mansions in the sky at dusk during the annual cycle of seasonal change. However, with the passing of time the original meaning of this imagery was lost and came to be understood simply as a mythical beast. Later and within the context of a continually changing society and the development of Ten Wings-like commentaries and the explanatory methods in them that were formulated and applied to *Zhouyi* text materials, the meaning of this mythical beast imagery also changed, adapting to the new order and context, and coming to symbolize an exemplary Superior Man and his actions. Such an interpretation is well presented in the *Wen yan zhuan* 文言傳 commentary to the line text for 1/1, where the Superior Man is likened to the 'hidden dragon' because he "is someone who has the virtue of the dragon [and] stays hidden. He is not moved or changed by the world, [and] making a name for himself does not complete him. He hides away from the world but is not in low spirits. He is not accepted positively but is not bothered by it. At ease [with something] then he carries it out; apprehensive [about something] then he shuns it. Without a doubt, he cannot be uprooted. He is a hidden dragon." 龍德 而隱者也. 不易乎世, 不成乎名. 遯世無悶, 不見世而無悶. 樂則行之, 憂則違

之. 確乎, 其不可拔. 潛龍也. In the same commentary for 1/3 the Superior Man is also talked about in terms of Confucian values: "The Superior Man advances virtue and works at things. Loyalty and trust are that by which he advances virtue, cultivating words and establishing his sincerity that by which he maintains things." 君子進德脩業. 忠信所以進德也, 脩辭立其誠所以居業. (*A Concordance to* Yijing 1-2.) The dragon, then, has become a sage, a man of wisdom and virtue who follows the correct Way and cannot be forced to deviate from it, with the Ten Wings and other commentaries thus functioning to create a metaphorical world expanding on the meaning of *Zhouyi* text materials in a manner that is both imaginative and complex.

Other imagery in these line texts, if it was indeed originally part of the *ad hoc* 'dragon constellation' divination texts, seems to have changed only once. This includes the Noble Person, literally "Lord Son," a member of the ruling class who was probably associated with these ancient divination passages, perhaps as the person for whom the divination was performed, and the Great Man, an honorific title used when referring to an official, elder, or person of higher standing to whom appeals for help could apparently be addressed. When the dragon came to symbolize the Superior Man, the Noble Man became equated with this exemplar, the Great Man perhaps becoming a general reference to or stock phrase for someone on whom the Superior Man could rely for help (sage, king, etc.).

Smith refers to both instances of change—from 'constellation to mythical beast' and 'mythical beast to exemplar'—as examples of transformation. I see the second change as metaphorical—with the mythical dragon functioning as tenor, and that same imagery refocused in a new context with didactic social and political connotations (the Superior Man) functioning as vehicle.

This kind of metaphorical interpretation, what I like to refer to as 'adaptative interpretation,' corresponds to what can be called the explanatory stage in the development of the *Book of Changes*.[3] However, it is not the only kind of metaphorical interpretation that can be seen in this ancient work. In fact, the same text materials that function as tenor in the commentary tradition might also, when looking at another, deeper level of meaning in the *Book of*

Changes, be seen as vehicle representing a new source domain. This, at least, is the approach that I have taken in shaping the translations—and interpretations—of *Book of Changes* text materials in my book.

This approach is not a difficult one to understand. However, its validity is premised on a number of assumptions. First and most importantly, it assumes that relevant text materials make up integrated units that represent general situations or concepts/themes reflecting those situations. I am not proposing here anything as complex as archetypes of the kind often associated with the hexagram diagrams, just general patterns and the ideas they are centered on. Second, one must accept that these concepts/themes are depicted by or contained in the imagery of the relevant text materials—with other narrative and prognosticatory elements (portents) functioning as suggestions for behavior or explanations on the consequences of actions in any particular situation they help form. Third, the concepts/themes lying behind these text materials must be posited as tenor in a manner that essentially reverses the direction of the kind of adaptative interpretation mentioned above—with ideas first separately extracted from the text materials in which they are metaphorically represented,[4] then strung together in a whole, creating a situation that is brought into focus in a single, summarized form (which some might find encapsulated in the hexagram name, but which I consolidate into a short Interpretation[5]).

Four examples of simple imagery of the kind being discussed here are given below, with the last two coming from the *Zhouyi*.

1. **Vehicle**: "Juliet on the balcony (at the window)."
   Tenor: Romantic love, especially the type that transcends social conventions.
2. **Vehicle**: "The river in winter."
   Tenor: Something freezing over, indication of the cessation of movement.
3. **Vehicle**: "Appointing a Feudal Lord" 建侯. (*Zhun* 屯 [Initial Difficulty], 3/1).
   Tenor: Reaching an agreement with someone to work with and help you.
4. **Vehicle**: "Proposing marriage" 求婚媾. (*Zhun* 屯 [Initial Difficulty], 3/4).
   Tenor: Asking for a collaborative relationship.

As can be seen, each of these examples of imagery, seen as vehicle, can be

understood in the process of metaphorical transfer as the more concrete representation of the general or abstract tenor into which it is projected or mapped. However, to better show how this transfer would work with a single whole hexagram as a coherent unit, we need to more closely examine at least one complete set of related text materials, materials which, when combined, would help us better understand the fluid situation they come to describe, the content of which has a beginning and an end, and the main goal of which is to offer an Interpretation that can be applied widely to real-life situations.[6]

2.2 Translation and Interpretation of Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Humility)

In The *Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation* the goal is to fashion translations and interpretations of *Zhouyi* text materials that can be incorporated into what is called a modern philosophy of change, one that effectively eliminates divination and correlative *Yin/Yang* philosophy from the equation (Fendos 2018: 182-83). The focus in this system is on line texts, while excluding hexagram texts. This is so, for the most part, because line texts seem to be the core material in the *Zhouyi*, and there are just too many examples of hexagram texts that are not easily related to their associated line texts. However, that does not mean emphasis is placed on what the original meanings of those line texts were when they were first created. In fact, that would be mostly impossible, because, as was alluded to above, by the time the *Zhouyi* moved from a simple divination manual to being an integrated part of the received version of the *Book of Changes* philosophical canon much of its line text material had already been transformed, metaphorically interpreted, or both—and ultimately incorporated into and painted over by the new correlative world view that swept over China from the late Warring States (403-221 BCE) period into the early Western Han. Later, these same line text materials were further interpreted by numerous commentators, recognized and otherwise, that endeavored to develop both fresh themes and methods of explanation within that new tradition. All of which resulted in interpretations that in most instances bore little if any resemblance to the original meanings

of the initial *ad hoc* divination texts themselves. In fact, when looking back at the more than two-thousand-year history of commentaries written on the *Book of Changes*, even at commentaries written by such well-known scholars as Wang Bi (226-249), Cheng Yi (1033-1107), and Zhu Xi (1130-1200), it is clear that interpretations were influenced by many things other than what the original meanings of the relevant materials were: e.g., the trends of different times and eras, prior commentary traditions, the philosophical leanings of individual commentators, or their unique understandings (or misunderstandings) of context or Chinese characters. This author's book may not match the breadth or scope of the many enduring works of those and many other scholars of the *Book of Changes*. But it does share one thing in common with them—it too is an attempt to fashion a set of interpretations of *Zhouyi* (line) text materials, the application of which will help one better understand and respond to change.

Of course, when and if some of the theories on original meanings that Modernists have fashioned would contribute to developing usable metaphorical interpretations of line text materials, i.e., interpretations in which the line texts understood within the context of original meanings still could be posited as vehicle in metaphorical representations of an underlying meaning functioning as tenor, then those Modernist theories and meanings are adopted. If not, more orthodox interpretations of the kind espoused by Traditionalists are used. Or, if neither the Modernist nor Traditionalist interpretations seem to work, then new translations and interpretations are fashioned—some of which would utilize sources dating from around the time when the *Book of Changes* was compiled into the received version we have today, and some of which grow out of what might be called unconventional readings of the pertinent text materials (by this author). Quite frankly, this approach is not without its problems. After all, there is no evidence to suggest that the original compilers of the *Zhouyi* were aware of anything resembling the kind of reverse adaptative interpretation being proposed (and no such claim is made). Instead, we must accept the obvious. That everything this author is attempting to do here is simply something

applied to or read into the text. Still, just as some translations are better than others, so too are some interpretations and their application, <u>given the context in which they are placed</u>,[7] easier to accept than others. In this author's case, some of my interpretations seem to fit, make sense, or are reasonable enough to serve as understandable explanations of line texts within a philosophy of change, and this is rationale enough for adopting them (as has been the case in countless if not most other commentaries). However, as some translations and interpretations really are better than others, I have divided mine into three general categories reflecting the levels of confidence I have in them: persuasive, understandable, and clear reaches (Fendos 2018: 183). Hexagram #15, the focus of the comparison in this article, is classified as a persuasive example, one that I hope most readers find relatively easy to understand, if not accept.

Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Humility) Line Texts (Fendos 2018: 61)

1. **【初六】謙謙君子。用涉大川。吉。**

   A Superior Man humble about humility. Acting to cross the
   great river. Good fortune.

2. **【六二】鳴謙。貞吉。**

   Making humility heard. Perseverance brings good fortune.

3. **【九三】勞謙君子。有終吉。**

   A Superior Man working at humility. Completion brings good fortune.

4. **【六四】无不利撝謙。**

   All will be furthered when demonstrating humility.

5. **【六五】不富以其鄰。利用侵伐。无不利。**

   Wealth not extended to one's neighbor. It will be advantageous
   to act to raid and punish. All will be furthered.

6. **【上六】鳴謙。利用行師，征邑國。**

   Making humility heard. It will be advantageous to act to mobilize soldiers,
   to attack the city and state.

Line #	Imagery	Narrative	Portent
1	truly humble person	moving to act	good fortune
2	openly showing humility	persevering	good fortune
3	struggling to be humble	completing goal/ struggling to the end	good fortune
4	demonstrating (acting with) humility		all furthered
5	bond breaking down	acting to encroach on and punish others	all furthered
6	openly showing humility	acting with force to tame others	(furthered)

Underlying Ideas of Hexagram #15 Line Texts

Interpretation

The sincerely humble person who acts will find success in many things. Someone who endeavors to demonstrate his/her humility, or must struggle to ultimately achieve it, will also find good fortune, because all things done in an unpretentious and reserved manner are well received. Even when the bonds between people begin to break down, harsh actions not done in arrogance or belligerence will advance. In fact, whatever the price to be exacted from others, actions done while demonstrating humility will always be better tolerated and furthered.

The translation offered here, especially as concerns content, though written in a relatively literal and almost descriptive style, is more Traditionalist than Modernist.[8] Modernists like Kunst (268-271) and Rutt (238-239, 309-311) believe the character for humility, *qian* 謙, is really a phonetic loan for 鼸, meaning "rat" or "hamster." Kunst also sees the character 謙 in 15/1 as a homophone for 嗛, or "crunch," apparently referring to the gnawing sound of a rat eating, a position at least somewhat supported by the *Erya*, where the characters 鼸 and 嗛 are both associated with rodents (10.27a, *shi shou shiba* 釋獸十八). In addition, as Rutt points out, assuming that a rat is the topic in these line texts makes some sense because rats were a

"rich source of early omen material." This approach also corresponds well with their translation of the character for the next hexagram, Hexagram #16, *Yu* 豫, as another animal, i.e., an "Elephant." However, the *Shuowen jiezi* states that 嗛 was itself a phonetic loan for 謙 (2, *shang* 上, 14; 3, *shang*, 16).[9] This, along with the fact that seeing the topic of these line texts as being humility, the common Traditionalist understanding for this character, and not something related to rats, just makes for a smoother adaptation in a philosophy of change. So, it is this interpretation that is pursued.

At the same time, when looking at the organization of these line text materials and how they might fit into something approximating an integrated or internally consistent unit, things begin to diverge from what could be called a normal Traditionalist position. First, it should be pointed out that how we understand the initial two characters in 15/1, 15/2, 15/3 and 15/6, and the last two characters of 15/4, can influence how we understand the content of and relationships among these line texts. While many translate the two characters *qian qian* at the beginning of 15/1 simply as 'humble humble' (i.e., very humble), a phrase describing the ideal or Superior Man, the first two characters of 15/2 and 15/3 suggest that there may be a common structure at work in all five binomes, one perhaps best described as a verb/noun structure. This would suggest the following translations for these five pairings: "humble about humility" in 15/1, "crying out about (making heard) humility" in 15/2 and 15/6, "working at humility" in 15/3, and "demonstrating humility" in 15/4. Second, if this type of verb/ noun structure (which has a third person subject) is accepted, then some kind of logical progression between line texts does appear to surface, a progression that makes it easier to bind the individual line texts together in an interpretative whole explaining a particular situation—a situation dealing with a person being humble and the practical value of such behavior.

Hexagram #15 is one of the few hexagrams where all lines augur good fortune. However, unlike some hexagrams where consecutive lines suggest an increase in something, the line texts for this hexagram start out at the apex or ideal, i.e., a person who is naturally humble even about his/her own humility

(15/1), and thus someone who is a truly humble person. Pursuing the logical progression that seems to follow, after that the line texts move on to examples of people not quite reaching that standard: first, someone who openly tries to demonstrate his/her humility (15/2), something almost a contradiction in terms, as the truly humble person would never feel it necessary to proclaim his humility to others; then someone who is aware of his/her shortcomings and is struggling to reach the ideal (15/3). Continuing on, it is pointed out that humility is valued in all things (15/4), so much so, in fact, that when undesirable actions must be carried out, even actions which impact others and would suggest a strong and almost overbearing attitude (e.g., military or police action), if done in as humble a way as is possible they are often more easily tolerated and results more readily achieved (15/5, 15/6).

As can be seen, this is an attempt to take the underlying meanings of the line texts as embodied in their imagery, along with the attached narratives and portents, and combine them so as to more easily summarize a general situation—this summary taking the form of an Interpretation (the more abstract tenor in metaphor theory), the principles of which can be applied in dealing with real-life circumstances. This Interpretation allows one to better grasp the dynamic of those circumstances, and functions to offer suggestions for behavior or explanations on the consequences of actions, all while aiming to maximize benefit/advantage and minimize harm/loss as one moves to influence developments and create desired ends in a practical philosophy of change.

3. Comparisons of Translations and Interpretations

3.1 James Legge

James Legge (1815-1897) is one of the pioneering translators of ancient classical Chinese texts and can be seen as an early bridge between China and the West. In fact, despite his misgivings about both China and the *Book of Changes*,

his *I ching* stood as the standard English translation of this work into the mid-twentieth century (Smith 184-185). In some ways he can be seen as a cautious Traditionalist. He traced the hexagrams, along with the hexagram texts and line texts, back to King Wen 文王 (fl. 11-10th centuries BCE) and his son, Zhou Gong 周公, but was skeptical of any role that Confucius might have played in the Ten Wings commentaries, suggesting instead that they originated sometime after Confucius' death. This allowed Legge to early on see a clear divide between the Basic Text and the Ten Wings Commentaries—something which led him to conclude they were not combined in one work until perhaps as late as the Han Dynasty scholar Fei Zhi 費直 (fl. 1st century BCE) (Legge 326-368).

Legge based his *I ching* translations and interpretations on traditional commentaries, in particular the *Balanced Annotations of the Book of Changes* (*Zhouyi zhe zhong* 周易折中) and what he referred to as the 'Daily Lessons/Lectures' (*Yu zhi ri jiang Yijing jieyi* 御製日講易經解義) (ibid. 325).[10] Legge also believed that written Chinese characters in the classics were not representations of words, but symbols of ideas, and thus not something one would say, but something one would think. And translators, he said, could use those characters to connect to the minds of the authors of the classics, in the case of the *Zhouyi* back to the original authors of the line texts (King Wen and Zhou Gong), whereupon they could take the original ideas of those authors and put them in their (the translators') own words (ibid. 320-321). This approach to knowing and translation is, of course, not without its problems, perhaps the most obvious issue being whether the translator (in this case Legge) was using the ideas of the original authors of the line texts or the ideas of all the commentators on those line texts that he had read. Nevertheless, none of this prevents us from looking at and offering a short analysis of some of his *Book of Changes* translation work—specifically the line texts for Hexagram #15.

Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Modesty) – Line Texts (Legge 107-110)

1. The first line, divided, shows us the superior man who adds humility to humility. (Even) the great stream may be crossed with this, and there will be good fortune.
2. The second line, divided, shows us humility that has made itself recognized.

With firm correctness there will be good fortune.

3. The third line, undivided, shows the superior man of (acknowledged) merit. He will maintain his success to the end, and have good fortune.

4. The fourth line, divided, shows one, whose action would be in every way advantageous, stirring up (the more) his humility.

5. The fifth line, divided, shows one who, without being rich, is able to employ his neighbors. He may advantageously use the force of arms. All his movements will be advantageous.

6. The sixth line, divided, shows us humility that has made itself recognized. The subject of it will with advantage put his hosts in motion; but (he will only) punish his own towns and state.

Notes

1. A weak line, at the lowest place of the figure, is the fitting symbol of the superior man adding humility to humility.

2. Line 2 is weak, central, and in its proper place, representing a humility that has 'crowed;' that is, has proclaimed itself.

3. Line 3 is strong and occupies an odd [numbered] (its proper) place. It is 'the lord of the hexagram,' to whom all represented by the lines above and below turn.

4. Line 4 is weak and in its proper position. Its subject is sure to be successful and prosperous, but being so near the fifth line, he should still use the greatest precaution.

5. All men love and honour humility, in itself and without the adjuncts which usually command obedience and respect. Hence his neighbours follow the ruler in the fifth line, though he may not be very rich or powerful. His humility need not keep him from asserting the right, even by force of arms.

6. The subject of the sixth line, which is weak, is outside the game, so to speak, that has been played out. He will use force, but only within his own sphere and to assert what is right. He will not be aggressive.

Legge begins his line text translations by referring to the relevant hexagram line number, followed by a reference to the line being either

divided or undivided (*Yin or Yang* [weak/strong]). This is a reflection of the original Chinese line texts, where the individual lines are referred to by their numbered order and as a 6 (an old *Yin*) or a 9 (an old *Yang*).[11] Though his translations of the remaining parts of the line texts follow their general order and structure as reflected in the punctuation I have given the Chinese on which my translation is based, Legge's writing seems more free than literal, more narrative in style than descriptive. In addition, his translations of particular words or phrases sometimes differ from mine; a good example of the latter being the third character in 15/2, *zhen* 貞, which he translates as 'firm correctness,' not 'perseverance.' However, the biggest difference, and the one that most distinguishes his approach to translating and interpreting the line texts from mine, centers on how far he goes in trying to bring the line texts together as a unit. In short, he does not expend much effort at all to do so. The text materials <u>are</u> bound together by their general focus on the concept of humility, something mentioned in at least four of the line texts, and, some might want to argue, something reflected in Legge's relatively faithful translations of the *Tuan* and Great Image (*Da xiang*) and Small Image (*Xiao xiang*) commentaries. Nevertheless, the individual line texts are not connected in any kind of logical fashion to form an integrated Interpretation describing a general situation centered on this idea. In the two characters ending 15/4 Legge does see a verb/noun structure (like the one mentioned in my translation), but he does not see it in the initial characters of 15/1, while in the first two characters of 15/2 and 15/6 the subject is not a third person but humility itself. As for 15/3, I am not sure how Legge got 'acknowledged merit' for the initial two characters there. His work, then, is unable to develop the type of progression I have starting with 15/1. In fact, the first two characters in 15/2 and 15/6 are seen in a relatively positive way, suggesting that humility that 'makes itself recognized' is a good thing, probably as a model for others to follow, something that does not at all fit into my interpretation, in which calling attention to one's humility diminishes it.[12] More importantly, for Legge the individual line text materials simply seem more important than any whole they could be integrated into, with the glue that really holds the

line texts together being a series of references to hexagram structure (in particular the locations, characteristics, and interrelationships of lines) in the explanations of parts of individual line text materials (and occasionally how those materials might reflect the attributes of the trigram they are found in). Found in his Notes following the line texts, those references include such terms/ideas as central, proper (correct) place/position, nearness to other lines, closeness to the ruling (fifth) line of the hexagram, and the like. These Notes demonstrate that Legge sees the *Book of Changes* as an oracle based on a unique correlative system of change centered around the *Yin/Yang* and their representation in the hexagram lines, with the focus being on clearly understanding and applying related line text materials within the context of that system, not on an attempt to extract a set of 64 general patterns of change from the hexagram line texts that can be applied to diverse situations.

3.2 Richard Wilhelm

If James Legge's *I ching* can be seen as the first in a line of good translations of the *Book of Changes*, then the Cary F. Baynes' English translation of Richard Wilhelm's (1873-1930) German original must surely be the most popular and widely read of any Western-language work ever done on the subject. Titled *The I ching or Book of Changes*, it is also one of the more complex introductions to this ancient text, something Joseph Needham once called a "sinological maze" for being what he thought was so unnecessarily complicated and repetitive (Needham 308, n. a). Nevertheless, the more I read it, the more I have come to admire Wilhelm's well thought out, smooth, and creative interpretations of the line texts (though less so his translations, with which I have more problems).

Like Legge, Wilhelm was a Traditionalist. However, more so than Legge, Wilhelm endeavored to express the wisdom of the *Book of Changes*, at the same time eschewing the numerological and Naturalist elements that began to envelop it during the late Warring States period and the Han Dynasty (206 BCE-220 CE)—elements that he described as being both rigidly formalistic and occult-like (Wilhelm *xlviii-xlix*). Though he worked with the prominent

scholar Lao Naixuan 勞乃宣 (1843-1921), from whom he is said to have learned much about *I ching*-related lore, Wilhelm, again like Legge, relied a great deal on traditional commentaries for his understanding of the work, especially the *Balanced Annotations of the Book of Changes* (ibid. *xlv, lxi*). Still, for Wilhelm it was more important to see the *Book of Changes* as a living text, not just an object of scholarly examination, with the core of any such examination being a better understanding of the interplay between image and concept. In particular, Wilhelm seems to have put great importance on the eight trigrams (eight images) as symbolic representations of tendencies of things in movement (i.e., states of change). In short, those images are seen as representations of ideas that exist beyond sense perception, yet ideas that, combined in hexagrams, imbue things in the material world with meaning, and ideas to which only those (the sages?) who are able to see into the supra-sensible world have access (ibid. *lvi-lvii*). The *Yin/Yang* lines of these images are also important, because movements in these lines result in changing situations. The text materials that are attached to hexagrams and their constituent lines are of equal import, because they clothe the images in words indicating whether an action will bring fortune or misfortune, remorse or humiliation, and thus make it easier for one to follow or change a course of action found in them (ibid. *lvii*). The manipulation of the yarrow stalks in the ritual of divination can be seen as the doorway to this system, making it possible for one to become actively involved in learning about particular situations and how they change.

Wilhelm divides his book into three parts. Book 1, The Text, introduces the oldest layers of the work, the hexagram texts and line texts (to which he attaches what he considers to be pertinent interpretations), along with the Great Image commentary on the hexagram as a whole. If one wishes to learn what Chinese wisdom has to say about life, this, Wilhelm would say, is where to begin (ibid. *lxii*). Book 2, The Material, concentrates on explaining the nature and origins of hexagrams and the attached texts, paying specific attention to the systematic and philosophical parts of the Commentary on Trigrams (*Shuo gua zhuan* 説卦傳) and the Great Treatise (*Da zhuan* 大傳). Particular elements

explained in Book 2 include the eight trigrams, the situation represented by a hexagram as a whole (time), the places of hexagram lines, the character of hexagram lines, relationships between hexagram lines, and the ruling lines of a hexagram. Book 3, The Commentaries, is the part from which Wilhelm's translation of and comments on Hexagram #15 as given just below are taken. It is perhaps the most complex section of the book. It aims to explain Basic Text materials by reference to relevant Ten Wings commentaries, but also by adding explanations for both. Wilhelm says he has endeavored to limit the number of Western ideas (including his own) that might color his explanations, a clear attempt to assure readers that the text translations and commentaries are genuine renderings of Chinese thought, but the fact that he also says many of the fundamental truths he uncovered in the *Book of Changes* closely parallel or reflect Christian tenants has to make even his most ardent supporters wonder about his success in doing so (ibid. *lxii*).

Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Modesty) – Line Texts (Wilhelm 463-466)

1. Six at the beginning:
   A superior man modest about his modesty
   May cross the great water.
   Good fortune.
2. Six in the second place:
   Modesty that comes to expression.
   Perseverance brings good fortune.
3. Nine in the third place:
   A superior man of modesty and merit
   Carries things to conclusion.
   Good fortune.
4. Six in the fourth place:
   Nothing that would not further modesty
   In movement.
5. Six in the fifth place:
   No boasting of wealth before one's neighbor.

It is favorable to attack with force.
Nothing that would not further.

6. Six at the top:
Modesty that comes to expression.
It is favorable to set armies marching
To chastise one's own city and one's country.

(Summaries of Attached Comments)

1. A yielding (*Yin*) line in a low place suggests two-fold modesty. The reference to crossing the great water is indicated by the lower 'nuclear trigram' *Kan* 坎 (lines 2-4), i.e., Water, above the first line.

2. The ruler of this hexagram is the 9 in line 3 (a *Yang* line in an odd numbered place). The *Yin* line in the second place responds to that *Yang* line, thus "expressing itself." Line 2 is also central, thus its modesty is in the middle, i.e., the heart [which apparently makes it more sincere?].

3. The lower trigram is *Gen* 艮, Mountain. Line 3 is at the top of *Gen*, from which comes the idea of effort leading to achievement. The three lines above the lower trigram make up the upper trigram *Kun* 坤, which means the 'masses' and 'devotion.' The *Yang* line in this third place is the third line of the hexagram *Qian* 乾, the Creative, which is also distinguished by indefatigable effort.

4. Line 4 is a *Yin* line, at the bottom of the upper trigram *Kun*, whose attribute is 'devotion.' It mediates between the *Yang* line in the third place and the *Yin* line in the fifth place. Line 4 is the middle line in the [upper] nuclear trigram *Zhen* 震 (lines 3-5), Movement.

5. Line 5 is central, in the place of honor (fifth place), yet it is a *Yin* or yielding line—all the virtues of a ruler. As a *Yin* line, it is empty, thus not boasting of its wealth. It is in the center of the upper trigram *Kun*, signifying the masses, and above the lower nuclear trigram *Kan*, Danger, from which comes the idea of chastisement.

6. Line 6, a *Yin* line, corresponds with the ruler of the hexagram, the *Yang* line in the third place, and just as the *Yin* line in the second place responded

to the *Yang* line in the third place, thus 'expressing itself,' so too does this *Yin* line respond to that *Yang* line in the third place, 'expressing itself.' The upper trigram *Kun* and the lower nuclear trigram *Kan*, together make Hexagram #7, *Shi* 師, The Army. The upper trigram *Kun* also indicates city and country. Line 6 is very far away from the *Yang* line in the third place with which it corresponds and towards which it strives, but in order to achieve such correspondence chastisement of the Army is necessary.

Wilhelm's translation tries, it seems, to be both literal and free: parts of the line texts are broken into separate rows that apparently reflect the manner in which he punctuates the Chinese original, but the writing and sometimes the combinations of those parts are generally done in smooth grammatical English. His translation is at times inconsistent. For example, 15/1 applies the same verb/noun structure as my translation, with similar wording,[13] but not 15/3. Like Legge in 15/2 and 15/6, the third-person subject in the verb/noun structures in 15/2, 15/4, and 15/6 is replaced by 'modesty (humility),' also making it difficult for Wilhelm to bind the line texts together in any kind of internally consistent integrated whole.

The Comments attached to his translation function to explain the content of the line texts and some of the attached Ten Wings commentaries as he has translated them. Like Legge's Notes, those explanations are part of the process of adaptative interpretation that is the foundation of the *Book of Changes* commentary tradition in general. However, Legge's Notes are somewhat simpler, based more on line-related explanations like those originating in the Ten Wings commentaries, explanations which Wilhelm includes but also expands on by incorporating, among other things, more on the trigrams—the upper, the lower, and the nuclear trigrams—and the meanings that their associations or characteristics evoke. To someone who is not that familiar with the *Book of Changes*, some of these explanations, especially those that introduce trigrams, might seem at times to be the result of just looking for something (maybe anything) that might fit or explain why parts of the line texts are found where they are or mean what they are thought to mean. Arbitrary would not be a good

way to describe such explanations. They might better be seen as having been parts of developing divinatory and philosophical systems that were gradually added to the expanding corpus of what in China's past had become *Book of Changes* studies—systems that over time slowly coalesced into the codified explanations that made up different commentary traditions, parts of which Wilhelm thought were appropriate for explaining these line texts. Once again like Legge, these explanations aim to take one closer to ideas. However, for Legge those were ideas that originated in the minds of the authors of the line texts, while for Wilhelm they were more abstract and independent entities that existed in some kind of supra-sensible world.

Of greater interest to me, and bearing some resemblance to my own Interpretations, are the interpretations of the line texts that Wilhelm offers in Book 1. They reflect Wilhelm the Traditionalist's attempt to deal not just with the explanatory stage of *Book of Changes* development (reflected in Book 3 and his translation given above), but with a philosophy of life as well. Here too, though, except when understood within the context of Wilhelm's translations of the Great Images, which they follow, those interpretations are not integrated into a whole that summarizes a particular situation or set of circumstances surrounding the main idea espoused by those line texts as a unit. Nor are they clearly stated to have been based on the adaptative interpretations of the same line text materials as given in Book 3. Instead, the text of each individual line is interpreted separately, in a smooth and free style, concentrating not on the hexagrams or their constituent parts, but apparently the words themselves, and the cultural context in which those words are thought to have once existed, with the aim of bringing the reader closer to the ideas the ancient sages must have contemplated (and the wisdom they extracted from them). Wilhelm's interpretation of the line text for 1/1 can serve as an example of what he is trying to do.

> "A dangerous enterprise, such as the crossing of a great stream, is made much more difficult if many claims and considerations have to be taken into account. On the other hand, the task is easy if it is attended to quickly and

simply. There the unassuming attitude of mind that goes with modesty fits a man to accomplish even difficult undertakings: he imposes no demands or stipulations but settles matters easily and quickly. Where no claims are put forward, no resistances arise.

Wilhelm does not read the line text for 1/1 exactly the same as I do. We both see "crossing the great stream" as a reference to enterprises attempted—his, dangerous ones, mine, any kind of enterprise. In addition, the general principle that he extracts from his reading of this line text, i.e., "the unassuming attitude of mind that goes with modesty fits a man to accomplish even difficult undertakings," is one that seems to focus on how having a modest attitude or mindset makes it easier for someone to do or achieve something. At the same time, his statement "Where no claims are put forward, no resistances arise" suggests the influence that humility can have on others and how this can also enhance success in endeavors. And this is similar to the principle I extract from 15/1, i.e., "The sincerely humble person who acts will find success in many things," though the principle as thus stated is vague until it is related to and combined with other line texts in a way that allows for a unifying Interpretation describing the effect that humility has on others, and how that leads to success. But of greater importance is exactly how Wilhelm arrives at his interpretation. Wilhelm is not espousing any kind of reverse adaptative interpretation,[14] but an interpretation apparently based on his understanding of Chinese culture and perhaps what his 'image and concept' based explanations might have told him about the wisdom contained in the line texts. And this would be a more complicated position than the 'simple extraction of general patterns and the ideas they are centered on' that I espouse. That said, I must admit, I am never really certain exactly what process Wilhelm followed to arrive at his life philosophy interpretations in Book 1.

3.3 Edward Shaughnessy

Edward Shaughnessy is one of the preeminent Western scholars of the *Book of Changes*. He has brought a disciplined scholarly approach to his study

of this ancient work, an approach influenced in large part by his knowledge of archaeologically uncovered materials such as oracle bone engravings, bronze inscriptions, silk manuscripts, and bamboo-strip texts (along with the times and cultures in which they originated). He also has a great interest in the received literary works of China's ancient period, especially the *Book of Documents*, the *Book of Odes*, and the *Zhouyi*, each of which he at times tries to use to explicate the others. He is a Modernist, his main focus being uncovering the original context and meaning of the text materials in the *Zhouyi* as a divinatory text—including the meanings of related materials in the different stages of text development leading up to the received version of the *Zhouyi*. Part of the work such a focus entails is transcription, i.e., discovering exactly what the characters used to write early *Book of Changes*-related manuscripts and texts (and their correct order) were, a process made difficult by the very nature of the scripts used (as well as the condition of the source materials on which they are written/inscribed). Another part of such work is putting those transcriptions into English, a process complicated by the large number of phonetic loans found in the related texts, something that makes determining exactly what words are being used in those texts more difficult. One thing Shaughnessy does not seem to have much interest in is developing or explaining any particular *Book of Changes*-related philosophy of change (including his own).

Shaughnessy is a prolific writer of both articles and books on the *Book of Changes*. His two most important *Zhouyi*-related works of translation are *I Ching: The Classic of Changes* (The First English Translation of the Newly Discovered Second-Century B.C. Mawangdui Texts) and *Unearthing the Changes* (Recently Discovered Manuscripts of the *Yijing*). The former work can probably be considered the standard English-language translation of the Mawangdui Silk Manuscript *Yijing* (馬王堆帛書周易). While the latter work, which offers background information and translations on a number of archaeologically unearthed manuscripts, is flat out the best in-depth English-language introduction to ancient *Zhouyi*-related text materials done to date. Three of Shaughnessy's translations of the line texts for Hexagram #15 are taken from these two sources and given below.

Shanghai Museum Chu Bamboo Strip *Zhouyi* (300 [?] BCE)

(Shaughnessy 2014: 84)[15]

䷏壐▊鄉君子又冬初六壐君子用涉大川吉六二鳴壐 ⋯ 四亡不礿葿壐六五不畼以其**箬**礿用戠伐亡不礿上六鳴壐可用行帀征邦 ▊

1. Initial Six: A modest lord-son. Herewith ford the great river. Auspicious.
2. Six in the Second: Calling Modesty…
4.…in the Fourth: There is nothing not beneficial. Encouraging modesty.
5. Six in the Fifth: Not enriched by his neighbor. Beneficial herewith to invade and attack. There is nothing not beneficial.
6. Top Six: Calling Modesty. Can be used to set in motion the army and correct the country.

Mawangdui Silk Manuscript *Yijing* (190 [?] BCE) (Shaughnessy 1998: 106-107)

1. 初六嗛嗛君子用涉大川吉

Initial Six:

So modest is the gentleman;

Herewith ford the great river;

auspicious.

2. 六二鳴嗛貞吉

Six in the Second:

Calling Modesty;

determination is auspicious.

3. 九三勞嗛君子有終吉

Nine in the Third:

Toiling modesty;

the gentleman has an end;

auspicious.

4. 六四无不利譌嗛

Six in the Fourth:

There is nothing not beneficial.

False Modesty.

5. **六五不富以其鄰[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]不利**

    Six in the Fifth:

      Not wealthy together with his neighbors;

        [beneficial herewith to invade and attack;

        there is nothing] not beneficial.

6. **尚六鳴謙[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]**

    Elevated Six:

      Calling modesty;

        [beneficial herewith to move troops to campaign

        Against city and state].

Received Version of *Zhouyi* Accompanying Shanghai Museum Text
(Shaughnessy 2014: 85)

1. First Six: Double Modesty. The lord-son herewith fords the great river. Auspicious.

2. Six in the Second: Calling Modesty. Determining: auspicious.

3. Nine in the Third: Belabored modesty. The lord-son has an end. Auspicious.

4. Six in the Fourth: There is nothing not beneficial. Waving Modesty.

5. Six in the Fifth: Not enriched by his neighbor. Beneficial herewith to invade and attack. There is nothing not beneficial.

6. Calling Modesty. Beneficial herewith to set in motion the army and correct the city and kingdom

The Shanghai Museum text is older than the Mawangdui manuscript. However, Shaughnessy translated the latter first, some seventeen years before he published his translations of the Shanghai Museum passages and the received version of the same texts accompanying them. Juxtaposing the translations of all three line-text excerpts for Hexagram #15 allows for some interesting insights into Shaughnessy's approach to translation, even some changes in it that seem to have occurred during that seventeen-year period.

The style of writing for all three translations is generally the same, more literal than free, more descriptive than narrative. But their general organization and spacing differ. The structure of the Mawangdui translation amplifies Shaughnessy's system for categorizing the different parts of the line text materials. Initially seen in his doctoral dissertation, this system breaks those materials up into four (three) different categories—image/topic, injunction, prognostication, and verification—with the relevant categories of materials in the Mawangdui translation each given on a separate line and indented differently (Shaughnessy 1983: 135-158). Specifically, a single indentation signifies the image/topic, double indentation the injunction, and triple indentation the prognostication and/or verification. The lack of any such indentations in the Shanghai Museum and received versions of these translations does not mean he abandoned this system of categorization in his later work. I assume he simply no longer thought it was as important to emphasize the differences among line text materials by using indentations.

Shaughnessy's translations of the Shanghai Museum, Mawangdui, and received versions of the *Zhouyi* all show some variations in groupings of Chinese characters. When looking at the line texts for Hexagram #15 this is most conspicuous with the terms 'lord-son/gentleman,' something that impacts the meanings of 15/1 and 15/3 as well as the categorizations of some of their constituent parts. For example, in his translations of the received versions of both 15/1 and 15/3 the term lord-son is part of the injunction, even though in the Shanghai Museum version of 15/1 that same term is part of the image/topic (15/3 is missing in the Shanghai Museum translation). While in the Mawangdui translation a corresponding term, gentleman, is used both in the topic (15/1) and in the injunction (15/3). This is different from the translations given by this author, Legge, and Wilhelm, all of which place all instances of those terms in the image/topic of each line text.[16] In his translations of the Mawangdui and received versions of 15/3, I can understand Shaughnessy using the terms gentleman/lord-son in the injunction—because the characters that those translations are based on correspond with similar isolated groupings of the same characters in two

(probably three[17]) versions of the hexagram text for Hexagram #15 (*junzi you zhong* 君子有終[18]). However, it is unclear (to this author) why the term lord-son/gentleman is part of the image/topic in the Shanghai Museum and Mawangdui versions of 15/1, but part of the injunction in the received version of the same text.

Of perhaps greater interest than how the terms lord-son/gentleman are grouped is why two different terms are used for the same two characters, i.e., *junzi* (君子). In his doctoral dissertation Shaughnessy first translated this term as "lordling," or minor lord, something that looks to be an attempt at a direct translation of the two characters. In his Mawangdui translation, however, he translates it as "gentleman," which is generally viewed as similar to my "superior man." This latter translation almost makes it seem that early on Shaughnessy already viewed the Mawangdui version of the *Zhouyi* as having been part of the commentary tradition[19] and he wanted his translation to reflect that fact. In the Shanghai Museum translation of these materials, he reverts back to something similar to "lordling," i.e., "lord-son," a term, mentioned above, that was probably an honorific title for a nobleman during the time when these line texts were first written. This could mean that Shaughnessy viewed the Shanghai Museum version of the *Zhouyi* as part of a tradition older than the Mawangdui text, part of the divinatory stage and not the explanatory stage in the development of the *Book of Changes*,[20] thus more closely reflecting the original meaning of the term. His use of this same term in his translation of the received version of these line texts does seem to demonstrate his desire to emphasize these original/older meanings,[21] even when translating a text that did not reach its complete received form until the early Han Dynasty and at that time had already long been a part of the commentary tradition—which only further bears out why he should be seen as a Modernist (according to my definition of the term).

However, it is Shaughnessy's craftsmanship as a philologist that distinguishes him as a translator. His early philological approach is stated relatively clearly in one of the introductory sections of his translation of the Mawangdui texts, where he introduces simple principles that help

determine meaning when looking at (mostly phonetic) variations in Chinese characters in related works (Shaughnessy 1997: 30-34). In that Mawangdui translation Shaughnessy places the Chinese texts for the Mawangdui and received versions together, the former above the latter. Comparing them, he postulates that if a particular Chinese character in both texts is the same then there is a strong presumption that that character represented the word with which it (the character) was usually associated. However, if the characters do not match, then one must choose the character from the Mawangdui version or the received version, with evidence used to make that decision being internal to the text—generally grammatical or contextual. And if that still does not produce a satisfactory result then one must take a look at other variations in additional (e.g., historical) materials. Shaughnessy's general principles are well argued and supported with clear examples, making his explanation quite convincing. However, when it comes to applying them in dealing directly with individual line texts, the core of his translation work, things at times become much less clear. This becomes apparent when looking at some of the differences in characters for all three versions of the line texts for Hexagram #15 being discussed.

His method seems to be on display and working when translating the variant characters for *qian*. As was mentioned just above, because the Mawangdui text was part of the commentary tradition, when it was written the character *qian* was already understood the way it is in the received text, i.e., as "humility (modesty),"[22] so 嗛 was read as 謙, both characters referring to the same word, with the real difference between these two characters being the interchangeable radicals (the radical *kou* 口 or "mouth" for the former, *yan* 言 or "words/language" for the latter). Shaughnessy also reads the corresponding character in the Shanghai Museum text as the same word, written with essentially the same character but using the earth radical (*tu* 土) (Shaughnessy 2014: 84, n. 1).[23] All three characters, then, are phonetically similar, and in the context given mean the same thing, i.e., humility (modesty), though they are written slightly differently (with different radicals [significs]).

Character	Shanghai Museum	Mawangdui	Received
Qian	嗛 (humility)	嗛 (humility)	謙 (humility)
15/4 - Character #6	藬 *hui* (encouraging)	譌 *e* (false/erroneous)	撝 *hui* (waving)

Hexagram #15 - Major Character Variations

Things are not so clear when looking at character #6 in 15/4, though. In the Mawangdui translation it is read as *e*, "false/erroneous," instead of *hui*, "to rip/tear," which is how, at that time, Shaughnessy read *hui* in the received version (Shaughnessy 1997: 106; 305, #35, n. 2). In the Shanghai Museum version the sixth character in 15/4 is also read as *hui*, though written as 藬 and given a different meaning, i.e., "encouraging" (Shaughnessy 2014: 84). One might perhaps be tempted to accept this latter translation, except for the fact that Shaughnessy translates the homophone *hui* (撝) in the received version that is attached to the Shanghai Museum text differently—as "waving" (Shaughnessy 2014: 85). So, I am left asking why Shaughnessy chose three different meanings,[24] especially when two of the three characters used are homophones and one (譌), when compared to another (撝), just has a different radical (signific). As he cited no internal grammatical or contextual evidence, I am simply left to assume he saw none and perhaps concluded these were textual variations, not possible phonetic or character variations.[25]

Shaughnessy's translations of Shanghai Museum line text remnants, including the line texts for Hexagram #15, generally represent what seem to be more polished and exacting translations than those found with the Mawangdui text (with no attempt to plug in and translate things that are missing in the former being a reflection of that more exacting nature). This seems due at least partially to his use of a growing number of primary source materials[26] in the philological analyses that contribute to these translations. In his later work he also appears to be aiming at fashioning

translations he believes might more accurately reflect the meaning that the people who wrote the different texts themselves intended. Even though I sometimes still question how we can really know with certainty if his choices are the correct ones, his focus seems to be increasingly on the various possible meanings of the different divinatory texts that were part of the developing *Zhouyi* tradition. Not, then, on the possible meanings of the line text materials within the context of a particular philosophy of change, but something more akin to Legge's attempt to get into the mind(s) of those who wrote the texts.

3.4 Stephen Karcher

Stephen Karcher has spent almost fifty years studying the *Book of Changes*. Though some might want to compare him with Richard Wilhelm, Karcher's work really more closely mirrors the ideas of the eminent psychologist Carl Jung[27] as presented in Jung's forward to Wilhelm's *The I ching or Book of Changes*—ideas, some of which Wilhelm may have accepted, but many of which he seems not to have so clearly enunciated as Jung. Karcher believes, then, that there is a particular kind of imaginative space set off for a dialogue with the gods or spirits, the creative basis of which is called the unconscious, with the symbols that connect us to that world, the hexagrams of the *Book of Changes*, constituting a kind of dictionary of the forces that move and change us (Karcher 8). Seen as such, Karcher might best be called a modern Traditionalist. In addition, as was noted above, Wilhelm, a practitioner of *Book of Changes*-related divinatory practices, still placed great value on his philosophical interpretations of its text materials as well, while Karcher focuses mostly on the *Book of Changes* as oracle and interpretations of the *Zhouyi* basic text that can be applied in the divinatory process.

Karcher's approach to divination is a popular one. It is based on the existence of a world organism, one made up of interdependent forces, including Time, the *Yin/Yang*, the Eight Phases of *Yin/Yang*, and the Five Transformative Movements (i.e., the Five Phases)—all cycles connected with the eight trigrams, and in turn connected to the sixty-four hexagrams (and something best seen as

represented in the concentric circles making up what Karcher refers to as the Universal Compass) (ibid. 56-58). *Book of Changes* divination, based on chance, is the means by which one connects to this organic whole, the psychological tool for uncovering the forces behind reality, and the process that links a situation faced and a question posed about it. Interpretation of a hexagram that results from divination is a somewhat nebulous process. Like Wilhelm's life philosophy interpretations, one key to understanding any hexagram seems to be the Image of the Situation (i.e., the Great Image), which Karcher describes as an archetypal situation. But any divination reading must also incorporate the 'transforming lines,' with these lines and the divined hexagram also explained within the context of their attached commentaries, a process during which one spontaneously discovers meaningful rules that can be related to the situation one is facing. Of special importance are the constituent imagery, underlying ideas, and what Karcher refers to as the Associated Contexts of both the hexagram and its transforming lines. All of which makes Karcher's approach to the *Book of Changes* in some ways even more complex than Wilhelm's.

When first looking at Karcher's *I ching* (The Classic Chinese Oracle of Change), anyone familiar with the *Book of Changes* and general scholarship on it will immediately notice a good number of differences that distinguish it from other such works. Karcher has, for example, created a number of new names and terms for the different parts and elements of the *Book of Changes* (some introduced below), something that makes moving smoothly between other translations of the work not without at least initial difficulty. However, such difficulty is minor compared with the larger task at hand if forming any kind of interpretation of a divined hexagram or transformed line is to be possible—that is, grasping the Associated Contexts that can be applied in such interpretations. Of course, one could simply use Karcher's book as a reference work during the process. But the origins of these Associated Contexts, which read like streaming lists of images, concepts, and related terms, along with their priority and application, are not always clear. A look at Karcher's translation of the line texts for Hexagram #15 allows us to see this at times unique approach to divinatory interpretation.

Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Modesty) – Line Texts (Karcher 223-227)

1. Humbling, Humbling: *chün tzu*.
   Avail of stepping into the Great River. Auspicious.
2. Calling Humbling. Trial: auspicious.
3. Toiling Humbling: *chün tzu*.
   Possessing completing, auspicious.
4. Nothing not advantageous, demonstrating Humbling.
5. Not affluence: use your neighbor.
   Advantageous to avail of encroaching subjugating. Harvesting.
   Nothing not advantageous.
6. Calling Humbling.
   Advantageous to avail of moving legions. Harvesting.
   Chastising the capital city.

15/1 Associated Contexts

Humbling, *Ch'ien*, The doubled character intensifies this quality.

Avail of, *Yung*: take advantage of; benefit from, profit by; use for a specific purpose; apply to advantage. The ideogram: *to divine and center*, applying divination to central concerns. **Step into the Great River**, *She Ta Ch'uan*: consciously moving into the flow of time; enter the stream of life with a goal or purpose; embark on a significant enterprise. **Auspicious**, *Chi*: leads to the experience of meaning; favorable, propitious, advantageous, appropriate, keyword. The ideogram: *scholar and mouth*, wise words of a sage.

Unlike Wilhelm's line text translations, Karcher's translations read more literal than free, more descriptive than narrative, reflecting an almost word-for-word approach to creating an English-language text. Both word groupings and term translations are at times unconventional. I am not quite sure, for example, where to place the term *chün tzu* in 15/1 and 15/3, and why it is preceded by a colon, though I conjecture (because it follows a colon) that it is given as an example of the two descriptive words preceding it and thus is part of the image/topic constituted by the first four characters

in the Chinese originals. Karcher's use of the terms 'Trial' and 'Harvest(ing)' are unorthodox (at least when discussing the *Book of Changes*); the former usually apparently synonymous with the more common translations 'determination' or 'to divine' (for *zhen* 貞—thus making it a Modernist interpretation), the latter related to 'advantageous' (or *li* 利). Why he felt the need to use these terms is unclear to this author, though I assume they are a part of his larger system of divinatory formulae encompassing more than just the *Book of Changes*. They also do add a more naturalistic—perhaps even poetic—sense to the text. More difficult to grasp is his translation of 'Humbling' for the character *qian*. 'Humbling' is apparently being used as a present participle functioning as an adjective,[28] but its meaning in that context is not the same as the more common adjective 'humble.' The latter is generally used to describe a quality or characteristic of someone, e.g., a humble person, one who is deferential and self-effacing. 'Humbling,' on the other hand, is generally not used in the same way. A more common usage might be 'humbling experience,' i.e., an experience in which one has been forced to admit one was wrong about something or lacked the ability to do something (with connotations of resulting humiliation, embarrassment, or shame). The sense of 'humility' in Hexagram #15 is not like the latter, something forced on one by circumstances, but like the former, and a practice or attitude that comes from within. There are, of course, other ways to read 'humbling.' As a transitive verb, in which case the imagery would be one of a person 'humbling oneself.' Or using the word 'humbling' to describe a continuous action or state of being, something one might see when contemplating a living, vital image (?).[29] However this author looks at things, though, 'humble,' or sometimes 'humility,' seem the better choices.

In addition to these unique word groupings and term translations, examples of which can also be found in other parts of Karcher's book and which distinguish Karcher from Traditionalists like Legge and Wilhelm, it is perhaps his lists of Associated Contexts that really separate him from many Traditionalists intent on using the *Book of Changes* in divination. Such lists can be found attached to the different parts of each hexagram: the

hexagram itself, the hexagram and line texts, commentaries attached to the hexagram and its text materials, even Karcher's interpretations of trigrams (inner, outer, and nuclear). As the lists attached to 15/1 show, Associated Contexts do seem to fit into the framework of adaptative metaphorical interpretations and intra-lingual translation that make up the core of most commentaries—with Karcher's Associated Contexts functioning as source domain or vehicle, the *Book of Changes* and its constituent parts the target domain or tenor (though specific examples in Karcher's Associated Contexts are not always directly related to didactic concerns). The list of associations attached to 15/1 specifically aims to describe or expand on the meanings of four terms (given in bold) in that line text, and though the sources of those descriptions, and whether or when they apply, is not always clear, they are easy to understand based on their purpose—as attempts to explain the meanings of words in the line texts, thus allowing for a variety of applicable interpretations in any instance of divination. Karcher also tries to incorporate into his Associated Contexts analyses of Chinese characters that the translations of some line text terms are based on. In 15/1 Karcher introduces two such analyses (in *italics*), both of which can be found after the phrase "The Ideogram.' These analyses seem to be similar to the kind of character analysis found in Xu Shen's *Shuowen jiezi* (説文解字) (i.e., often forced). Leaving aside the question as to whether such character analyses are correct (and they are not free of problems), one might also wonder if the characters that Karcher categorizes as 'ideogram' really can or should be so classified, or whether such analyses really even contribute (or would have originally been meant to contribute) anything to further understanding the relevant terms and the line texts they are a part of.

Judging from the bibliography attached to his book, Karcher does not approach the *Book of Changes* as a Sinologist (and it is not clear what his ability to read Chinese is). In addition, the general tone of his book reminds at least this author of New Age philosophy. However, whether one accepts or does not accept Karcher's divination-centered approach to his study of the *Book of Changes* (or the explanations, analyses, and translations that go into it), one

thing is clear. Karcher has developed a system that is in many ways his own, one that only someone who has spent much of a lifetime studying the Book of Changes could achieve, one that is clearly a part of and an extension of its divinatory tradition, and thus one that has brought Karcher's own approach to interpreting *Zhouyi* text materials to the forefront.

3.5 John Minford

John Minford is a well-known Sinologist and distinguished translator of classical Chinese literature. He is best known for his translations of *Dream of the Red Chamber* (*Hong lou meng* 紅樓夢), *The Art of War* (*Sunzi bing fa* 孫子兵法), and the *I Ching* (The Essential Translation of the Ancient Chinese Oracle and Book of Wisdom). His *I Ching*, an almost 900-page tome centered on the hexagrams, hexagram materials, and their attached commentaries, was some twelve years in the making. Faced with the question of whether to translate the *Book of Changes* from the perspective of a philosophical text dealing with change or on the basis of the original meanings of its divinatory passages, Minford made what seems to be a singular choice and decided to do both, breaking his book up into two main parts, a Book of Wisdom and a Bronze Age Oracle (he thus wears the hats of the Traditionalist and Modernist). As his translations of the line texts for Hexagram #15 show, each part is unique and representative of a different time and world view.

Book of Wisdom: Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Humility) – Line Texts
(Minford 137-144)

1. **(Yin in First Place)**

   The True Gentleman

   Is Humble.

   It avails

   To cross a Great Stream.

   This is

   Auspicious.

   Hoc bonum

2. **(Yin in Second Place)**

   Humility

   Sings.

   It is Auspicious

   To be Steadfast.

   Solidum bonum

3. **(Yang in Third Place)**

   This is

   The Diligence,

   The Humility,

   Of the True Gentleman.

   An Auspicious Conclusion.

   Hoc bonum.

4. **(Yin in Fourth Place)**

   All things

   Profit.

   Humility

   Is made Manifest.

5. **(Yin in Fifth Place)**

   Wealth is not shared

   With neighbors.

   It profits

   To attack with force.

   All things

   Profit.

   Nihil quod non conveniat.

6. **(Yin in Top Place)**

   Humility

   Sings.

   It Profits

   To send an Army on the march,

   To attack one's own city.

(Attached Comments to 15/2)

Yin Line in Yin Place. Centered and True. Humility proclaims itself. Here, writes Chen Guying, in the Center of the Lower Trigram (Mountain), the Humility of the Recluse "sings." His voice is heard in the world. It reverberates. This is Master Zhuang's "Thunder speaking in the silence of the Abyss;" it is Master Guan's "Voice of Silence, heard in the rumbling of Thunder." Humility "singing," writes Magister Liu, is the expression of the Nothing (*wu*) of Self, of the Something (*you*) of Others. It is Yielding and Compliant (Yin in Yin); it is Centered and True (in Apt Place). Outwardly expressed Humility, writes Professor Mun, proceeding from a Steadfast Heart-and-Mind, is Auspicious.

Bronze Age Oracle: Hexagram #15, *Qian* (Humility) – Line Texts
(Minford 571-573)

1. **(Six in First Place)**
   Rats
   Crunch.
   Noble man
   Crosses big stream.
   Auspicious.

2. **(Six in Second Place)**
   Rats
   Squeal.
   Auspicious augury.

3. **(Nine in Third Place)**
   Rats
   At work.
   For noble man,
   Conclusion.
   Auspicious.

4. **(Six in Fourth Place)**
   Profit in all things.

Rats
Rip.

5. **(Six in Fifth Place)**
Wealth
Not shared by neighbors.
Profits to invade or attack.
Profit in all things.

6. **(Six in top Place)**
Rats
Squeal.
Profits to march,
Against town
Or state.

The language in both of Minford's translations is unlike that used by Legge, Wilhelm, Shaughnessy, Karcher, or this author. In the Introduction to his Book of Wisdom, Minford seems to be referring to both parts of his book when describing the arrangement of line text materials as being an attempt to break "the core text into short lines so as to reflect its pithy, often poetic and parallelistic nature" (Minford 7). Though this author has been unable to always feel the rhythm or in many cases see the parallel structures that Minford was attempting to create, Minford does seem to have been successful in creating a translation that is more literal than free, more descriptive than narrative, and one that often isolates grammatical and semantic units (or tight phrases combining them) in a fashion that reminds me somewhat of Gary Snyder's translation of classical Chinese poetry, a style that emphasizes imagery (and in Minford's case other grammatical and semantic parts of the text materials) in a spontaneous impulse of presentation, while attempting to adopt the word order of the original Chinese.

However, as one would expect, the tone and content of the language from the Book of Wisdom and the Bronze Age Oracle are quite distinct. The Book of Wisdom speaks in a more deliberate tone, often tinted in Daoist colors and

hues, something no doubt the result of his choice of commentators adopted (ibid. 3-6).[30] When looking at the translated line texts for Hexagram #15, in particular their use of terms such as 'humility,' 'True Gentleman,' and 'steadfast,' it is also clear that these materials fall into the commentary tradition and its didactic reading of the world, something further developed in Minford's own comments, which regularly make references to the kind of hexagram-structure based explanations that refer to line positions and interrelationships found in the translations of both Legge and Wilhelm (see Attached Comments to 15/2). In addition, as his Attached Comments to 15/2 demonstrate, Minford likes to add remarks made by other commentators, in this particular case remarks concerning their understanding of the idea of 'humility singing,' something that increases the number of different contexts that can be used when interpreting this passage.[31] The Bronze Age Oracle, on the other hand, is more abrupt and matter of fact, written in an unadorned style, with an attempt made to strip all exegesis away from the text so as to reach back to the time when the text materials were written (ibid. 3, 501-503). The use of the term 'noble man' instead of 'gentleman,' along with interpretations of the main imagery as 'rats eating (crunching on food) or squealing,' are clear examples of Modernist interpretations, something one would expect to find in an attempt at uncovering the original meanings of these line texts.

Minford points out that his work is not a scholarly or academic translation, but an attempt to open the *Book of Changes* to the more common lay reader. This is only half true. Because one thing that makes Minford's translation so valuable, and something reflective of Minford's impressive command of source materials, is his inclusion, particularly in the Bronze Age Oracle, of a wide range of references to text materials from other sources that help one better see how *Zhouyi* passages were understood when placing them in a specific historical context and time.[32] In addition, Minford's inclusion of Latin phrases following his translations in the Book of Wisdom, even if seen simply as a nod to some of the early Jesuit translators of the *Book of Changes*, is, in reality, also a nod to the educated scholar. It is clearly an attempt at making line text materials more understandable within the target culture (an older traditional Western culture),

but probably does so at the expense of distracting some readers from better understanding the subject culture. Neither Minford's Book of Wisdom nor the Bronze Age Oracle aims at uncovering any type of archetypal pattern that was the focus of Karcher's (and to a lesser degree Wilhelm's) interpretation of hexagram materials—not even the simpler form of unified line-text Interpretation offered by this author. Instead, Minford simply puts forward two separate interpretations of the *Book of Changes*, mostly of its line texts. This allows him to easily straddle the divinatory and explanatory stages in the development of the *Book of Changes* and avoid problems in translation usually associated with the changes in meaning they entail.

4. Summary and Conclusions

More than anything, a look at the short translations given above of one small section of the *Zhouyi* by this author and five other authorities on the *Book of Changes* makes it clear that there is a great deal of variety in understanding, translating, and interpreting this ancient text. To be certain, the scope of the material focused on in the comparison, the line texts from Hexagram #15, can in no way be seen as giving a full picture of the work of any of the individual authors. However, the analyses of even such short passages of each author's work do offer some insights into their approaches to the *Book of Changes* and make it easier to comprehend what I have tried to do in The *Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation.*

My attempt to apply metaphor theory to the *Book of Changes* by introducing the concepts of adaptative interpretation and reverse adaptative interpretation provides an alternative framework for understanding and translating this work. Most scholars familiar with the *Book of Changes* will probably find it relatively easy to accept the idea of adaptative interpretation, the view that parts of some commentaries (including the Ten Wings attached to the Basic Text as well as commentaries that developed from them) have served much like metaphorical vehicle or source domain in which didactic

interpretations of Basic Text materials (which can be seen as tenor or target domain) were developed to create new ways of understanding what were originally divinatory passages. In fact, this general position, even if not the term adaptative interpretation itself, seems not uncommon. However, the same cannot be said for reverse adaptative interpretation. This theory attempts to move the focus away from the commentaries to the function and underlying meaning of *Zhouyi* text materials—specifically line text materials. And it is here where diverging approaches taken by different scholars/translators begin to become most evident.

As I have explained it, reverse adaptative interpretation turns the commentary tradition (in particular the explanatory stage of the commentary tradition) on its head, reading *Zhouyi* text materials not as tenor, but as vehicle, allowing, in the process, for the discovery of a series of more general and deeper patterns of change. Some might see this as being similar to efforts made by Wilhelm and Karcher. Wilhelm, working to better understand the interplay between image and concept, saw trigram and hexagram images as representations of ideas that existed in a supra-sensible world, and using the *Book of Changes* aimed to gain access to this world and the order and insight it could bring to reality. Karcher seems to have tried to more clearly define and categorize these ideas, which he referred to as archetypal patterns, the essences of which he saw being expressed in the Great Image commentaries attached to each hexagram. However, unlike Wilhelm and Karcher, the patterns of change that I extract from units of line text materials are not so complex, just general Interpretations based on elements of imagery, narrative, and portent found in the line texts, and nothing that entails any involved psychological, epistemological, or metaphysical considerations or arguments.

This kind of reverse adaptative interpretation is no doubt anathema to Modernists like Shaughnessy, because it requires neither fidelity to the original meanings of the Basic Text materials nor adherence to the belief that the *Zhouyi* Basic Text is a compilation of divinatory passages. The *Zhouyi* did, of course, originate as a compilation of divinatory passages, but it later was incorporated into and functioned as an essential part of a philosophical canon. Traditionalists

like Legge and Wilhelm, while still seeing the *Book of Changes* as an oracle, tried to focus on this philosophical dimension so as to both better understand and apply divination within the context of a larger and more complex system of change (and the correlative world view on which it was based).

   This struggle to find a balance between the old and the new, between the divinatory and explanatory stages in the development of the *Book of Changes*, seems to be a problem that anyone hoping to understand and translate this ancient work must deal with. Shaughnessy attempts to sidestep the issue somewhat by focusing on the original meanings of the divinatory passages in the Basic Text, creating, in the process, translations that do not always reflect the nature of the texts being dealt with (e.g., the Mawangdui and received versions, which were already part of the developing commentary tradition). Minford is a rare example of someone who mostly avoids the problem, but he was able to do so only by offering separate and distinct translations and interpretations of the *Book of Changes*—both as an oracle and as a philosophical text (book of wisdom). In *The Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation*, my application of reverse adaptative interpretation makes it possible to mostly steer clear of divination and correlative philosophy while still incorporating text material meanings from both the divinatory and explanatory stages of development of the *Book of Changes*. 'Whatever works' might very well be the criterion when carrying out reverse adaptative interpretation. However, though my approach does result in a set of sixty-four different patterns of change, they are not definitive Interpretations. In fact, being subjective, whatever is seen as working depends a lot on exactly what is extracted from the text materials, and by whom, because the reality of the process shows that the former (the what) is intricately connected to the latter (the who), resulting in interpretations that at least in part usually differ from person to person (just as adaptative interpretations of text materials and translations based on them often differ from person to person or school to school). Some might attribute all this difference and disagreement to the 'all-encompassing nature' of the *Book of Changes*. A more realistic explanation would suggest that it reflects the distance in time, from the present, of the text materials that make up the *Zhouyi*, and

perhaps the relativistic view of the world and truth that is part of the Chinese tradition—both of which allow for a great deal of latitude, if not ambiguity, in interpretations of text materials. In spite of these problems, this author hopes that his approach in The *Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation* can still serve as a simpler starting point for some, the starting point of what I like to call a modern Chinese philosophy of change in which anyone can use the *Book of Changes* as a guide for better understanding change in their lives and how to respond and adapt to it.

References

Aristotle (2017). *Poetics.* Translated by Ingram Bywater. Boston: Digireads.com Publishing.

Caplan, Harry, trans. *Cicero: Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Loeb Classic Library #403. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

A Concordance to Yijing 周易引得 (1935). *Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Supplement 10.* Hong Ye 洪業, ed. Beijing, China.

Erya zhushu 爾雅注疏. Guo Pu 郭璞 *zhu* 注 and Xing Bing 邢昺 *shu* 疏 (Ruan Yuan ed.). From *Erya zhushu ji buzheng fu jingxue shi* 爾雅注疏及補正附經學史, Vol. 16 of *the Shisanjing zhushu buzheng* 十三經注疏補正. In *Zhongguo xueshu mingzhu diliu ji* 中國學術名著第六輯. Yang Jialuo, ed. Taibei: World Books, 1985.

Fendos, Paul G. Jr (1988). "Fei Chih's Place in the Development of *I Ching* Studies." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin - Madison. (UMI facsimile.)

_____ (2010). "Culture, Looking Back, and Translation of the *Book of Changes.*" *Translation Quarterly* 57: 50-85.

_____ (2018). *The Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation.* New York: Vernon Press. (Paperback ed. has been updated to correct errors in hard cover ed.)

Guldin, Ranier (2016). *Translation as Metaphor.* New York: Routledge. Kindle Version.

Han Xiping Stone Classic *Yijing* (*Han Xiping shijing Yijing* 漢熹平石經易經). See Pu Maozuo, Vol. 2, 636-772.

Jakobson, Roman (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *On Translation*, pp. 232-239. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Karcher, Stephen (2002). *I Ching: The Classic Chinese Oracle of Change. A Complete*

Translation with Concordance. New York: Fall River Press.

Kunst, Richard Alan (1985). "The Original *Yijing*: A Text, Phonetic Transcription, Translation, and Indexes with Sample Glosses." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley. (UMI facsimile.)

Legge, James, trans. (1971). *I ching*. Raymond Van Over, ed. New York: Mentor Books/ The New American Library.

Macadam, Alfred V. "Translation as Metaphor: Three Versions of Borges." *Modern Language Notes*: Vol. 90, No. 6 (December 1975): 747-754.

Mao shi zhengyi 毛詩正義. Mao heng 毛亨 *zhuan* 傳, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 *jian* 箋, Kong Yingda 孔穎達shu 疏. From the *Mao shih zhushu ji buzheng* 毛詩注疏及補正, Vols. 3-4 in the *Shisanjing zhushu buzheng* 十三經注疏補正. Yang Jialuo, ed. Taibei: World Books, 1981.

Mawangdui [Han Tomb] Silk Manuscript (Yijing) (*Mawangdui Han mu boshu* 馬王堆漢墓帛書易經). See Pu Maozuo, Vol. 2, 547-635.

Minford, John (2014). *I Ching: The Essential Translation of the Ancient Chinese Oracle and Book of Wisdom*. New York: Penguin Books.

Needham, Joseph and Wang Ling. *Science and Civilization in China, Vol. 2 of History of Scientific Thought*. Taibei: Caves Books, 1985.

Pu Maozuo 濮茅左 (2006). *Chu zhushu Zhouyi yanjiu* 楚竹書周易研究 (*Jian shu Xian Qin Liang Han chutu yu chuanshi Yi xue wenxian ziliao* 兼述先秦兩漢出土與傳世易學文獻資料). 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社.

Richards, I.A. (1965). *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rutt, Richard (2002). *The Book of Changes*. London: Routledge Curzon.

Shanghai Museum Chu Bamboo Strip Zhouyi (Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu Zhouyi 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書周易). See Pu Maozuo, Vol. 1.

Shaughnessy, Edward (1983). "The Composition of the *Zhouyi*." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University. (UMI facsimile.)

_____ (1998). *I Ching: The Classic of Changes. The First English Translation of the Newly Discovered Second-Century B.C. Mawangdui Texts*. 2nd ed. *Classics of Ancient China*. New York: Ballantine Books.

_____ (2014). *Unearthing the Changes. Recently Discovered Manuscripts of the Yi jing (I Ching) and Related Texts. Translations from the Asian Classics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014

Shuowen jiezi zhu 説文解字注. Duan Yucai's 斷玉裁 commentary to Xu Shen's 許慎 work. *Jingyunlou cangban* 經韵樓藏版. Taibei: Liming Culture, 1985.

Smith, Richard (2012). *The I Ching: A Biography. Lives of Great Religious Books.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wilhelm, Richard (1981). The *I Ching or Book of Changes.* Translated from German into English by Cary F. Baynes. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Zhouyi zhengyi 周易正義 (1987). Wang Bi 王弼 and Han Kangbo 韓康伯 *zhu* 注 and Kong Yingda 孔穎達 *shu* 疏 (Ruan Yuan ed.). From the *Zhouyi zhushu ji buzheng* 周易注疏及補正, Vol. 1 of *Shisanjing zhushu buzheng* 十三經注疏補正. In *Zhongguo xueshu mingzhu diliu ji* 中國學述名著第六輯. Yang Jialuo, ed. Taibei: World Books.

Zhu Xi 朱熹. *Yi benyi* 易本義 (1987). From Vol. 2 of *Zhuzi Xiaoxue ji Sishu Wujing duben* 諸子小學及四書五經讀本. In *Zengding Zhongguo xueshu mingzhu diyi ji* 增訂中國學述名著第一輯. Yang Jialuo, ed. Taibei: World Books.

Notes

[1]   Metaphors take a variety of shapes. 'Love is War' is a simple one. 'Love' is the tenor, 'war' the vehicle by which it is described. 'Old age is the evening of life' is another. 'Old age' is the tenor, 'evening of life' the vehicle. Though both of these examples give the tenor first, followed by the descriptive vehicle, this is not always the case. The phrase 'curtain of night' reverses the order. In addition, some metaphors are not so clearly represented. "Your position is indefensible,' a statement in which argument or debate is being compared to war, is a good example. Some metaphors even expand to cover longer pieces of writing, with Shakespeare's Sonnet 18, "Shall I Compare Thee to a Summer's Day," an extended analogy of a man's love of a woman with the beauty of summer, standing as a classic example.

[2]   Punctuation of Chinese is this author's, based on Smith's translation. The 'Use all nines' 7th line is not included.

[3]   Though parts of my thirty-year-old dissertation are now outdated, I still find the old system of categorizing *Book of Changes* materials in it useful even today, i.e., the divinatory, explanatory, and metaphysical stages (Fendos 1988: 266-267). Both the explanatory and metaphysical stages are part of what can be called the 'commentary tradition,' with explanatory elements, at least in terms of function and complexity,

seeming to be the earlier of the two.

[4] An admittedly vague and subjective process shaped by the unique experiences and world views of different individuals.

[5] Some might wonder why I did not use the Great Image (*Da xiang* 大象) or Small Image (*Xiao xiang* 小象) commentaries in fashioning the Interpretations in my book. Because they are just that, commentaries, parts of which function as adaptative interpretations, not the reverse adaptative interpretations that aim at a deeper or more general level of meaning (it is tenor, not vehicle, that I am after here).

[6] See Fendos 2018: 169-179 for how they could be applied.

[7] Which is why I can talk/apply reverse adaptative interpretation in this article and *The Book of Changes: A Modern Adaptation and Interpretation,* yet adhere to a more Modernist approach to translation in an article such as "Culture, Looking Back, and Translation of the *Book of Changes*" (Fendos 2010).

[8] As is immediately evidenced by the use of the term Superior Man (instead of Noble Man/ Lord Son), which already places it in the commentary tradition.

[9] The former replaces the latter in the *Mawangdui Silk Manuscript* (567) and the *Han Xiping Stone Classic* Yijing (711).

[10] The former attributed by many to the Qing Dynasty scholar Li Guangdi 李光地 (1642–1718), the latter first compiled in 1683 from the contributions of some seventy-eight Qing Dynasty scholars, including Niu Niu 牛鈕 (1648-1686).

[11] Related to the process in divination of changing lines (old lines changing into young lines) and the new hexagrams that result.

[12] There is a subtle difference in my interpretation of the first two characters of 15/2 and 15/6. 15/2 is read in a clearly negative way, i.e., one who tries to express humility is less humble by doing so (the truly humble person does not need to let others know). That said, there are some instances where being humble (showing humility) might have a desirable effect (15/6).

[13] I avoid use of the word 'modest' because of the sexual connotations that are absent in 'humility.'

[14] In fact, his use of the Great Image commentary in Part 1 seems to suggest his philosophical interpretations are more like adaptative interpretations.

[15] Chinese characters, which were scanned directly from Shaughnessy 2014: 84, also contain the characters for the hexagram text, which is not translated.

[16] Though both Legge's and Wilhelm's at times relatively free translations often combine these different parts in the same sentences.

[17] Some of the relevant characters in the Mawangdui text are missing, though it is assumed they would be the same.

[18] In the *Zhouyi*, these four characters are found together only in this hexagram. Actually, this is the only hexagram in the *Zhouyi* where a '*junzi you* X' structure can be found. As my translation of 15/3 above shows, I separate the first two characters from the last two. Such a separation would assume that the hexagram text is a misreading of the line text for 15/3 (showing the hexagram text came later?)—something for which I have no real proof.

[19] I.e., the term *junzi* can be seen as already having been refocused or mapped as vehicle by a source domain that provides a new context for understanding it—a moral, Confucian one.

[20] Actually, I am only guessing this might be his position, because in the Mawangdui text he stills translates other terms within the context of divination (see n. 21). So it may very well be that in his early translations he did not <u>try</u> to reflect distinctions between meanings (as understood by those of the different relevant eras) in texts that were part of the divinatory and commentary stages in *Book of Changes* development (as I try to).

[21] There are a number of other terms that Shaughnessy translates to reflect such older meanings. The most obvious examples for Hexagram #15 being *xiang* 鄉/亨*(享)* (these characters are found in the hexagram text, the former in the Shanghai Museum version, the latter in the received version—with the former apparently being a phonetic loan for the latter), translated as "receipt" (he also includes the word 'receipt' in his Mawangdui hexagram text translation, even though the corresponding character is missing); and *zhen* 貞 (found in the Mawangdui and received versions of 15/2), translated as "to determine." These terms are associated with sacrifices and divination, respectively.

[22] Shaughnessy does not make this exact argument.

[23] I must admit that when reading these translations I do wonder if Shaughnessy believed *qian* as "humility" in any of these texts was the original meaning of *qian* or a transformation. I assume the former, even though Shaughnessy mentions, in his Mawangdui translation, that a possible alternative meaning of 嗛 is "hamster," an animal which some Modernists associate Hexagram #15 with (Shaughnessy 1996: 305, n. 1).

[24] Four if you count the two different translations he gave at different times to *hui* in the received version.

[25]   Actually, in a note Shaughnessy does try to connect 蕢 and 撝 phonetically to a common word (homophone), i.e., 揮, which generally means "to direct" or "to lead," originally apparently in a military context (Shaughnessy 2014: 84, n. 4). And it is from this character that he seems to get the translations "encouraging" and "waving" (i.e., directing [soldiers] with a hand[s]), though I am unsure why he just did not translate them the same. Lack of clear explanations is something I encountered with Shaughnessy's translations of both the Mawangdui and Shanghai Museum materials (though perhaps more with the former). He points out variations in characters, and choses one along with its meaning, usually leaving out any analysis he might have gone through to make the choice. In fairness to Shaughnessy, he is aware of this, pointing out in his Mawangdui translation that he has no intention of providing too much discussion for each and every choice he makes. He knew it would distract from his attempt to create smoother reading translations, translations that did not trip the reader up with too many distracting explanations. In addition, he assumed that such variants would be of most interest to scholars, who would understand what he did not say. Nevertheless, this did result in many translations that I found difficult to accept, some of which, without an explanation, seemed downright strange (definitely different from the received version, e.g., 'waving modesty" in the Shanghai Museum version). Perhaps this is the inevitable result of an attempt at creating literal translations of different texts that offer many possible meanings.

[26]   Including the Mawangdui text, the Fuyang Han Bamboo Strip *Zhouyi* 阜陽漢簡周易, and the Han Xiping Stone Classic *Yijing* 漢熹平石經易經. This suggests a change in Shaughnessy's perspective, one that is now focusing more closely on the multiple variant texts of the *Zhouyi* tradition that were recently unearthed, all of which must be consulted to determine the respective meanings in them.

[27]   And Richard Wilhelm's son, Hellmut Wilhelm.

[28]   Most of his line-text translations utilize a verb + ing structure when translating imagery, some apparently as present participle, some as gerund.

[29]   An effect that he may have also been trying to create with 'Calling Humbling' in 15/2 and 15/6, and 'Toiling Humbling' and 'Possessing Completing' in 15/3. Frankly, this kind of translation is at times difficult for me to understand.

[30]   Of which there are many, but here referring in particular to the 18th century Daoist Liu Yiming (Minford 5-6), whom he frequently quotes.

[31] Perhaps the biggest problem I have with his translation of the line texts for Hexagram #15 in the Book of Wisdom is the inconsistency in dealing with the five verb/noun binome structures found in 15/1, 15/2, 15/3, 15/4, and 15/6. He seems to recognize this structure in 15/2, 15/4, and 15/6, but even there has 'humility' as the subject, not a third person. Though his translations in the Bronze Age Oracle of "Rats Crunch," "Rats Squeal," "Rats at Work," and "Rats Rip" in 15/1, 15/2, 15/3, 15/4, and 15/6 might be reversed by some to match the Chinese syntax ("Squealing Rats," etc.), one can understand Minford's attempt at trying to create his own rhythm and order in those translations. However, not adhering to the syntax of the original in the verb/noun structures when translating 15/2, 15/4, and 15/6 in the Book of Wisdom creates—at least for this author—inconsistencies in the meanings and interrelationships of the line text materials (thus making an integrated whole out of the line texts impossible).

[32] Including ancient examples of real divination when specific hexagrams and changing lines were arrived at—something that gives valuable insight into the early divination process. Minford, like Shaughnessy, does not want to burden or distract his readers, only mentioning such examples in passing without lengthy citations or notes (one thing that does indeed make it more easily readable for the layman), though he does offer readers a website where pertinent references can be found.

About the Author

Dr. Paul G. Fendos, Jr., is semi-retired Head Instructor of Chinese Studies in the Minnesota State System of Colleges and Universities. He received his doctorate from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, studying under Professor Cheng Tsai-fa, and he lived, studied, and taught in East Asia for some twenty years. His main fields of interest are the *Book of Changes*, traditional Chinese thought, and translation studies (with a special interest in the place of Chinese in early Korean translation).

回憶錄

✿✿✿✿✿

香港翻譯學會的發展
（1991-2018）（三）

劉靖之

2004–2010、2010–2018的會務活動

在我於2004年6月結束學會的執委職務之後，以"榮休會長"的身份參與學會會務。這之後的十年，我集中時間和精力做幾樣事，都是與音樂評論、音樂研究、音樂教育有關，因此減少了參予學會的會務與活動：一、從2004年9月開始，每學期兩次去上海音樂學院音樂教育系授課，包括音樂教育原著導讀，所謂原著是指英文版本，每學年去四次，每次兩星期。除了授課外，還要輔導碩士研究生撰寫畢業論文，因此無論在香港或在上海，我都要修改學生的論文，忙碌的程度視學生多寡而定，若同時有六名碩士研究生，就會相當忙碌。二、修改1998年出版的《中國新音樂史論》和它的英譯本，前者的增訂本於2009年7月由香港中文大學出版社出版，根據增訂本翻譯的英文版也由同一出版社於2010年出版。中、英文版都是超過千頁的大部頭論著，因此這幾年裏有修改不完的稿件。三、2009年9月，上海音樂學院出版社出版了我的《論中國新音樂》，這本論文集收入了1980-2000年代有關"新音樂"的文章19篇，約26萬字。這本貫穿近四分之一世紀時間所寫的文章需要修訂編輯。四、從2007年開始，我收集並撰寫有關香港的音樂發展史，除了經常跑圖書館外，還訪問了30位作曲家和音樂人，旁聽中、小學的音樂課，並與音樂教師和校長交談。此外，我還訪問香港特區政府民政事務局負責文化事務的許曉暉女士、

教育局負責藝術教育（音樂與美術）領域的總課程發展主任和高級課
程發展主任。這兩本書《香港音樂史論——粵語流行曲、嚴肅音樂、
粵劇》和《香港音樂史論——文化政策、音樂教育》由香港商務印書館
分別於2013、2014年出版。五、聽音樂會、看歌劇、寫樂評是我堅持
了三十多年的習慣，不僅在香港，澳門聽、看，還跑去歐洲的英國、
德國、奧地利、義大利等地和澳洲的墨爾本聽音樂會、看華格納《指
環》等樂劇和義大利美聲歌劇，並為香港、大陸的刊物撰寫樂評。

2004–2010年間的活動

　　隨學會經過了2001年底的180餘人參加的“國際譯聯第三屆亞洲
翻譯家論壇”和為這次論壇提交的120篇論文的審稿、選稿、編撰成七
輯《翻譯季刊》專刊的繁重（義務）工作，以及2004年6月的第二次“嶺
南——清華大學翻譯研究研討會”和編輯出版相應的《翻譯季刊》專號。
副會長陳德鴻則擔負起《翻譯季刊》的主編工作，由 Robert Neather 和
執委、香港大學中文系的潘漢光分別協助編輯英文、中文稿件。由於
香港各大學的管理文化近年來趨向企業管理方式，教授要在教學、研
究、專業服務和校內服務四個方面都有所表現，壓力和工作量顯著增
加，難以顧及與職位沒有直接關係的工作，如香港翻譯學會這種跨大
學的機構。在這種情況下，能夠繼續出版《翻譯季刊》已是萬幸了。

　　2004年6月至2010年6月的6年，除了2006年11月25日學會慶祝成
立35週年晚宴和“榮譽會士”銜頒授外，學會所舉辦的活動包括：

　　一、講座：牛津大學出版社翻譯講座：英國梭網有限公司總裁、
英國外交部首席中文翻譯（兼職）林超倫博士：“Mission Impossible IV:
Consecutive Interpreting”（20/01/2007）、嶺南大學英語系系主任歐陽楨
教授：“Errant English and Aberrant Translation”（16/06/2007）、香港城

市大學語言及亞洲語言講座教授鄒嘉彥："New Approaches to Neologisms and Lexicography in the Digital Age"（19/04/2008）、香港中文大學中文系名譽教授何文匯 "Where Cross-Fertilization Fails"（28/06/2008）、著名作家、崑劇製作人白先勇教授："向高克毅先生致敬——談《台北人》中譯經過兼論崑劇《牡丹亭》的翻譯"（12/11/2008）、香港中文大學中文系講座教授張洪年："意在文內：從文本翻譯看文學創作"（16/05/2009）等。（本回憶錄作者按：上述6次講座錄自《譯訊》第48期2009年9月出版，與2006年11月出版的第47期相隔兩年10個月，在這期間的有幾次講座可能漏報。）

　　二、獎學金：香港翻譯學會——羅富昌獎學金頒獎典禮（2010年4月10日），演講嘉賓為著名作家余秋雨教授。

　　三、會員大會：2010年6月26日舉行學會會員大會，演講嘉賓為香港中文大學翻譯系陳善偉教授："漫談科技翻譯"。會員大會改選執委會、選出陳德鴻為新一屆（2010-2012）會長、潘漢光和陳潔瑩為副會長。

　　四、《翻譯季刊》：陳德鴻從2005年開始負起《翻譯季刊》主編的責任，2004年6月至2010年6月金聖華擔任會長期間，陳德鴻主編了35-38（2005）、39-42（2006）、43-46（2007）、47-50（2008）、51/52-53/54（2009）、55、56（2010）等共22期，並從51/52期開始，《翻譯季刊》登上網絡平台，成為國際性研究刊物。主編陳德鴻在"主編的話"裏說："第51、52合刊是學報的里程碑：《翻譯季刊》進入了第16年。在過去15年裏，我們發表了200餘篇論文、書評，在香港堪稱尚無對手的學術刊物（可與香港大學的《東方文化》媲美）。其次，更重要的是這份學報因加入了著名的研究資料庫 EBSCO HOST，以數碼形式出現。通過EBSCO資料庫，全球的讀者都可以通過公共和大學圖書館訂閱。事

實上，《翻譯季刊》數碼化後不僅擴大了知名度，更令之成為全球化的學術刊物。"（頁VI，中譯者為本回憶錄作者）。我個人覺得這是非常突出、非常重要的成就。作為學術、翻譯專業團體，學報、研討會、講座是三項重要的會務工作，而學報則是重中之重，沒有學報，翻譯學會很容易下滑而成為俱樂部，研討會會成為社交活動場合。

五、研討會：與香港中央圖書館聯合主辦為期一天的"翻譯與藝術研討會"（2005年5月29日），並舉行"賴恬昌慈善書畫展"以配合研討會主題（翻譯與舞臺、電影、音樂、書畫）；主辦"第18屆世界翻譯大會分論壇："從語言工程到法律語言學的調動：香港從單語法律制度轉型至雙語法律制度"（2008年8月6日在上海國際會議中心舉行，學會代表團包括會長金聖華、香港政府法律草擬前專員嚴元浩、香港城市大學講座教授鄒嘉彥語與中文、翻譯及語言學系冼景矩博士）。

六、獎學金："香港翻譯學會——獅球教育基金翻譯研究獎學金2004/5"於2005年9月3日舉行，首屆參加這項獎學金有11人，分別來自中、港、臺三地。第一名為香港理工大學翻譯碩士生鄭旭小姐，論文題目 "The Chinese Translation of Shakespeare's Suggestive Language"；"香港翻譯學會——震雄集團獎學金2005/6"於2006年7月22日舉行，6名獲獎者為香港中文大學歐陽慧、嶺南大學李斯婷、城市大學廖頌欣、浸會大學羅慧佩、香港大學徐錦、香港理工大學黃國麟。這六名得獎者都是翻譯本科最後一年學生。

七、翻譯比賽："全港青年翻譯比賽2005"於4月17日舉行，是這項比賽的第30屆，主席評判為陳潔瑩博士，評判為中文大學的童元方博士、浸會大學的周兆祥博士。這次參加的人數達300人，頒獎禮於2005年7月7日在美麗華酒店舉行。2006年第31屆的比賽參加者有350人，4月30日舉行，7月6日舉行頒獎禮。2008年有300人參加，7月3日

頒發獎品；2009年有400人參加，是歷屆最多人參加的。

八、學會於2005年9月3日在香港大學黃麗松講堂舉行榮譽會士專題講座，由學會會員黃國彬、楊慧儀等宣讀贊辭，再由獲頒榮譽會士的許鈞教授、彭鏡禧教授、羅志雄先生演講，題目依次為"網路讀者與文學翻譯批評"、"瞻前顧後：一個翻譯工作者的告白"、"英語新詞的構成與翻譯問題"；當天晚上學會設宴於香港君悅酒店特首廳，晚宴程序包括：頒授"榮休會長"銜予賴恬昌、劉靖之、榮譽會士致答辭、《翻譯季刊》創刊主編劉靖之教授致辭，慶祝該刊創刊十週年。

2006年學會成立35周年，執委會組織了一系列慶祝活動，包括出版學會《簡史》、"翻譯、語言、文化"傑出學者公開講座系列、榮譽會士銜頒授儀式、35周年晚宴等。"公開講座系列"有三個：一、臺灣名作家、文化評論員龍應台教授講題"從副刊看文化心靈——以德語為例"（22/4/2006）；二、臺灣大學中文系榮休教授、學會榮譽會士林文月教授"最認真的讀者：談談我的翻譯經驗與心得"（20/5/2006）；三、2006年榮譽會士講座：（i）臺灣名作家、翻譯家黃文範教授："英漢文學翻譯詞典淺議"；（ii）香港中文大學翻譯系講座教授黃國彬："細心翻譯與雄心翻譯"；（iii）中國社會科學院外國文學研究所譯審羅新璋"譯文增刪"；（iv）英國Aston大學副校長、德語系教授 Nigel Reeves："Bertolt Brecht and the Chinese Literary Tradition：From Translation to Inspiration"（三講均安排在2006年11月25日上午9:30至中午12時）。

35週年慶祝活動還有一場"中華經典外譯學術研討會"，由學會與香港中華書店聯合主辦、香港大學中文系協辦。講者為：一、中國出版集團總裁楊牧之、外文出版社總編輯黃有義、嶺南大學

翻譯系教授陳德鴻、香港中文大學United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia China/HK Programme Director Bright Linder博士。

2010-2018年間的活動

　　譯陳德鴻於2010年6月接任學會會長一職，潘漢光、陳潔瑩為副會長，分別負責學會內部和對外事務。陳德鴻從1990年代中便開始參與學會事務。我於1996年9月上任嶺南學院（1998年秋升格為大學）翻譯系教席兼任文學與翻譯研究中心主任，便立即邀請陳德鴻和翻譯系同事孫藝風參與《翻譯季刊》編輯工作，然後更說服陳德鴻擔任學會義務秘書工作。2001年12月在香港大學和嶺南大學舉行的"國際譯聯第三屆亞洲翻譯家論壇"便是我初次與他合作的大項目，之後的《翻譯季刊》主編和會長自然而然地由陳德鴻來接任——2005年開始主編學報、2010年6月開始接任會長。在做會長之前，他擔任副會長凡6年。

　　陳德鴻於2010年6月開始接任會長，那時的大學翻譯系／課程已全面理論化，文化研究也佔有重要地位，翻譯技巧與方法只佔整個學位學分一個部分。各大學翻譯系/課程的學生為數不少，並經常舉行專題講座、組織研討會，對學會主辦的兩月一次的午餐例會的專題講座興趣大減，在一定程度上影響了學會的活動。

　　由於《譯訊》與2009年至2011年脫期了兩年三個月，然後再脫期兩年（2013年12月出版第50期），許多學會活動沒有留下記錄，只能依照《譯訊》第49-52期（2011年12月-2016年10月）的報導，敘述如下：

　　一、為慶祝學會成立40週年，學會主辦了多項活動：（i）與香港中央圖書館於2011年5月7日聯合舉辦"翻譯在香港：21世紀的挑戰與機遇"公開講座——"法律文化與法律語言"，主講者為資深大律師、中國證監會國際顧問委員會委員梁定邦博士；"翻譯：中西醫學

的對話”，主講者為香港大學中文學院名譽副教授曾昭祺博士、註冊中醫師陳潤家碩士；“翻譯出版在兩岸三地”，主講者為香港出版總會會長、聯合出版（集團）有限公司副董事長兼總裁陳萬雄博士；（ii）創會會員、榮休會長賴恬昌先生九十壽慶書畫展（香港大會堂高座展覽廳，11-15/11/2011）；（iii）學會執委會於2011年11月28日在中環馬車會慶祝學會成立四十週年及創會會員、榮休會長賴恬昌先生九十大壽；（iv）出版《翻譯季刊》第1-50期精選文集《蛻變中的中國翻譯研究》（中文）和 *Confluences: Translation Research in Chinese and Asian Contexts*（英文，《匯流：中國及亞洲的翻譯研究》）。

　　二、學會與香港中央圖書館聯合主辦了三場“香港的外籍翻譯教師談香港的中英翻譯”：一、香港中文大學翻譯系講師Duncan Poupard主講“Big Fun in Little Stories: Translating Chinese Children's Literature”（15/11/2014）；二、香港浸會大學翻譯課程副教授 Robert Neather主講“Short but Sweet: Translating Short Chinese Texts from the World Around Us”（29/11/2014）；三、香港大學中文學院助理教授Lucas Klein博士主講“Happy Fish and Monk's Mountains: Literary Translation as a Way of Reading”（12/12/2014）。

　　三、2016年是學會成立45週年，慶祝活動包括研討會、系列講座、榮譽會士頒授和論壇，後兩項因各種問題而延至2017年：

　　1.“翻譯與專業”研討會，講者包括香港特別行政區律政司袁國強資深大律師致開幕詞、香港中文大學（深圳）人文社科學院陳善偉教授、（“翻譯專業與科技”）、商務印書館（香港）有限公司前總經理兼總編輯陸國燊博士（“對香港中文典籍出版的回顧”）、香港律師會副會長彭韻僖律師（“香港的法律翻譯”）。（與香港大學中文學院聯合主辦，12/11/2016）

　　2.“翻譯與生活”系列講座，講者包括珠海學院商學院院長何

潹生教授（"以心靈相通為本的意譯：以《道德經》和《信心銘》為例"，19/11/2016）；香港中文大學翻譯碩士劉家儀女士（"翻譯與博物館"，10/12/2016）；執業大律師馬耀添博士（"法律翻譯：我從立法機構工作所得的體驗"，21/01/2017）。（與香港公共圖書館聯合主辦）

　　3. 學會"榮譽會士"銜頒授儀式暨大師論壇：由學會會長陳德鴻教授頒發"榮譽會士"銜予：

<div align="center">

黎翠珍教授　香港浸會大學榮休教授

馬耀添博士　執業大律師

Professor David Pollard　香港中文大學前翻譯系講座教授

楊承淑教授　台灣輔仁大學跨文化研究所所長

張經浩教授　上海理工大學外語學院教授

</div>

Professor David Pollard代表榮譽會士致答謝辭。

　　4. "榮譽會士論壇"

（i）馬耀添博士："Translation is Key to Success"

（ii）Professor David Pollard："The Interest of Ghostland"

（iii）楊承淑教授："翻譯教授與國際醫療"

（iv）張經浩教授："譯事難——我的體驗"

（2017年12月2日上午9時至12時，與香港大學中文學院合辦）

　　四、學會繼續協助香港半島青年商會主辦全港青年翻譯和口譯比賽。從2011至2018年，每屆均能吸引眾多青年和學生報名參加比賽。學會執委和各院校的翻譯和口譯教師均不辭勞苦地義務評判，對此

學會致以衷心謝意。在翻譯獎學金方面，羅富昌獎學金從2009/10至2011/12、2012/13至2014/15連續6年慷慨捐助，金額更從第一個三年的每年三萬元增至第二個三年的每年四萬，獎勵香港大學生主修翻譯成績優異的應屆畢業生。學會對此善舉，銘感於心。

五、《譯訊》雖然頻頻脫期，仍然刊登了好幾篇感人的訃文——從2008年開始，一連幾年都有大師級的翻譯和口譯家離世，包括金聖華〈愛美的夫子——懷念永遠的喬治高（1912-2008）〉和John Minford "David Hawkes（1923-2009）"（第48期，2009年9月）、譚載喜〈譯學、譯論、譯道——緬懷一代大師奈達（1914-2011）〉（第49期，2011年12月）、Peter Newmark（1916-2011）——Reminiscences and tributes by family, friends and colleagues"（第50期，2013年12月）、《譯訊》編輯部〈中英叢刊走廊上的見證人——鄭仰平（1929-2014）〉（第51期，2014年12月）以及我寫的一篇小文〈記楊憲益二、三事——楊憲益百年叢書〉（第52期，2016年10月）。

報紙上還刊登了記念思果和張同的文章，一篇是榮譽會士劉紹銘寫的〈憶思果〉（《信報》，25/5/2004），另兩篇是張柱〈痛失健筆張同先生〉（《信報》，8/10/2009）和詩人戴天〈懷念張同先生〉（《信報》，9/10/2009）。思果（1918-2004）是學會1987年的榮譽會士，是著名的翻譯家和散文家，也是"沙田七友"之一。另一位"沙田七友"黃國彬為他的逝世寫了一篇訃文〈當代聖方濟——悼思果先生〉（《譯訊》第44期，2004年9月）。張同（1918-2009）是學會的資深會員，既是翻譯能手又是漫畫名家，張柱是張同的兒子。

六、《翻譯季刊》：在2005-2018的14年裏，《譯訊》雖然脫期了幾次，但《翻譯季刊》大體上沒有脫期，每年4期，共出版了54期：2005-2017年共出版了52期，2018年到6月底出版了兩期。對這驕人的成績，我

們應該感謝主編陳德鴻（從2005年第35期開始），執行編輯潘漢光（從創刊開始）和Robert Neather（從2003年第30期開始）和副執行編輯邵璐（從2009年第51期開始）、李忠慶（從2012年第64期開始）、李波和洪蘭星（從2015年第77期開始）。這份學報的所有編輯人員從創刊開始全部是義務的，堅持了近半個世紀，實屬難得！

香港的翻譯生態

　　在過去8年裏（2010年6月-2018年6月），香港的翻譯生態繼續跟隨着新潮流發展，大學裏的翻譯教師集中精力學習歐美翻譯理論，陳德鴻、張南峰編《西方翻譯理論精選》（香港城市大學出版社，2000）銷路奇佳是為證明。陳德鴻的 *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory* 進一步肯定以嚴復的"信、達、雅"為中心的傳統中國文學翻譯原則缺乏西方以語言學為基礎的翻譯理論，言下之意是說"信、達、雅"的中國傳統翻譯準繩已落伍了。2011年學會40週年，會長陳德鴻建議以《蛻變中的中國翻譯研究》（中文）和《匯流：中國及亞洲的翻譯研究》（英文文集：*Confluences: Translation Research in Chinese and Asian Contexts*）為書名，出版論文集，以示香港翻譯學會與時俱進，因為這兩本論文集的文章都是從《翻譯季刊》第1至50期（1995-2008）裏挑選出來的15篇英文、16篇中文文章。

　　有見於這種趨勢，中國英漢語比較研究會在上海外語教育出版社的支持下，委託幾位翻譯學者編輯"英漢對比與翻譯研究"系列文集八冊：一、共性·個性·視覺——英漢對比的理論與方法研究；二、結構·語義·關係——英漢微觀對比研究；三、認知·語用·功能——英漢宏觀對比研究；四、比較·鑑別·應用——英漢對比應用研究；五、衝突·互補·共存——中西文化對比研究；六、結構·解構·建構——翻譯理論研

究；七、二元‧多元‧綜合——翻譯本質與標準研究；八、方法‧技巧‧批評——翻譯教學與實踐研究。這套叢書比較全面系統地總結1977-2007年間國內英漢對比和翻譯研究的歷史檢閱，涵蓋英漢對比語言學、對比文化學、翻譯學三個學科。上文曾提及文集七，拙文〈重神似而不重形似——嚴復以來的翻譯理論〉被收入此文集。《二元‧多元‧綜合——翻譯本質與標準研究》的主編為南京國際關係學院教授楊曉榮，在"編後記"裏，她說：編選這部文集需要精心選擇的是三個部分：一是作為正文部分全文收入的幾十篇論文；二是附錄"重要論著索引"中的重要書名即"著作部分"；三是"索引"裏的重要文目即"論文部分"。她選擇的時間範圍是從1977年到2007年，選擇的主線是這部文集的主題，即基於翻譯本質研究的翻譯標準研究。

我用了不少篇幅來敘述"英漢對比與翻譯研究"系列文集和楊曉榮主編的《二元‧多元‧綜合——翻譯本質與標準研究》，因為我同意這八冊系列文集的觀點和方法——集中英、漢兩個語種來研究其特性以及理論、應用和方法；我也同意拙文〈重神似不重形似〉應屬於翻譯的價值和標準探討和追求，不屬於翻譯理論的範疇。把翻譯集中在英漢對比、把標準和價值與理論區分開，令絕大部分的香港翻譯從業人士頓然發現了焦點和目標，避免了盲目、漫無重點的搬用歐美翻譯理論於英漢翻譯。

在以歐美翻譯理論為時髦的大氣候下，香港的翻譯學者對於中國與文學翻譯為主的嚴復、趙元任、胡適、林語堂、傅雷、朱光潛等有關翻譯原則、方法、標準已不感興趣，也不再用"信、達、雅"、"化境"、"神似與形似"等傳統名詞，改用"傳意翻譯"、"語意翻譯"、"對等效果"語言學名詞以及解構學派的"解構"、"差異"、"可譯性／不可譯性"等翻譯學名詞。向歐美翻譯理論取經這股浪潮從1990年代前後

開始，一直持續到現在，前後有30年。我在上文曾說過，歐美翻譯理論是取自歐洲語文的營養，如Eugene Nida是《聖經》翻譯專家，Peter Newmark是英德翻譯家，好像沒有一位翻譯理論家懂中文。而漢學家如我認識的David Hawkes、John Minford、Göran Malmqvist、David Pollard等都是文學作品翻譯家，對理論毫無興趣。那麼這些與外譯中，尤其是英譯中毫無關係的歐美翻譯理論對外譯中有借鑒之用嗎？有趣的是作者的參考文獻絕大部分是英文，極少數有德文、法文的論著，如楊曉榮主編的《二元·多元·綜合——翻譯本質與標準研究》收入的王東風〈解構"忠實"——翻譯神話的終結〉（2004）一文的26種參考文獻有7種是中文、19種是英文；又如朱志瑜、徐敏慧編《當代翻譯研究論集》（四川人民出版社，2015）收入的王斌華〈口譯研究的路徑與方法——回顧與前瞻〉一文，47種參考文獻全部是英文，其中有44篇是一位作者D. Gile從1988到2006年在不同學報上發表的文章（頁374-378）。形成這種現象主要有兩個原因：一、中文文章少；二、香港的大學教師需要經常發表研究成果，最好是用英文來寫，以示其國際視野。由此可見，大學教師的著作發表影響他們的事業前途，顧不到與中英、英中翻譯的實踐中所遭遇的問題是否與英、中——中、英翻譯有關。

結　語

　　由香港翻譯學會有其特殊性，因為香港在中國的近代史裏有她的特殊性：作為殖民地，香港的統治者通過英語、英文來管理以華人為主的城市，在1974年中文與英文一樣成為法定語文之後，英國殖民者雖然以英語、英文來管理香港，雖然英、中同時為法定語文，但一切以英文為準。為了做到上傳下達，香港基本上是中、英並用的雙語社

會，但英語英文處於主導地位。香港翻譯學會成立於中文尚未成為法定語文之前的1971年。中文於1974年成為法定語文之一，1984年中英兩國就香港問題簽署聯合聲明，1990年香港《基本法》獲全國人民代表大會通過，並自1997年7月1日起實施。這一連串歷史事件促使香港的語文經歷了巨大的變化，就在這段時間裏，中文的社會地位逐漸提高，翻譯在香港的大專院校的課程裏備受重視。香港翻譯學會的創會成員，尤其是宋淇和賴恬昌兩位，前者從翻譯實踐、刊物出版和講座等幾個方面，後者則從課程的設立和翻譯員的培訓方面來進行建設、發展學會的會務和聲譽。學會的成立在中文成為法定語文之前三年，似乎對香港未來在語文上的變化有所感應。

在過去半個世紀裏，學會遵循兩大指導方針進行會務：一是促進翻譯教育、翻譯實踐、翻譯研究的發展；一是促進與翻譯有關的文化交流。其實這是兩者相互有關的，翻譯教育需要實踐和研究的支持，與翻譯有關的文化交流則離不開研討會、頒授榮譽會士、交換刊物如《譯訊》、《翻譯季刊》以及研討會論文集、個人論著等。學會在1980年代訪問北京、上海以及臺北，1990年代與國際譯聯（FIT）、英國特許語文學會（Chartered Institute of Linguists London）緊密聯繫，並於2001年12月在香港大學和嶺南大學舉行"國際譯聯第三屆亞洲翻譯家論壇"，與會者達180餘人、提交論文近120餘篇。千禧年學會繼續沿著同一方向推動會務，尤其是在舉辦公共講座、全港青年翻譯與口譯比賽、翻譯獎學金、編撰出版《翻譯季刊》和《譯訊》以及頒授"榮譽會士"銜等五個方面，但午餐例會和大規模的研討會則因各大學翻譯系均有自己的活動而減少了。

學會執行委員會，照我個人的看法已經過了三代。第一代包括馬蒙（會長任期1971-1973、1973-1974）、賴恬昌（1974-1975、1975-

1976、1980-1982、1982-1984、1984-1986）、宋淇（1976-1978、1978-1980），三位之中，賴恬昌任會長八年、宋淇任四年、馬蒙任三年。第二代包括我本人（1986-1988、1988-1990、1994-1996、1997-1998、1998-2000、2000-2002、2002-2004，會長任期共13年）、金聖華（1990-1992、2004-2006、2006-2008、2008-2010，共8年）、孫述憲（1992-1994，兩年）、羅志雄（1996-1997, 1年）。第三代從陳德鴻（2010-2012、2012-2014、2014-2016、2016-2018，共8年）開始，其實第三代應該在千禧之初接班，但當時年青一代沒有人肯出來做會長而迫使第二代延長任期。

　　三代人所處的時代相異，個人的教育、興趣、性格等都不同，社會環境也變了，但領導一個像香港翻譯學會的執委會所需要具備的基本條件大致一樣：一是翻譯上有公認的成就和貢獻；二是有良好的社會網絡，能夠為學會爭取資源，有利於會務的開展。但事實上很少人同時具有這兩個條件，這就需要在執委會裏，既有在翻譯上頗有成就的學者，又要有廣泛的社團關係的委員，如學術基金會、教育基金會等組織。學會在過去數十年裏的經歷很清楚地說明了這一點。我個人認為精通業務要比社會關係重要。

　　翻譯這個行業與醫生、律師、會計師、測量師、建築師/設計師等專業不同，翻譯員到目前為止不需要領取執照才可以執業，但其他專業就不同了，如做醫生、建築師、會計師等都需要考取牌照/執照才能開業。有沒有因翻譯錯誤而需負上法律責任的翻譯員、口譯員？好像到目前為止香港還沒有。可能是由於重要文件大部分以英文為主，一切以英文本為準的緣故罷！從這一點來看，翻譯學會這種組織可有可無，一些抱有實用主義的青年人就不會浪費時間和精神來為翻譯學會提供義務服務，令人擔憂的是現代社會的青年一代，持有實用、利己

主義的人要比他們的先輩為數更多！

　　回憶錄是一面鏡子，能將過去照得清清楚楚，學會過去近半個世紀的講座、研討會、訪問、學報和論著的出版令我們增長了見識、長期薰陶令我們具備了國際視野，但用英文寫作、出版並不代表國際性，用中文寫作出版也不一定應標籤為地方性或區域性。西方漢學家絕大多數只用母語寫作，很少用中文，但香港和大陸的學者，尤其是科學領域的學者，努力用英文寫作，為了在國際學報上刊登，以達到在國際舞臺上顯示研究成果，這顯然是客觀環境、實際需要所驅使的。香港的翻譯教師、學者為了名聲、升級，不得不用英文寫作，我十分理解，並深表同情，但西方翻譯理論真是如此重要、實用嗎？我總是覺得理論是從實踐中提煉出來的，不是發明的，像自然科學那樣"被發現"的。純數學、純物理學等純科學理論一旦應用到實用科技上就能發出驚人的效果，如"相對論"，如高錕的光纖。但西方的翻譯理論如語言學派、文化學派、解構學派以及各式各樣的學派，建立在歐洲語文基礎上，能為外譯中、中譯外解決問題嗎？中國翻譯學者跟西方翻譯理論之風有30年，在外譯中上有什麼創見？有幾位權威？我們回過頭來再提問：中國翻譯學者跟風跟了30年，引起了西方翻譯學者的共鳴和回應嗎？為什麼外國漢學家對翻譯理論不感興趣？為什麼外國翻譯理論家對中文不感興趣？我提出這幾條問題，是因為我覺得中國在收回香港之後，一部分翻譯理論界的學者心甘情願地擁抱殖民主義──自願做西方翻譯理論的殖民臣民！這與音樂界的情況一模一樣，都是西方的次等公民！

　　旅美華裔學者余英時為他的論文集再版所寫的"序：《歷史與思想》三十八年"裏有這麼一段話："我中年以後改用中文為我個人學術著作的重要媒介，本書是最早的一個見證。本來我在美國教書和研究，

著作自然應該用英文刊佈。但是1971年夏初訪日本和臺北，並重回香
港母校（新亞書院）會晤師友，我發生了一個很深切的感觸。我發現我
的英文專著和學報論文，在整個東方學界的同行中，根本無人問津。
尤其是在日本京都大學的人文研究所訪談之後，這印象更是牢牢地銘
刻於心。我已萌生了用中文著述的念頭，希望我的研究成果可以傳布
到西方漢學的小圈子以外（當時西方漢學遠不及今天這樣流行）。"余
英時為了讀者和讀者的反應而用中文寫作、發表、翻譯學者還要為增
加優秀的中文論著而用中文寫作出版，因為中文讀者比英文讀者更需
要夠水準的著作，對所討論的事情更感興趣，因此會有更強烈甚至廣
泛、深刻的反應。

　香港是世界上僅有的在生活上需要翻譯的幾座城市、地區之一，
如新加坡、加拿大的蒙特利尔等，因此香港翻譯學會在殖民地時代和
後殖民地時代的歷史經驗非常珍貴。假如我們說中國的第二次翻譯高
潮（"五四運動"前後）是偏重於文史哲，尤其是文學，那麼香港的翻譯
則是全方位的，因為香港的各行各業每天都需要翻譯（包括口譯），因
此香港雖小、香港翻譯學會雖小，但所涉及的範圍、內容、功能、效
果都是龐大的、廣泛的、觸及生活的各個領域的、意義深邃的。

參考文獻

Chan, Leo Tak-hung (2004). *Twentieth-century Chinese translation theory: Modes, issues and debates.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Liu, Ching-chih and Chan, Leo Tak-hung (eds) (2011). *Confluences: Translation Research in Chinese and Asian Contexts.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong Translation Society.

Hong Kong Translation Society (1995-2018). *Translation Quarterly.* (Issue No.1 (March 1995) to No.84 (June 2018)).

香港翻譯學會（1995-2018），《翻譯季刊》，第1期（1995年3月）至第84期（2018年6月）。

香港翻譯學會 (1972-2018)，《譯訊》，香港翻譯學會會訊第一期 (1972年8月1日) 至第53期 (2018年4月)。

朱志瑜、徐敏慧 (編)，(2015)，《當代翻譯研究論集》，成都：四川人民出版社。

余英時 (2014)，"《歷史與思想》三十八年"，《蘋果日報》"蘋果樹下"，2014年4月27日。

陳德鴻、張南峰 (編)(2000)，《西方翻譯理論精選》，香港：城市大學出版社。

楊曉榮 (主編)(2012)，《二元‧多元‧綜合——翻譯本質與標準研究》，上海：上海外語教育出版社。

劉靖之、陳德鴻 (主編)(2011)，《蛻變中的中國翻譯研究》，香港：香港翻譯學會。

劉選民 (主編)(2009)，《結構‧解構‧建構——翻譯理論研究》，上海：上海外語教育出版社。

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：translationquarterly@gmail.com。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. *Translation Quarterly* is a journal published by the Hong Kong Translation Society. Contributions, in either Chinese or English, should be original, hitherto unpublished, and not being considered for publication elsewhere. Once a submission is accepted, its copyright is transferred to the publisher. Translated articles should be submitted with a copy of the source text and a brief introduction 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 perferably be checked by a native speaker before submission.

8. Electronic files of contributions should be submitted to translationquarterly@gmail.com.

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 Editors.

《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，由陳德鴻教授及倪諾誠教授出任主編，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 3943 9800

傳　　真：+852 2603 7355

電　　郵：cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk

綱　　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 Editors are Professors Leo Tak-hung Chan and Robert Neather, 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. Engene 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 3943 9800
> Fax: +852 2603 7355
> Email: cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk
> Website: www.chineseupress.com

Translation Quarterly 翻譯季刊

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 3943 9800
  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.91 to 94(2019).*

Subscription and order	Rates
1 year	☐ HK$624 / US$80
2 years*	☐ HK$1,123 / US$144
3 years**	☐ HK$1,498 / US$192
Back issues (No.1 to No.90)	☐ 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: 20140402