Translation Quarterly No. 36

目錄 CONTENTS

ISSN 1027855936

9 771027 855003

Translation Quarterly

No. 36 2005

Special Issue II

Selected papers presented at the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇五年 第三十六期

第二屆清華—嶺南國際翻譯學術研討會專號(二)

Translation Quarterly

No. 36 2005
Special Issue II
Selected papers presented at the Second
Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇五年
第三十六期
第二屆清華—嶺南國際
翻譯學術研討會專號
(二)

《翻譯季刊》
二〇〇五年六月 第三十六期

Translation Quarterly
No. 36, June 2005

ISSN 1027-8559-36

Printing sponsored by
C & C OFFSET PRINTING CO., LTD.
中華商務彩色印刷有限公司
贊助印刷

翻譯季刊
Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會
The Hong Kong Translation Society

Translation Quarterly **No. 36, June 2005**

Special Issue II: Selected papers presented at the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium, 5 - 6 June 2004

目錄 CONTENTS

Chief Editor's Note

It was seven years ago that I last wrote an Introductory Note for *Translation Quarterly*, on that occasion for the Special Issue on "Translation Teaching: East-West and North-South" (issues 9 and 10, 1998). The momentous changes that have occurred to the journal in the interim are all too obvious. In particular, a dedicated and resourceful team of Editors, under the leadership of Professor Liu Ching-chih, has ensured that production is always on schedule, with four handsome volumes every year, and that there is a fine balance between articles in Chinese and English, between pieces submitted by Chinese and overseas scholars. I am more than happy to be back at the helm.

In this, the second of four projected Special Issues containing papers from the Second Tsinghua-Lingnan Translation Symposium of 2004, we have contributions from both sides of the Taiwan Strait, in our two "working" languages. Yu Kwang-chung engages with the perennial question of how translators should tackle "empty" words in translating from Chinese into English and vice versa. With reference to a wide range of examples from classical Chinese poetry as well as works by John Dryden and Christopher Marlowe, the veteran poet-translator revisits some thorny issues, but with unswerving confidence that the best translator can overcome his problems like a skilled kung-fu master.

Martha Cheung addresses the ideological forces behind the

compilation of translation anthologies, making specific reference to her own (and Jane Lai's) voluminous anthology of contemporary Chinese drama published in 1997. Here personal experience undoubtedly adds depth to her analysis of possible uses of anthologizing to create new canons and to project and/or subvert cultural images.

Brian Holton starts off with a provocative title, "The Sound of Snow", and invites his readers to ponder on how "those who have never traveled to the north in winter, never smelt snow or heard the crunching noise it makes underfoot", can have the requisite sensory experience to translate the word "snow". While his concern is primarily with the problems inherent in the training of translators, I must say that his paper also refocuses attention on the necessity for the translator to *feel* what he is translating. Thus it continues the theoretical discussion of the *somatics* of translation first adumbrated by Douglas Robinson in *The Translator's Turn*.

He Honghua reacts to the current disparagement of the linguistic approach to translation by asserting that the notion of "equivalence" cannot be dispensed with, since some sort of relationship certainly exists between a target text and a source text, or else the former cannot be designated as a translation of the latter. Through looking microscopically at a plethora of texts, he demonstrates how the comparative study of coherence in the target and source texts can yield fruitful results. His paper should

remind us that the linguists are always ready to stage a comeback.

This issue is rounded off by a non-Symposium article by Jessica Yeung which deals with a multitude of new, inventive uses of the concept of "translation". It should serve as a useful corrective to the belief—or fear—among some scholars that Translation Studies is somehow moving into a cul-de-sac only decades after its inception.

We welcome suggestions and comments from our readers not just on this issue but also with regard to the overall editorial approach we have adopted.

Leo Chan

May 2005

Politics of Representation: A Translation Anthologist's Self-examination

Martha P. Y. Cheung

Abstract

This paper focuses on the politics of representation behind the compilation of anthologies of English translations of Chinese literary works. This type of translation anthology projects to the English-speaking world an image of Chinese literature, and to some extent, of Chinese culture as well. As such, it is bound up with identity construction and image projection. It is also closely related to canon-formation—whether it is to reinforce the prevailing canon, enlarge it, undermine it, subvert it, or replace it. The anthologist, as presenter and selector, has to consider many factors, deploy many strategies, and overcome many constraints. While these issues have been discussed frequently, the attention is mostly on the ways in which translation anthologists have (mis)represented the Other (literature, culture, race). This paper looks at the same issues—but also from the position of a translation anthologist assuming the responsibility of representing her own culture.

One of the impacts which theories of postcolonialism have on the practice of translation and on translation studies as an academic discipline is a much greater awareness of, and a more focused attention on, the relation between translation and the question of identity. The term "identity" normally refers to notions such as a person's understanding of who he/she is and of his/her fundamental characteristics as a human being. As Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak says, "Making sense of ourselves is what produces identity" (Spivak 2000: 395). In translation, the question of identity becomes considerably more complex because it involves the translator as a mediating agent. It is the translator who is responsible for carrying across to the target reader the text that encapsulates its author's sense of who he/she is. As such, translation is bound up with the question of representation—representation in the political and not the mimetic sense. For every act of translation is an attempt to speak on behalf of something or someone, an attempt to speak formally about and for something or someone, whether that "something" is a text or a body of texts, and whether that "someone" is a single person or a group of people. In the postcolonial context, such attempts are never innocent. They are sites for debates (with one's own self or with others) about a number of thorny issues. There is the issue of authority. (Who has the right or power to speak for and on behalf of whom?) There is also the issue of inclusion and exclusion. (Who/what is selected for translation and who/what is left out? Who/what is given the limelight and who/what is suppressed?) These issues lie at the heart of the politics of representation. The aim of this paper is to investigate the politics of representation inscribed in the making of translation anthologies. In particular, it deals with anthologies of English translations of Chinese literary works. [1]

This type of translation anthologies projects to the English-speaking world an image of Chinese literature, and to some extent, of Chinese culture as well. For if one takes culture not simply as being made up of

categories such as material culture, ecology, art, history, etc., but also as being constituted within discourse formation, then translation anthologies, which move and marshal texts into particular groupings, are certainly a type of discourse formation, and on a scale larger than that involving just the operation of a single text. The compilation of a translation anthology is therefore directly related to identity construction and image projection. It is also related to canon-formation—whether it is to reinforce the prevailing canon (of the source culture and/or of the target culture), to enlarge it, undermine it, subvert it, or replace it.

What then are the considerations of the translation anthologist as presenter and selector? Friedrich Schleiermacher has made the observation that when one translates, one either "disturbs the writer as little as possible and moves the reader in his direction, or disturbs the reader as little as possible and moves the writer in his direction" (Robinson 1997: 229). Lawrence Venuti discusses the same issue with the terms "domestication" and "foreignization"—terms which are variants of earlier distinctions such as "naturalization" and "barbarization". [2] These terms, and the modes of thinking they represent, are normally deployed in discussions of the politics of translation. Space, however, does not permit an examination of this issue, though it is also an important aspect of the politics of representation. Suffice it to say that the observations of Schleiermacher and Venuti will be used to analyze the methods of compiling translation anthologies. Assuming that the translation anthology will be comprised of texts selected from the source culture for translation and not simply of texts that have already been translated, the question can be asked as to whether the anthologist should bring a particular literature and culture to the reader or whether the anthologist should bring the reader to that literature and culture. [3] The question can also be asked as to whether the anthologist should stress the similarities or the differences in the literary tastes and creative achievements of the

two cultures involved. But, apart from "domestication" and "foreignization", which seem to me to pose an unnecessary dichotomy, are there other positions from which the anthologist can negotiate? What options does the anthologist have and what constraints must the anthologist face? What, in short, are the politics involved in making these decisions?

I shall explore these questions by drawing from my personal experience as co-editor of the *Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama.* [4] The purpose is not to privilege personal experience but to find a discursive position from which to speak, and to make that position clear to my readers. For I do believe that all attempts at representation are situated (i.e. located in time and space, and traceable to, if not directly informed by, a particular political, ideological or theoretical position) and should be acknowledged as such. Acknowledging the situatedness of my own attempt at representation will allow me to articulate what lies embedded in *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* in its attempt to speak formally about and for "contemporary Chinese drama". [5] The self-examination, or metadiscourse, thus produced can work together with the "Introduction" and the notes about the plays and about the playwrights provided in *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* to offer the reader an image of the source culture that is considerably more complex than if such paratextual writings were not available. The self-examination thus produced can, hopefully, also illustrate the point that the more fully aware one is of the politics of representation, the more empowered one would be to act as a mediating agent between cultures.

Mapping the Domain

In selecting for translation into English (as opposed to compiling

from existing English translations) an anthology of contemporary Chinese drama, the anthologist first has to tackle the question of the domain to be encompassed by the term "Chinese drama". "Drama" in the Chinese context can refer to the various forms of regional opera (known collectively as *geju* 歌劇) that make up the traditional Chinese theatre. It can also refer to *huaju* 話劇—literally, spoken drama, or what theatre-goers in the West simply call "drama". As a dramatic form, spoken drama was imported into China from the West at the beginning of the twentieth century. [6] Except for the darker periods of Chinese history (the Cultural Revolution in the People's Republic of China [PRC] from 1966 to 1976, for example), Western plays have been translated for performance on the Chinese stage all through the decades. The demarcation between traditional Chinese theatre and spoken drama is therefore fairly clear even though the anthologist still has to decide whether to focus on one or the other, or both. My co-editor and I, for reasons of personal interest and specialisation, decided to focus on spoken drama.

Mapping the domain for the word "Chinese", however, is more problematic and involves many other considerations. [7] Should the focus be on the dramatic works of the Chinese mainland alone? Or should the anthology also include works from Taiwan—considered by many to be a part of China? At the time of research, there was also the question of whether Hong Kong—still a British colony—should be included. All these are politically sensitive questions. Even if one tries to be inclusive, one still has to consider whether the Chinese mainland, Taiwan and Hong Kong will be given equal or proportional representation (in terms of the number of plays to be included) and what this implies in terms of the rival claims made by the PRC and Taiwan to be the legitimate heir of the "authentic" Chinese literary tradition. Equally sensitive is the issue of language. In English, the word "Chinese" can refer to the Chinese language. The anthology would then include texts written in Chinese—

whether selected from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macau, Singapore, Malaysia, the United States, the United Kingdom, or the PRC itself. But then "the Chinese language" is also a problematic designation. As Victor H. Mair, an experienced editor of translation anthologies of Chinese literature, has noted, "it is hard to define precisely what is meant by '*the* Chinese language'" because "Chinese language includes such widely dissimilar entities as Hoklo, Cantonese, Pekingese, Classical Chinese, and Modern Standard Mandarin …" (Mair 1995: 232). While the complex question of whether these are separate languages can be left to the linguists, a decision is still required. Indeed, the issue of which of the many entities of the Chinese language would be chosen remains, ultimately, an ideological question.

The politics of representation involves not just taking a position on issues related to the source culture (in this case, my home culture) but also issues related to the receiving culture. Where Chinese spoken drama is concerned, the following questions are in order: (1) What are the images of contemporary Chinese spoken drama current among English-speaking countries? (2) What representations—in the form of existing anthologies of contemporary Chinese spoken drama—are available in the English-speaking world? (3) What kind of identity has been constructed for contemporary Chinese spoken drama? (4) What position does contemporary Chinese spoken drama occupy in the literary polysystem of the receiving culture?

In the early 1990s, when research on this anthology first started and well before the Western readers have heard of the name of Gao Xingjian 高行健, 2000 Nobel laureate in Literature, the English-speaking world only had a blurred image of contemporary Chinese drama. At best, people would have some recollection of the rare stage productions that had toured the West—*Teahouse* 茶館, for example. Or they would associate Chinese spoken drama with the "model revolutionary works"

樣板戲 such as *The White Haired Girl: An Opera in Five Acts* 白毛女, which they had read about in newspapers and magazines. A small portion of the university population in the United States, Britain or Australia might have seen stage productions of Chinese spoken drama in English, but few Chinese plays had been published in English translation. The only anthology, in English translation, of twentieth-century Chinese spoken drama available was Edward M. Gunn's *Twentieth Century Chinese Drama: An Anthology*, published in 1983. Spanning the sixty years between 1919 and 1979, this anthology features sixteen plays, fifteen of which are selected from the Chinese mainland, and one from Taiwan. Five of the plays are translated in abridged form. Representation in an abridged form says a lot about the literary merits, or rather, the lack of them, of the plays included, and will therefore lead to a certain impression of the state of spoken drama in the Chinese mainland as a whole. [8] Representation in terms of number, besides being an implicit statement that the Chinese mainland holds exclusive claims to the main tradition in Chinese spoken drama, will also lead to a certain impression of the overall quality of spoken drama in Taiwan. In the opening paragraph of the "Introduction", Gunn says that the work of the Chinese writers "is offered here not in competition with the pillars of modern Western drama, but rather as studies of what and how this foreign art and its concerns have been translated into the bold experiments of young Chinese writers" (Gunn 1983: vii). The tone, whether interpreted as patronizing or not, will very likely lead to an impression of Chinese drama as being somewhat impoverished, definitely inferior to Western drama. Towards the end of the "Introduction", Gunn lays bare his intention of compiling the anthology. It is intended to fill "the basic need for an anthology of twentieth-century Chinese drama based on a systematic appreciation of its development and representative concerns" (Gunn 1983: xx).

A poor relation of Western drama, interesting for what the plays

say about the "representative concerns" of the "young Chinese writers" and their "broader views for social reforms and revolution" (Gunn 1983: vii)—this then was the identity constructed for twentieth-century Chinese spoken drama. In the early 1980s, it was probably an accurate representation and Gunn's anthology, whatever criticisms of it one might have, is an important, highly respectable, and irreplaceable pioneering work. But in the years since then, contemporary Chinese spoken drama has grown and developed and flourished. It needed a new representation. It was ready to leave the marginal position into which it had been slotted in the Western literary polysystem.

An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama was therefore conceived as a new programme of identity construction and image making. It was a general determination to provide an identity different from that constructed by Gunn's collection that helped me map the domain for this anthology. Covering the years 1981 to 1995, the aim is to show that contemporary Chinese spoken drama has, in the decades since the sixty years (1919-1979) covered by Gunn's anthology, gradually come of age and to illustrate this by showing Chinese spoken drama in all its richness and variety. The plays are all translated in their entirety to enable the readers to assess for themselves their aesthetic and literary merits. Moreover, the focus is not on the Chinese mainland alone. In addition to six plays from the Chinese mainland, the anthology includes works from Taiwan (five) and Hong Kong (four), with roughly the same weighting in length. This weighting is deliberate. If Hong Kong (which is where I was situated, still am situated) is to cease to be a British colony and gain a new identity as a legitimate part of China, then Hong Kong commands a legitimate place in the anthology. So does Taiwan, if the one-China policy is to be fully respected. The anthology therefore registers a refusal to marginalize the drama from Hong Kong and Taiwan. It registers, too, a refusal to deprive Hong Kong and Taiwan of the right to

representation in the discursive mapping of contemporary Chinese spoken drama. The decision, however, was not based on political considerations alone. In both Taiwan and Hong Kong, there is a tradition of spoken drama which can be traced back to that of the Chinese mainland before the establishment of the PRC, but which has developed in distinctly different ways, and yielded very different, but equally exciting results. No reason, therefore, why the Chinese mainland should be given exclusive claims to contemporary Chinese drama.

This decision to include—yes, include, not just tokenize—Hong Kong and Taiwan in the anthology turns out to be of greater cultural and political significance than I had anticipated at the time. [9] *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* was published in 1997. A few months earlier, in 1996, another collection—*Chinese Drama After the Cultural Revolution, 1979-1989, An Anthology*—was published in America. Edited by Shiao-Ling S. Yu, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures of Oregon State University, this anthology features the English translation of two traditional opera scripts and five plays—all produced in the Chinese mainland. Dramatic works from Taiwan and Hong Kong are not included, as can perhaps be deduced from the title, and no mention is made of Hong Kong and Taiwan in the introduction written by the editor. Then, in 1998, yet another collection, *Theatre and Society: An Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* appeared, also in America. It was edited by Yan Haiping, a Chinese playwright who was awarded the First Prize for Excellence in Drama 1980-81, by the Society of Chinese Dramatists and the Ministry of Culture of the PRC for her historical play *Li Shimin, Prince of Qin* 秦王李世民, and who subsequently went to America and became an Assistant Professor at the Department of Theatre and Dance of the University of Colorado at Boulder. The anthology consists of the English translations of four plays and one film script, again all selected from the Chinese mainland. Hong

Kong and Taiwan do not figure in the domain mapped for this anthology, even though its title suggests a scope considerably broader than the one compiled by Yu. If anything, an extremely negative image of Hong Kong and Taiwan is projected in the introduction, "Theatre and Society, An Introduction to Contemporary Chinese Drama". There, the point is made —in an implicitly or explicitly disapproving tone—that since the late 1980s, "the aggressive expansion of Western consumer culture" in the "'Kong/Tai' (Hong Kong and Taiwan) style into China" has resulted in the "'Hongkongization' and 'Taiwanization' of Chinese culture", to the detriment of the survival of serious theatre and serious cinema in the Chinese mainland (Yan 1998: xxx). If there is any serious theatre in Hong Kong and Taiwan, no reader of that anthology of "contemporary China drama" will be aware of it. The contrast in scope and in the images of contemporary Chinese drama fashioned by these three anthologies is stark. While this may be so because each anthologist is governed by his/her own "situatedness", the strikingly different identities of contemporary Chinese drama projected by these anthologies should, at the very least, awake us to the need to be alert to the politics of representation in the making of translation anthologies.

In compiling *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama*, considerations about the politics of representation were extended to the selection of publishers. Gunn's anthology came out from Indiana University Press, a mainstream academic publisher. In order for the new identity my co-editor and I have fashioned for contemporary Chinese spoken drama to gain influence, a publisher with a worldwide distribution network was needed. When Oxford University Press (Hong Kong) agreed to publish the work, attempts were made to apply to the publisher's head office in Oxford for the anthology to appear in the series "An Oxford Anthology". A signature title is a form of endorsement of quality. This is one of the strategies an anthologist sensitive to the politics of

representation does well to consider. If the anthologist, like my co-editor, Jane Lai, and myself, does not have the advantage enjoyed by an English, or American, or Australian university professor—a fairly established constituency of readers for their works—such a strategy may be crucial to the introduction of the anthology into the receiving culture. For even if there is no guaranteed readership, a work that takes the form of a signature product from a mainstream publisher could gain easier access to university libraries—a key institution of knowledge and a place where potential readers could be reached. The mapping of the domain will not be complete without identifying a potential space of existence and without ensuring easy movement for the anthology in the receiving culture. [10] This is especially so if there is an asymmetrical power relation between the source and receiving culture, and a huge imbalance in the exchange of cultural products (like translations) between them.

Whose Cup of Tea? Or, the Question of Taste

The anthologist, having addressed the question of what "Chinese drama" encompasses, will then have to consider the next question: what will be selected as "representative" works in the anthology? [11] Here, much depends on whether the anthologist can work without outside interference, such as political censorship and other ideological pressures. W. J. F. Jenner has once made this observation on the editors of Beijing's Foreign Languages Press: "[they] have absolutely no control over the texts selected for translation or the final form of the published translations. These decisions ... are made by political authorities and not by the putative editors ..." (quoted in Lau 1995: 226). To analyze the politics of representation is therefore to see what constraints an anthologist has

to work with, and what political and ideological pressure he/she has to live under; in other words, to pay attention to the situatedness of the anthologist's attempt at representation. Joseph Lau, one of the leading translation anthologists of Chinese literature, also singles out political pressure as a special constraint faced by the PRC anthologists. If and when this constraint is absolute, then the anthologist can only select works considered by the authorities to be "representative". Anthologists outside the PRC (who are situated differently) may be free from such pressures, but they have to work under a different constraint. I call this "the anxiety of representation". This is the anxiety an anthologist will have about how representative she can be of the literature she is anthologizing. Of course, if the culture to be represented is held in low esteem by the receiving culture or by the anthologist, then the anthologist can be as cavalier as she likes. The history of translation, East and West, provides striking examples of anthologies put together with little or no respect for the culture they represent. [12] Assuming, however, that the anxiety is real, one way of easing the pressure is, in the words of Lau, "to 'go native', i.e., to pick those staple products of the genres … that have endured in the Chinese popular imagination" (Lau 1995: 227). Lau, however, regards this as a purely expedient measure. If a translation anthology comprises selections that are made "exclusively on borrowed taste and received opinions", then it would "differ little from the existing Chinese collections". An anthology, Lau believes, "is by its very nature a statement of taste and critical judgment on the part of the editor" (Lau 1995: 227). [13]

Lau's statement deserves to be studied in greater depth. Certainly, questions might be asked as to whether an anthology is, *by its very nature*, a statement of taste and critical judgment on the part of the editor? From where does one derive one's taste? What is one's critical judgment based on? Isn't there some relation between the poetics of the time and

individual taste? Since translation is an act of cross-cultural communication, these questions become even more complex. Indeed, what makes translation studies distinct from literary studies—and therefore translation anthologies different from ordinary anthologies—is the doubly contextualized nature of the constraints faced by the translation anthologist. [14] Take the apparently simple matter of taste. If one is interested in promoting cross-cultural understanding, then, in representing a particular culture, one would be obliged to take into account the taste of that culture. One would be obliged, too, to take into account the taste of the receiving culture, which may be very different. And, in exercising critical judgment in the process of selection, one has to take into account the notion of what constitutes good literature, which may or may not be the same for the two cultures involved. All these go to show that taste can never be an innocent matter.

What is more, in considering the taste of the receiving culture, one has to take into account that culture's prevailing taste for Chinese literature (drama being one of its components), and the prevailing taste for literature in general. Some may ask—is it necessary to draw such a distinction? Is there a taste for Chinese literature as such? Would the reader care about it much as long as it is good literature? But these questions cannot be taken as merely rhetorical, with a straightforward "no" as the answer. For in the decades after the Cultural Revolution in China, i.e., from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, a certain preference could be detected among anthologists of English translations of contemporary Chinese literature —important shapers of taste and setter of norms in the English-speaking culture. It was a preference for works denounced or censored by the PRC authorities, i.e., controversial works noted not so much for their literary merits as their ideology of opposition. The preference also included works that could serve as windows through which to learn about the political and social conditions of China. [15] There is nothing wrong

with taking such an approach; it is all part of the politics of representation. In any case, the old opposition between "treating literature as literature" and "treating literature as social documents" has already been deconstructed by a host of literary critics. Besides, many writers and critics, East and West, have stressed the social and political functions of literature, though not to the exclusion of its aesthetic function. My concern at the time, therefore, was whether contemporary Chinese dramatic works of strong literary merit—strong by Western standards—would be made available in translation to the readers. Another major concern was, if only certain types of dramatic works were to be selected for translation, what kind of image of contemporary Chinese drama would be projected as a result.

Victor H. Mair, quoted earlier, suggests that translation anthologists of Chinese literature should all become "historically-minded anthropologists for a while" (Mair 1995: 254) and concentrate on unearthing works that had been rejected by the "central culture of China" (Mair 1995: 243). In selecting works for translation into English, or for inclusion in translation anthologies in English, the anthologist should examine the corpus of Chinese literature "with an eye toward its diversity rather than its monolithism" (Mair 1995: 254). Agreed, especially since Mair is talking about classical Chinese literature, the dominant canon of which—the Confucian canon—has been very well represented in translation. But, where contemporary Chinese literary works are concerned, perhaps the anthologist should also train his vision on the receiving culture as well. If officialdom in China and the "prestige culture of the capital" (Mair 1995: 243) are stifling, the tendency to read Chinese literary works as mere political and social documents, or as dissident literature, can be equally stifling. The anthologist who wants to subvert the established canon in the Chinese mainland should also think about whether the prevailing taste, or the expectations, in the receiving culture

with regard to contemporary Chinese literature should or should not be subverted as well. When one type of literary works gains too heavy a representation in the receiving culture, there may be the danger of the part being taken for the whole—in our case, of contemporary Chinese drama being labelled as political drama. The result is that a literature that is rich, multifaceted, dynamic and heterogeneous would become reduced, flattened and homogenized. [16] The implications become even weightier if one remembers that in the 1980s and 1990s, literary taste in Anglo-America was eclectic; variety and diversity, both in style and dramatic form, were privileged.

The Dynamics of Negotiation

The considerations described above were real preoccupations for me and they exerted great influence on how I carried out the programme of identity construction and image making for contemporary Chinese spoken drama. Attention to *both* the taste of the culture represented and that of the receiving culture set into motion a complex dynamics. There was, as it were, an attempt to bring the reader to the drama scene in the Chinese mainland by acquainting them with mainstream spoken drama in the Chinese mainland—the socialist realist plays. They are plays that promote Party doctrines through the actions of ideal types of characters in a realistic setting. Being neither subversive nor oppositional in politics and ideology, these plays would not measure up to the poetics and the prevailing taste of the receiving culture. But they were not dismissed outright simply because they were the mainstay of the central canon. Of course, plays which were pure propaganda would be rejected. But typical socialist realist plays which nevertheless feature full-blooded characters who can voice the grievances and aspirations of the Chinese populace in

a tactfully woven plot would be considered for inclusion in the anthology. Take for example *Who's the Strongest of Us All?* 誰是強者？written by Liang Bingkun 梁秉堃 (1995). In both its subject matter and its embodied values, the play expresses the ruling Communist Party's official policy of anti-corruption. It is also a representative work of the canon of socialist realist drama. But it is, in the view of my co-editor and myself, also a very fine play—warm, funny, gripping, and moving—and done beautifully in the tradition of the well-made play of the West. Hence it was selected for translation.

In other words, even as the attempt was made to bring the reader to spoken drama in the Chinese mainland, there was a simultaneous attempt to bring spoken drama in Chinese mainland to the reader. This strategy informed the selection of a number of other plays as well, whether they were from the Chinese mainland, Taiwan, or Hong Kong.

At times, however, the selection was consciously subversive of the central canon of socialist realism in the Chinese mainland. This was done not by selecting plays that would reinforce the tendency to read contemporary Chinese literature (drama included) merely as political and social documents or as dissident literature. Instead, current drama trends and poetics in the West were taken into consideration. Plays were selected that would meet the interest of a reader excited by the different innovative movements making up the alternative theatre in the West. But it was not a straightforward matter of bringing Chinese spoken drama to the reader either. The plays were selected for yet another reason. They experiment with ways of introducing elements of traditional Chinese culture in a Western dramatic form, elements such as plot lines from classical Chinese literature; acting techniques of Peking opera, Cantonese opera, or other regional operas; body movements derived from Chinese martial art such as *tai chi chuan*, and others. They are therefore intended to help the reader appreciate what is also an integral strand of contemporary Chinese spoken

drama. What is more, they provide interesting examples of fruitful cross-cultural fertilization that may well serve as a source of inspiration for Western dramatists.

The dynamics of negotiation, the attempt to present to the English-speaking reader a foreign culture that is at once foreign and yet also familiar, though not stereotypically so, is maintained in the "Introduction", "About the Play", and "About the Playwright" sections—short introductory notes that precede each translation in the anthology. In their different ways, both the "Introduction" and the notes provide the readers with the political, ideological, social, and historical background necessary for understanding the significance of the plays within the dramatic traditions in their places of origin. They are thus attempts at contextualisation, attempts aimed at helping the reader understand the plays from different local perspectives. At the same time, a perspective based on Western notions of (good) drama is maintained in the discussion of each play and each type of play. The quotation below, excerpted from "About the Play", can illustrate the dynamics of negotiation of this critical discourse:

> The play [*Birdmen* from the PRC] is replete with puns, witty repartee, and verbal and psychological one-upmanship, and features amusing caricatures of familiar urban types. It belongs to the tradition of "slice-of-life" drama that has brought international fame to dramatic works from mainland China. It differs, however, from such works (Lao She's *Teahouse* being the most memorable example) in two important aspects. It does not rely simply on the racy Beijing dialect and the use of topical wit for its linguistic effect. The playwright is equally inventive in the use of bird-fanciers' jargon, psycho-babble, and the highly-mannered language of traditional Peking Opera. The result of this medley of styles, registers, and diction is an extravaganza of linguistic fireworks that brings

new vitality to this popular genre.

More importantly, *Birdmen* does not present the usual critique of the pre-liberation "old society". Instead, it offers a delightful range of reading possibilities. The birdmen's chatter is loaded with political overtones, and the play can be read as a clever lampoon of gerontocracy in China. Scholars in cultural studies will, depending on their theoretical positions, regard the play either as a hilarious/tongue-in-cheek or sobering/cynical study of what happens when two cultures meet, and clash. Others may simply enjoy the play as an amusing social comedy, or an outrageous parody of the game called psychotherapy. And, to keep the authorities happy, the play can also be read as a rebuttal of the influence of Western "bourgeois liberalism" on the Chinese people—a triumphant assertion of their belief in doing things their own way, with Chinese characteristics.

(Cheung and Lai 1997: 297)

The first paragraph sets the discussion within the parameters of a critical discourse that emphasizes the relation between an individual play and the tradition to which it belongs. It therefore transports the readers to a cultural space called contemporary Chinese spoken drama and encourages them to understand it in its own terms. The purpose is not to exoticize contemporary Chinese spoken drama but to insist on its difference. Lest the readers find this cultural space of the Other too alien, the second paragraph offers a reading of the play in terms which the readers can appreciate but which discourage any reductive treatment of the play as mere political and social documents, or as dissident literature. The purpose is not to dispel the foreignness of this cultural text but to relocate its familiarity.

Whether contemporary Chinese spoken drama has indeed come of age, has richness and variety, and whether some of the plays included

in this anthology deserve a place on the international stage are of course matters to be decided by the readers and critics of *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama*, and that involves a complex of intricate power relations. I hope, however, that the point has been made about the importance of attending to the politics of representation. Behind the apparently simple questions of inclusion and exclusion is the operation of a whole mindset. Is the anthologist ready to reflect on the dominant practice of discourse formation with which her anthology will be in dialogue? Is she ready to interrogate the dominant structure of power relations (the centre and the margin, the represented and the suppressed, etc.) in the culture in which she is situated, and in the culture that will play host to her work? Is she ready to question the normativity of knowledge (of contemporary Chinese drama, for example) and the identity politics involved? The anthologist can ignore these questions and simply follow the norms, the poetics and the prevailing taste of the time. She can also address these questions seriously and use her anthology as an act of intervention. I prefer the latter. *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* is meant to serve the function of intervention on two levels. First, it affirms and asserts the right of representation for Hong Kong and Taiwan through the actual production of an anthology. Second, it affirms and asserts a notion of culture that cherishes heterogeneity, celebrates hybridity, accommodates shifting boundaries, and embraces multiple traditions (of drama, for example, or of literature)—not as add-ons but as constituent parts of a kaleidoscopic whole.

Conclusion

This paper focuses on the politics of representation in the

compilation of anthologies of English translations of Chinese literature, and special reference is paid to *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama*. But I hope what is explored in the paper carries general relevance as well, not only for translation anthologists, but also for every translator who aspires to be more than a follower of norms, who wishes, in fact, to engage constructively with norms, to challenge the prevailing taste of the time, or to negotiate between the poetics of the home and receiving cultures. A translator who takes the initiative in addressing questions of identity construction, image making, representation and canon-formation will be able to assume greater and more satisfactory ownership of his/her work and play a more active role in the interaction between cultures. A translator who is fully alert to the politics of representation will find in it a sure way to self-empowerment.

Notes

[1] As Armin Paul Frank and Helga Essmann have noted, although everyone uses anthologies, there is very limited systematic research interest on this important media for the dissemination of translated literature. See their "Translation Anthologies: A Paradigmatic Medium of International Literary Transfer" (1990) for a brief overview of the state of research and a neat analysis of different types of translation anthologies and the functions they serve. For an interesting study that traces the fate of Edgar Allan Poe (prose and verse) and Walt Whitman in the German anthologies (published between 1859-1985) containing specimens of American literature, see their "Translation Anthologies: An Invitation to the Curious and a Case Study" (1991). This case study throws useful light on the behavior of German translation culture from the mid-nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. These two pieces of work are both oriented towards the provision of a model for historical analysis of translation anthologies. The present paper's orientation is quite different. Based on the assumption that there is a close relation between theory and practice, it is oriented towards the practitioners—the makers of translation anthologies—and intended to serve the function of ideological consciousness-raising.

[2] "Naturalization" and "barbarization" are terms used by James J. Y. Liu to distinguish between two different methods of translating Chinese poetry into English. The former means "the attempt to turn Chinese poetry into English poetry without violating existing conventions of the English language". The latter refers to "the attempt to reshape the English language so as to preserve the linguistic structures of Chinese poetry and its underlying ways of thinking and feeling". However, these two terms have not gained critical currency in the way that Venuti's "domestication" and "foreignization" have (see Liu 1975: 60-68).

[3] The constraints of the anthologist who takes on the responsibility of selecting texts from the source culture for translation—either by himself/herself alone or by a team of translators—are very different from those faced by an anthologist who compiles an anthology from texts that have already been translated. The very corpus he/she can select from is limited and slanted compared to that of the translator-anthologist.

[4] Circumstances permitting, this should have been a joint paper, with input from Professor Jane Lai, my co-editor, whose experience and expertise in drama translation has been a continuous source of illumination for me. The best I can do, by way of acknowledgement, is to state at the outset that while the theoretical explorations carried out in this paper are my own, the objectives set down for the anthology originated as much from her as they did from me.

[5] Donna Haraway, in her celebrated article, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective" (1988), uses the notion of "situated knowledges" to highlight the "critical and interpretive core of all knowledge" (584). In particular, she employs

this notion to query and critique the meaning of "objectivity". Her purpose is not to exalt relativism, which she considers to be "the perfect mirror twin of totalization in the ideologies of objectivity" (584). Rather, she stresses that it is limited location and situated knowledge that allow us to become "answerable for what we learn how to see" (583). I share her view and have employed the word "situatedness" in my discussion of the politics of representation in this paper.

[6] Details about how Western drama was introduced into China and about characteristic features of traditional Chinese drama are given in the "Introduction" (Cheung and Lai 1997: xii).

[7] In a paper that deals with the politics of representation in the compilation of another anthology tentatively entitled *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation, from Earliest Times to the Revolution of 1911*, I describe the word "Chinese" as a "levitational word", "a word with floating meanings", and analyze how I deal with the mapping of the domain for that anthology (Cheung, forthcoming).

[8] Gunn did offer in the "Introduction" his apologies for abridging some of the plays and stress the "practical necessity" for abridgement (Gunn 1983: xx). My point, however, is that an anthologist might wish to consider the politics of representation in making decisions of such nature, since what is "practical necessity" may translate into practical consequences.

[9] It is in order to avoid tokenization that much time was devoted to the selection of plays by women playwrights in the Chinese mainland, Taiwan and Hong Kong. Space, however, does not permit me to discuss gender politics in this paper even though it is an important consideration in the politics of representation.

[10] According to André Lefevere, the education market is likely to be the potential space of existence identified by many translation anthologists for their works. He further argued that such a consideration would shape, if not determine, the kind of image a translation anthology can project of

a particular literature and culture. Since my co-editor and I went cold into the market, we were free from the constraints that make up what Lefevere called the publisher's "hidden agenda". But the market factor is an important constituent element of the politics of representation (Lefevere 1996: 138-144).

[11] The question of representation is discussed—as an issue to be problematized rather than as a problem to be solved—in the introduction to *Hong Kong Collage: Contemporary Stories and Writing*, another anthology I have compiled (see Cheung 1998: ix-xiii). More recently, and with reference to *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation, from Earliest Times to the Revolution of 1911*, I have discussed the question of representation again (see Cheung, forthcoming).

[12] André Lefevere, for example, had shown how cavalier Charles Tuetey was in his treatment of Arabic poetry in the anthology *Classical Arabic Poetry* (Lefevere 1992: 79-80).

[13] *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Chinese Literature* is a comprehensive collection that covers a rich variety of works in the major genres from the PRC, Taiwan and Hong Kong, and its introduction is finely nuanced. The greater is the pity, therefore, that Joseph Lau should be happy with describing an anthology as being "by its very nature a statement of taste and critical judgment on the part of the editor".

[14] I have borrowed this term "doubly contextualized" from Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, who describe translation as a doubly contextualized activity (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 11).

[15] It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into the reasons for such a preference—itself an interesting phenomenon for study—or examine the thematic contents of the translation anthologies in detail. But a brief glance at some of the titles of the anthologies of contemporary Chinese literature published during this period may help illustrate my point about the preference of anthologists for controversial works. These titles include:

The Wounded: New Stories of the Cultural Revolution 1977-78 (Lu, *et al.* 1979); *Fragrant Weeds: Chinese Short Stories Once Labelled as Poisonous Weeds* (Jenner 1983); *Mao's Harvest: Voices from China's New Generation* (Siu and Stern 1983); *Stubborn Weeds: Popular and Controversial Chinese Literature after the Cultural Revolution* (Link 1984); *Seeds of Fire: Chinese Voices of Conscience* (Barmé and Minford 1988).

[16] I was not aware that Yu's *Chinese Drama after the Cultural Revolution, 1979-1989, An Anthology* (c1996) and Yan's *Theater and Society: An Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* (c1998) were under preparation when I was working on mine. But the appearance of Yan's anthology shows that the danger noted above, of the part being taken for the whole, of what is heterogeneous becoming homogenized, is not purely imaginary. That anthology, which consists of works that are noted for the social and political controversies they stirred in the PRC, succeeds Gunn's anthology seamlessly. They would reinforce one another, thus producing in America a fairly normative, if not definitive, image of contemporary Chinese drama. Yu's anthology includes a few works that could help give an impression of variety to the dramatic scene in the PRC, but since Hong Kong and Taiwan have not been included for treatment, Yu's anthology will almost certainly work together with Gunn's and Yan's to displace Hong Kong and Taiwan from the cultural space designated discursively as contemporary Chinese drama, thus making that cultural space more uniform in feature than it actually is.

References

Álvarez, Román and Carmen-África Vidal, eds. (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barmé, Geremie and John Minford, eds. (1988). *Seeds of Fire: Chinese Voices of Conscience.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. (1990). *Translation, History and Culture.* London/New York: Pinter.

Cheung, Martha P. Y. and Jane C. C. Lai, eds. (1997). *An Oxford Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Cheung, Martha P. Y., ed. (1998). *Hong Kong Collage: Contemporary Stories and Writing.* Hong Kong/New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (Forthcoming). "Representation, Intervention and Mediation: A Translation Anthologist's Reflections on the Complexities of Translating China". In *Translating China.* Ed. Luo Xuanmin. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Eoyang, Eugene and Tao-fu Lin, eds. (1995). *Translating Chinese Literature.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Frank, Armin Paul and Helga Essmann (1990). "Translation Anthologies: A Paradigmatic Medium of International Literary Transfer". *Amerikastudien/ American Studies* 35(1): 21-34.

_____. (1991). "Translation Anthologies: An Invitation to the Curious and a Case Study". *Target* 3(1): 65-90.

Gunn, Edward M., ed. (1983). *Twentieth-Century Chinese Drama: An Anthology.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haraway, Donna (1988). "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective". *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599.

Jenner, W. J. F., ed. (1983). *Fragrant Weeds: Chinese Short Stories Once Labelled as "Poisonous Weeds".* Trans. Geremie Barmé and Bennett Lee. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Co.

Lau, Joseph S. M. and Howard Goldblatt, eds. (c1995). *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Chinese Literature.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lau, Joseph S. M. (1995). "More Than Putting Things Together: The Anthologizing of Chinese Literature in Translation". In Eoyang and Lin (eds.): 221-230.

Lefevere, André (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London/New York: Routledge.

_____. (1996). "Translation and Canon Formation: Nine Decades of Drama in the United States". In Álvarez and Vidal (eds.): 138-144.

Liang, Bingkun (1995). *Who's the Strongest of Us All?* Trans. Shun Cheng. In Cheung and Lai (eds.): 3-88.

Link, Perry, ed. (1984). *Stubborn Weeds: Popular and Controversial Chinese Literature after the Cultural Revolution.* London: Blond & Briggs.

Liu, James J. Y. (1975). "Polarity of Aims and Methods: Naturalization or Barbarization?" *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 24: 60-68.

Lu, Xinhua, Kong Jiesheng, Yang Wenzhi, Lu Wenfu, Wang Yaping, Liu Xinwu and Wang Meng (1979). *The Wounded: New Stories of the Cultural Revolution 77-78.* Trans. Geremie Barmé and Bennett Lee. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Co.

Mair, Victor H. (1995). "Anthologizing and Anthropologizing: The Place of Non-elite and Non-standard Culture in the Chinese Literary Tradition". In Eoyang and Lin (eds.): 231-261.

Robinson, Douglas (1997). *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche.* Manchester: St Jerome.

Siu, Helen F. and Zelda Stern, eds. (1983). *Mao's Harvest: Voices from China's New Generation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2000 [1993]). "The Politics of Translation". In *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London/New York: Routledge, 397-416.

Yan, Haiping, ed. (c1998). *Theatre and Society: An Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama.* Armonk/N. Y.: M. E. Sharpe.

Yu, Shiao-ling S., ed. (c1996). *Chinese Drama after the Cultural Revolution, 1979-1989: An Anthology.* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

About the Author

Martha P. Y. Cheung received her Ph.D. in English and American literature from the University of Kent at Canterbury. She is now Head of the Translation Programme and Director of the Centre for Translation at Hong Kong Baptist University. She has translated many works of Chinese literature into English, including those of Han Shaogong (*Homecoming? And Other Stories*), Liu Sola (*Blue Sky Green Sea and Other Stories*), and of Hong Kong poets such as Leung Ping-kwan (*Foodscape; Traveling with a Bitter Lemon*). She co-edited (with Jane Lai) and translated (with Jane Lai and others) *An Anthology of Contemporary Chinese Drama* and co-translated (with Jane Lai) *100 Excerpts from Zen Buddhist Texts*. She is Editor-in-Chief (Chinese translation) of *Oxford Children's Encyclopedia*, and Editor-in-Chief (English translation) of *An Illustrated Chinese Materia Medica in Hong Kong*. She edited and translated (with Jane Lai and others) *Hong Kong Collage: Contemporary Stories and Writing*.

On Coherence in Translation: A Theoretical Object from a Comparative Linguistic Perspective

He Honghua

Any comparison of two languages implies a
examination of their mutual translatability; th
widespread practice of interlingual communicatio
particularly translating activities, must be ke
under scrutiny by linguistic science.

— Roman Jakobson (1959: 233-23

Abstract

The maintenance of equivalence is a prerequisite for success i
translation. It is, in turn, determined by a thorough understanding o
the source text. This understanding, in essence, is a linguistic type o
understanding. Equivalence entails the comparison between the targe
text and the source text in terms of cohesion and coherence. Usually
cohesion gives way to coherence. It is hypothesized that (i) coherenc
a fundamental property of any text, can be perceived as logic
congruity between the TT (target text) and the ST (source text); (ii)
translation problems at this level make possible the study of logic

forms of language; and (iii) coherence can be regarded as cognitive/pragmatic congruity, involving the author's and/or the translator's intentional-functional programme in the text. Given the above hypotheses, coherence is interpreted as a theoretical object conducted by sets of universal principles. Therefore, translation is no more than an intellectual activity constrained by universal logical/cognitive principles applicable to all human languages, and adjusted by parameters specific to individual languages.

With the emergence of a culture-oriented approach to translation studies, there seems to be a disregard for the traditional linguistic view of translation which was prominently held by translation scholars in the sixties of the last century. It is argued by some that translation, in nature, is an activity of re-interpretation in the target linguistic context, which can digress a lot from the source text. This implies the unimportance of the minutiae of the surface forms of texts to be translated, and of the type of text they are to be translated into. However, it is hard to give up equivalence in translation studies, since there must be some sort of relationship between a target text (TT) and a source text (ST) if the former is to be considered a translation of the latter. Whether equivalence can be maintained is a prerequisite for successful translation, which is, in turn, determined by a thorough understanding of the source text. This understanding, in essence, is a linguistic type of understanding.

Equivalence may be preserved through the correspondence between the TT and the ST on many parameters, including text type and text content. Equivalence of content, to some extent as I see it, is reduced to discoursal cohesion and coherence. Usually, cohesion gives way to

coherence when conflicts arise between them. This means equivalence might mainly be maintained by preserving TT coherence as against ST coherence. And this is the central concern of the present exploration here.

Formulating Hypotheses

In generative linguistics it is assumed that humans are genetically assigned the Faculty of Language (FL) when born, in some subsystem of the brain. FL is close to being uniform for humans: it is a genuine human genetic endowment. Exposed to experience, FL passes through a series of states, normally reaching a relatively stable state at about puberty, after which changes are peripheral—growth of vocabulary, primarily (Chomsky 1999). If language is supposed to be the instrument for conveying information, all humans, except for those with pathological defects, are gifted with the equal capability of expressing ideas—or meaning, to borrow a more ambiguous term. This implies that meaning exists objectively in the external world, independent of human mind/brain. The idea here might be vociferously denied; it is not unreasonable, however. Imagine a scenario where meaning is language specific: the corollary is that communication between humans is not possible.

Taking these assumptions as working hypotheses, this paper seeks to investigate how coherence affects equivalence in translation, and code-switching in general, from a comparative linguistic perspective. It is hypothesized that: (i) coherence, a fundamental property of any text, can be perceived as logical congruity between the TT and the ST; (ii) translation problems at this level make possible the study of logical forms of language; and (iii) coherence can be regarded as cognitive/pragmatic congruity, involving the author's and/or the translator's intentional-

functional programme in the text. Given the above hypotheses, coherence is interpreted as a theoretical object conducted by sets of universal principles. Therefore, translation is no more than an intellectual activity constrained by universal logical/cognitive principles applicable to all human languages, and adjusted by parameters specific to individual languages.

Global Text Coherence

In conformity with Barbaresi (2002), the notion of coherence I adopt here is a broad one. Within the relevance model (Sperber and Wilson 1986; Wilson 1997), coherence has received a very reductive interpretation. It has been explicated within local relations in the micro-text (conditionality, causality, temporality, etc.). In my conception, however, coherence is congruity at all levels of the text. It is congruent at the logical, cognitive and pragmatic levels.

With reference to translations of *Reminiscences of Tsinghua*, we found many examples of failure in complying with the requirements of macro-coherence. [1] In the third paragraph the sentence "I have many such unforgettable experiences" is a transition, linking the sweet memory of the teachers in the immediate previous line and the preceding information focus, "the teachers and students of Tsinghua were endeavoring to achieve excellence in learning …" The sentence "The Japanese troops were carry out military maneuvers …" only functions as the background to this information focus, and should be realized as a subordination in terms of linguistic structure. Therefore, the partial translation should be "the teachers and students of Tsinghua achieved excellent academic performances in spite of the Japanese troops maneuvering in the city streets of North China". But, discouragingly enough, most English

translations put the emphasis on "the Japanese troops maneuvering in the city streets of North China", leading to a semantic contradiction in the target texts, hence giving an inadequate and incoherent translation.

Relative to coherence, the loss of the "illocutionary force" of particular items blurs the centrality of the information and, indirectly, the author's real intention concerning the value of these items in relation to the context where they are located. In the Chinese source text there is a sentence: "Its (Tsinghua) history is **not** very long; (by contrast) a good many universities in the world boast histories of several hundred years." In actual fact, against the global context of the whole paragraph where the negative "not" is positioned, the negative cannot be interpreted in the target text in its literal sense. It is acknowledged that negatives bear the features of scope, and the placement of a negative item in a local structure determines where the focus of information is. In the above example the item "not" bears its "locutionary force" and well defines the length of "its history". However, the entire sentence is intertwined in the contrastive relations with the previous and preceding lines. It has been argued that contrastive negation often implies ambiguity where ambiguity is embodied as presence or absence in compliance with the author's intention (Shen 1983). In everyday usage, "ambiguity" usually refers to the property of sentences: they may be interpreted in more than one way and insufficient clues are available for the intended or optimal interpretation (Kooij 1971: 1). Given this, different presuppositions relate to different interpretations of the *BU*-construction (negation); the meaning of negative structures, sometimes, does not lies in what has been explicitly stated, but in the implied/"illocutionary force" beneath the superficial structure, which can only be understood against the global context where the structure is found (Lu 1984). The negation here bears its opposite sense of affirmation, wherein the campus is beautiful, the facilities are advanced, and analogically, its history is a long

and attractive one.

Another crucial factor for macro-coherence in literary discourse is the internal logical order of the text. The stages of thought groups must be logically connected and internally congruent. Put in another way, equally important are the relationships among the various stages, which must be mutually and logically motivated by intra-textual events at every point of their development.

Again, Wang Zuoliang provides relevant examples. In *Reminiscences* the general textual construction shows its internal coherence. The first paragraph has a very stable designation in all the versions of translation, especially at the beginning, which introduces the Tsinghua alumni, creating a clear referential line. Paragraph two raises the theme of Tsinghua people's recollections. The third paragraph enumerates the lofty spirit of Tsinghua people in academia with specific persons and examples. The fourth paragraph talks about the particular historical period of Tsinghua people's glory in the national emancipation and their devotion to academic research. The fifth paragraph discusses their large-scale reconstruction of Tsinghua. The next two paragraphs is an exposition of the collective influence of Tsinghua people on the author, indicating its unforgettable quality. The last paragraph is a brief conclusion, also related to the above mentioned theme, pointing out explicitly the spirit of Tsinghua people in terms of how "actions speak louder than words" and considering their "preeminence in academia and contribution to society".

Some English translations combine the first two paragraphs of the source text and readjust the original paragraphing of the rest. So they miss the structural reiteration with respect to the textuality of the source text, and consequently, the opportuity to reinforce the designation of the theme—Tsinghua people—during the time the text is developed. English, of course, differs from Chinese and can have recourse to

augmentative suffixation (e.g. Tsinghua people) to maintain the stability of character representation and hence the logical coherence throughout the development of the target text. From the perspective of syntactic typology, English also differs from Chinese in that English is a head-initial language whereas Chinese is essentially head-final (Huang 1982). In this respect, however, there are some exceptions in Chinese: the objects of verbs, the objects of prepositions and some complements always follow their heads. This guarantees at least the conforming properties of simple, basic sentence structures between English and Chinese. The partial similarities of the underlying structures between the SL and the TL can make possible the correspondence between the TT and the ST with regard to coherence.

The disorder in paragraphing in fact is caused by the translator's fallacy, which is in turn attributed to his illogical thinking. That does not mean that the translator does not have independent thinking in a logical sense. In actual fact, the activity of translation is subject to differences in representation between the two languages involved. The narration of the source text is of course developed in accordance with its own logic. However, the source text logic, though can be maintained globally, is not to be projected directly into the target text. It requires minute manipulation on the linguistic level, which should appeal to the logical conventionality and the necessary revision practiced in paragraphing (Liu 2001).

While dealing with TL paragraphing, the translator should bear in mind that the sentence is the prime unit for preserving logical coherence. Logical conventionality may be ensured by the maintenance of basic concepts and content as embodied in individual sentences. One presupposition entailed is that there cannot be any reduction in TL paragraphing with respect to the value of the basic concepts and content of the ST. As for the narrative method and the order of development of the target text, there is special concern about the different types of logical

conventionality between the two languages involved. Further, the above operation of TT paragraphing must be governed by both grammatical logic and narrative logic.

Logical Conventionality and Revision on the Sentence Level

As mentioned above, the maintenance of global coherence in terms of TT paragraphing can happen at the sentence level. Therefore, it is crucial to analyze the logical relations among various sentential components. In linguistic communication ambiguity often arises, which creates obstacles for successful communication. Kaplan has succinctly summarized the various aspects of ambiguity:

> Ambiguity is the common cold of the pathology of language. The logician recognizes equivocation as a frequent source of fallacious reasoning. … Even the sciences are not altogether free of verbalistic disputes that turn on confused multiple meanings of key terms in the controversy. (1950: 1)

Linguists, logicians and philosophers have made persistent efforts to eliminate or interpret the linguistic phenomenon of ambiguity by devising artificial languages. Their efforts indicate that human languages must be governed by logical conventionality and need revision.

In real language practice there are various representations of the unconventionality of logic. The following are examples of some sentences Chinese learners of English tend to utter: [2]

(a) *In fact the tiger had already died before the hunter killed it.

(b)*So far there are as yet no facts to show inflation ease the next year.
(c)*Zone A is for those who take part in driving test to park their cars.
(d)*Their (China's) respective advantages will be brought into full play, their resources will be utilized in a more optimized way and the competitiveness of their industrial structures will be further enhanced.

The sentences above more or less violate principles of logical conventionality and need to be revised. Sentence (a) is an anomaly. Now that the tiger had already died, how could the hunter kill it? The concept of "to kill" is decomposed and interpreted as "cause … to die/death". To make it conform with logic, "kill" is to be revised as "shot". (b) also makes no sense in that it is hard to conceive of "facts" in the future, i.e., "the next year". (c) consists of at least two propositions: (i) people take part in driving tests; and (ii) people park their cars. The two propositions are not contradictory under the condition that the pronoun "those" is read disjunctionally. However, the two propositions are realized with one embedded in the other in linguistic form, which only yields conjunction reading to the pronoun "those". Hence the contradiction. (d) is a case which violates rules of semantic restriction between individual words. "Structures" are inanimate and not dynamic, so they cannot be "competitive". It is the feature manifested by the "structures" that makes it competitive.

Analyses of the above sentences serve to point out that during the transference of information between the SL and the TL, logical conventionality must be observed and necessary revisions have to be done. According to Hayes and Flower (1987), logical convention and revision play important roles during the course of translation or code-switching. In the transferring process logic monitoring functions both in comprehending the SL and in representing in the TL. During the comprehension stage the translator interprets the ST by decoding,

analyzing and synthesizing, and logic serves to monitor everything; in the representation stage the translator develops the TT by encoding, dictioning and optimizing, and there is monitoring by logic. Of course this only portrays a possible and approximate picture. It still requires support with strong evidence, and needs to be explicitly illustrated. In the following section the necessity of maintaining logical conventionality is expounded through a look at the properties of quantifiers both in English and in Chinese.

Logical Congruity in Terms of Logical Form

The argument of logical congruity between the TT and the ST is tenable and the maintenance of logical congruity on the sentence level is possible, for meaning, by its very nature, is logical. So the assessment of the preservation of sentential semantic value might appeal to the logical form of the sentence. Put in another way, whether there is a loss of coherence (and hence equivalence) might be assessed at the underlying logical form of the sentence. By observing logical form, it is possible to examine whether the target sentence is a faithful rendition of the source sentence, and the problem of preserving coherence can be solved with the logical form of the sentence. The scopal properties of quantifiers set a good example for discussion in this respect.

Linguistic logical form is derived from formal logic and is applied extensively in generative grammar. In generative linguistics logical form is a representation that interprets meaning which is only relevant to the grammar of language. By applying logical form to the translation of sentences between English and Chinese, we can see clearly how equivalence is obtained at the level of logical form. [3] Look at the

examples below.

Youren	yao	[meigexuesheng	dou	qu]
Someone	want	every student	all	go

The Chinese sentence is unambiguous. It is assumed here the embedded clause is a finite clause and that it is the embedded clause that is first generated while the matrix VP is adjoined to the resulted structure in the derivation. During the derivation *meigexuesheng* originates in the Spec VP position of the embedded clause and moves to the Spec DistP projected by *dou* to check its strong Q-feature (in Wu's [1992] sense), resulting in the following partial derivational structure:

$[_{DistP}$ meigexuesheng$_I$ $[_{Dist'}$ dou $[_{VP}$ t_I qu]]]
every student all go

Then, in the latter derivation *meigexuesheng* continuously moves to the Spec AgrSP of the clause to check its Nom feature.

$[_{AgrSP}$ meigexuesheng$_I$ $[_{DistP}$ t_I' $[_{Dist'}$ dou $[_{VP}$ t_I qu]]]
every student all go

The principles of Greed and Economy [4] prohibit it from rising higher and so *meigexuesheng* can only take scope over the embedded clause. As the derivation goes the matrix VP is adjoined to the embedded clause, yielding the following structure:

$[_{VP}$ youren yao $[_{AgrSP}$ meigexuesheng$_I$ $[_{DistP}$ t_I' $[_{Dist'}$ dou $[_{VP}$ t_I qu]]]
someone want every student all go

It is clear that *youren* can only starts from the spec position of the matrix VP and hence takes scope over the whole sentence. Thus, the unambiguity of the sentence is obtained.

There are two possible English renditions of the sentence:

(a) Someone wanted every student to go there.
(b) Someone wanted that every student would go there.

Of the two renditions, (a) is ambiguous and hence is excluded from the repertoire. Therefore (b) is the appropriate option. The (un)ambiguity may be accounted for at the level of logical form. Their corresponding logical form representations are as follows:

(c) $[_{AgrSP}$ someone$_i$ $[_{AgrOP}$ every student$_j$ $[_{VP}$ t_I wanted $[_{AgrSP}$ t_j $[_{VP}$ t_j win]]]]]
(d) $[_{AgrSP}$ someone$_i$ $[_{AgrOP}$ $[_{VP}$ t_I wanted $[_{AgrSP}$ every student$_j$ would $[_{VP}$ t_j win]]]]]

In embedded finite clauses, the embedded subject moves only as high as the embedded Spec AgrSP. In the former, the embedded subject must move to the matrix Spec AgrOP to get its case checked because the embedded clause is infinitival. This allows it to take scope over the matrix VP. An analogous structure cannot be obtained with the latter as the embedded subject never rises to the matrix Spec AgrOP. It can have its case checked in the embedded case active Spec AgrSP. Consequently, Least Effort prohibits it from rising any further. Hence *someone* must take scope over *every student.*

It is now obvious that by employing logical form analyses we can make an adequate evaluation of the possible renditions in both Chinese and English. To ensure the validity of the rendition with respect to coherence between languages, it is reasonable to reduce the problem to a logical analysis deciding the appropriate target on the sentence level.

Support also comes from the contrastive analysis of syntactic properties of universal quantifiers in Chinese and English.

The Chinese character *dou* (all) is referred to as a totalizing adverb (see Huang 1982), or a distributor, or a universal quantifier (Lee 1986: 1.1). Regardless of the various readings, one prominent feature is that *dou* and the NP it is related to must obey certain structural constraints. The most conspicuous fact concerning the property of *dou* is that *dou* can only quantify an NP to its left, viz. it occurs to the right of the head NPs.

(a) Zhexie shu dou hen you jiazhi.
These book all very have value
All of these books are much valuable.

(b)*dou zhexie shu hen you jiazhi.
All these book very have value
All of these books are much valuable.

(c) Xiaozhao zhexie wenxue shu dou du-guo.
Xiaozhao these literature book all read ASP
Xiaozhao has read all of these literary works.

(d)*Xiaozhao dou du-guo zhexie wenxue shu. [5]
Xiaozhao all read AS these literature book
Xiaozhao has read all these literary works.

Sentence (a) is acceptable where *zhexie shu* (these books) is on the left of *dou*; sentence (b), by contrast, is unacceptable where the same NP is on the right of *dou*. Similarly, sentence (c) is acceptable where the object *zhexie wenxueshu* (these literary works) is moved to the left of *dou*; sentence

(d) is unacceptable where the same object stays put.

It is not the case with English. As is indicated by the English translations, the corresponding English term "all" for the Chinese *dou* occurs to the left of the NPs quantified. [6] The answer is found in the underlying structure. The Chinese *dou* is taken as a functional head at the level of logical form, projecting to Universal Phrase (UniP for short). Given this, the logical form structure for Chinese involving *dou* is illustrated as follows:

$[_{TopP}\ Top[_{CP}\ C\ [_{AgrSP}\ AgrS\ [_{UniP}\ [_{Uni'}\ dou\ [_{TP}\ T[_{AgrOP}\ AgrO\ [_{VP}\ V\ ]]]]]]$

The head NP quantified by *dou* bears strong features that must be checked first during the derivation by a strong feature via spec-head agreement relation before the operation of Spell Out applies. The procedure of derivation of a Chinese sentence involving *dou* is illustrated in the following examples:

The initial phase:

$[_{TopP}\ Top[_{CP}\ C\ [_{AgrSP}\ AgrS\ [_{UniP}\ [_{Uni'}\ dou\ [_{TP}\ T[_{AgrOP}\ AgrO\ [_{VP}$ Xiaozhao Xiaozhao
du-guo zhexie wenxue shu]]]]]]
read AS these literature book

The intermediate phases:

(a) $[_{TopP}Top[_{CP}\ C\ [_{AgrSP}\ AgrS\ [_{UniP}\ [_{Uni'}\ dou\ [_{TP}T[_{AgrOP}$ zhexie $shu_j\ [_{VP}$ $Xiaozhao_i$ du-guo t_j]]]]]]

(b) $[_{TopP}Top[_{CP}C\ [_{AgrSP}\ AgrS\ [_{UniP}$ zhexie $shu_j\ [_{Uni'}\ dou\ [_{TP}T[_{AgrOP}\ t_j'[_{VP}$ $Xiaozhao_i$ du-guo t_j]]]]]]

The yielded structures:

(a) [$_{TopP}$ Top[$_{CP}$ C [$_{AgrSP}$ Xiaozhao$_i$ [$_{UniP}$ zhexie shu$_j$ [$_{Uni'}$ dou [$_{TP}$T[$_{AgrOP}$ t$_i$
[$_{VP}$ t$_i$ du-guo t$_j$]]]]]]

(b) [$_{TopP}$ zhexie shu$_j$ [$_{CP}$ C [$_{AgrSP}$ Xiaozhao$_i$ [$_{UniP}$ t$_j$''[$_{Uni'}$ dou [$_{TP}$T[$_{AgrOP}$ t$_i$
[$_{VP}$ t$_i$ du-guo t$_j$]]]]]]

The utterances derived:

(a) Xiaozhao zhexie shu dou du-guo.
Xiaozhao these book all read ASP
Xiaozhao has read all of these books.

(b) Zhexie shu, Xiaozhao dou du-guo
These book Xiaozhao all read ASP
All of these books, Xiaozhao has read.

The left-ward quantification by *dou* seems to be different from its corresponding English and is a unique property only in Chinese. However, the quantificational procedure by universal quantifiers is universally governed by interpretive principles, and in this respect, Chinese is in line with English. The miscellaneous surface structures are actually the result of parameters which are language-specific. The parameters of language, then, are the representations of logical conventionalities observed by individual languages. Therefore, in the activity of translation, the assessor of equivalence between the TT and the ST can look at logical form to see if the rendition conforms with individual parameters (like the logical conventionalities of the TL) and hence see the logical congruity.

Concluding Remarks

I have tried to show—albeit partially, and by way of approximation—how logic is related to the activity of translation, mainly translation into English. The point concerned here is to rectify the conceptual errors that translation competence only includes the so-called "translation techniques" and has nothing to do with the logical potentials of human beings.

The systematization of scientific knowledge is important to the development of the science of translation. It is based on a scientific hypothesis that implies a system of "interlinking" knowledge, the scope of which is sufficient to explain the process of translation in all of its phases and sub-phases. No science is exclusively theoretical or practical. However, it is theory that guides us in our research and allows us to systematize our knowledge.

Notes

[1] The piece, the source text in Chinese for the 14th Han Suyin Prize of Translation, is an abridged portion of the account given by the famous Professor Wang Zuoliang.

[2] Some examples are adopted from Liu Miqing (2001: 439) for convenience.

[3] I just directly cite here the logical form representations of both English and Chinese sentences in generative grammar, and take them for granted. I will adopt the generative convention in my analysis.

[4] The principles of Greed and Economy and the like are assumed to be universal principles governing the derivation of syntactic structures of languages.

[5] A sentence like (d) is acceptable under a focus reading where *dou* acts somewhat like *even* in English.

[6] Of course "all" may occur to the right of the head NP, e.g. "These books are *all* valuable." This is not the central concern, however. My focus is on the contrastive syntactic distribution of the two terms in order to show the miscellaneous superficial structures in this respect in both Chinese and English.

References

Barbaresi, Lavinia Merlini (2002). "Text Linguistics and Literary Translation". In *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*. Ed. Alessandra Riccardi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1999). "Preface". In *Introducing Transformational Grammar: From Principles and Parameters to Minimalism*. Ed. Jamal Ouhalla. London: Edward Arnold.

Hayes and Flower (1987). "The Organization of Writing Processes". In *Natural Language Generation, New Results in Artificial Intelligence, Psychology and Linguistics*. Ed. Gerard Kempen. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Huang, James C. T. (1982). *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT.

Jakobson, Roman (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". In *On Translation*. Ed. R. A. Brower. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 232-239.

Kooji, J. G. (1971). *Ambiguity in Natural Language*. North-Holland.

Lee, Thomas H. T. (1986). *Studies on Quantification in Chinese*. Doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California.

Liu, Miqing 劉宓慶 (2001). *Fanyi yu yuyan zhexue* 翻譯與語言哲學 [Translation and the Philosophy of Language]. Beijing: zhongguo duiwai fanyi.

Lu, Shuxiang 呂叔湘 (1984). "Qiyi leili" 歧義類例 [Examples of Divergences in Meaning]. *Zhongguo yuwen* 中國語文 [Chinese Language], issue 5.

Shen, Kaimu 沈開木 (1983). "Biaoshi 'yizhongyoutong' de 'ye' zi duyong tantao" 表示"異中有同"的"也"字獨用探討 [On the Use of *Ye* to Show "Differences in the Same"]. *Zhongguo yuwen* 中國語文 [Chinese Language], issue 1.

_____. (1984). "'Bu' zi de fouding fanwei he fouding zhongxin de tansuo" "不"字的否定範圍和否定中心的探索 [On the Negation Area and Focus of *Bu*]. *Zhongguo yuwen* 中國語文 [Chinese Language], issue 6.

Sperber, David and Deirdre Wilson (1986). *Relevance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, Deirdre (1997). "Linguistic Structure and Inferential Communication". In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Linguistics (Paris, 20-25 July 1997)*. Ed. B. Caron. Oxford: Elsevier Sciences.

Wu, Yuru (1992). *Anaphora and Quantifier Scope in Chinese*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

About the Author

He Honghua teaches at the Department of English, Tsinghua University, Beijing.

The Sound of Snow:
Sensory Experience in Translator Training

Brian Holton

Abstract

This paper will argue for the necessity of trainee translators spending as much time as possible living in a Language 2 community, in order to acquire as much three-dimensional experience of not only the foreign language, but also such matters as the geography, gastronomy, weather, and popular culture of the host community. I will argue for the important role of sensory experience in prompting recall (e.g. Proust's madeleine) and in stimulating a full understanding of the denotational and connotational meanings of translation items. Three-dimensional experience will be defined as lived experience of actuality, derived not from second-hand materials such as films, books and the internet, but through personal first-hand interaction with the host community and individual members of that community.

Some reference will be made to the literature on language-learning and translator training, but the paper will draw on my own experience as translator, language teacher and teacher of translation. Examples will be drawn from my own practice as (i) a student of Chinese; (ii) a self-trained translator who began translating ten years before being able to visit the L2 community; (iii) a trained teacher of Chinese to non-native speakers; and (iv) a self-trained teacher of Chinese-English translation who has taught both English-speaking and Chinese-speaking students.

The title refers to the difficulties Hong Kong translation students have with texts from northern zones, whether in English or in Chinese: how can those who have never travelled to the north in winter, never smelt snow, or heard the crunching noise it makes underfoot, have the requisite sensory experience to find the mot juste in the target language?

7, Lady Menzies Place, Edinburgh, Scotland, Winter 1954-55

Not my first experience of snow, not this particular photograph, but my first recorded experience. I'm standing in the centre of the picture, my twin brother Harvey is on the right, and a neighbour whose name I no longer recall is on the left. Harvey and I were five years old, newly home from living in the tropical humidity of Nigeria.

My earliest remembered experience of snow dates from a winter visit to Scotland a year or two before. My twin brother and I (aged about two, I'd guess) had been washed in a zinc bath before the log fire and dressed for bed, when, as my mother was in the kitchen throwing out the bath water, we made a dash for the front door, and ran for it in our dressing gowns. Under a clear winter sky full of stars, we ran off into the snow: I can still feel the exhilaration of freedom, and the high keen smell of the snow.

What does snow smell like? If you've ever smelt it, you'll know; if you haven't, there is no way that I can tell you. Language just doesn't go there.

The sound of snow falling—or, maybe more accurately, that absence of sound, when snow falls thickly on a windless day—I can't tell you either. Nor is the crunch of dry snow underfoot easily describable, or the glorious feeling of walking in the winter sunshine of a short northern day, when the snow reflects the blue of the sky and every breath is hard and clean and pure. And how does it feel, when you get inside at last, and spread your chilled hands out in front of a beech wood fire? How does it smell?

Conversely, if you have only ever lived in southern lands, like Hong Kong, where the difference between the length of a summer day and a winter one is negligible, what can you know of the joys of the long northern summer, when the sky is still pale at midnight? Or of the gloom of a dark December day, when shop lights are switched on before 4 p.m., and dawn doesn't come until halfway through the morning's work? In these short days, the sunlight is precious, and the connotation of the words "winter sunshine" powerful. Likewise, Shakespeare's "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?" (Sonnet 18) [1] takes on a whole new meaning if you have ever smelt the air early on a May morning in Scotland, when the dark winter is long past and the sweet northern summer just

begun.

So here, at last, is my point. When we learn a foreign language, we must obviously also learn about the culture from which that language grew, and from which it is inseparable. And that culture in turn derives, at least in part, from the physical environment, and from the human experience of that environment. Without sensory experience, without knowing the misery of icy sleet and endless dark days, we cannot correctly interpret the texts we choose to read.

Eva Hoffman, in her delightful book *Lost in Translation*, talking of her experience as a Polish teenager whose emigration to Canada demanded that she learn English, said this:

> *River* in Polish was a vital sound, energized with the essence of riverhood, of my rivers, of my being immersed in rivers. *River* in English is cold, a word without an aura. It has no accumulated associations for me, and it does not give off the radiating haze of connotation. It does not evoke.

And there, in a word, is our problem, as language learners or as translators: the learned L2 word "does not evoke", so connotation is necessarily absent. And connotation is something that must be learned through experience: dictionaries, however good, cannot help us make the word evoke. Hoffman also says:

> … the problem is, the signifier has become severed from the signified. The words I learn now don't stand for things in the same unquestioned way they did in my native tongue. (Hoffman 1989: 106)

For teachers of languages or teachers of translation, this should be of immediate and profound importance—how can we best help our students to *connect* with connotation?

A Translator's Testimony

Liu Si Ta, Hangzhou, 2002

I began the study of Chinese at Edinburgh University. I had never been to China, though several of my family had sailed to the Far East on a regular basis as sailors and ship's engineers. My own history was different, and the choices that led me to Chinese are not without interest: my father was Liverpool Irish, seminary-educated, with a grounding in Latin and Greek, and a near-native command of French; in 1943, having spent some time in East Africa and learned some Swahili, he married my mother and went to work in Northern Nigeria, in a job that required him to learn the Hausa language. Later he moved south to Lagos, where I grew up, and where he also learned some Yoruba. The working language of the household was generally West African Pidgin English, and my mother was a natural Scots speaker. So I grew up in a multilingual environment, which gave me language learning skills at an early age: by the time we left Nigeria to go to school in Scotland, my brothers and I had mastered a large and multi-lingual vocabulary, aided by my father's love of language

games.

Once I had finished high school, where I studied French and Latin for six years, and Classical Greek for four, I had also added some Russian and a little German to my list. Chinese happened because, in our school library, I stumbled on Ezra Pound's *Cathay* and Arthur Waley's *170 Chinese Poems*. I was astonished. I had never considered the idea that Chinese poetry might exist. Even though I had grown up surrounded by artefacts from Africa and the Far East, as well as (courtesy of other close relatives) New Zealand and India, and even though my father had helped to make me sensitive to languages, somehow I had failed to imagine the Chinese writing poetry. I abandoned myself to as many translations of Chinese as I could find. And in that same year, as I prepared to apply for university, I noticed a small item in the newspaper, announcing that the University of Edinburgh was about to open a new department of Chinese. There and then, I decided to apply.

In those days, the study of Chinese was not common, though there was a growing interest. There were only five of us in our graduating class in 1975 (the same department now routinely has 25 or more graduates each year). There were no scholarships to visit Hong Kong or Taiwan, and, because of the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, no chance at all of visiting the People's Republic of China. So we studied in isolation, also cut off from the Overseas Chinese in the city, who were predominantly Hakka or Cantonese speakers, and cut off from Chinese culture. We read a great deal of Chinese literature.

What could I know then about the sounds and smells of China? Of course, I "knew" the word *simiao* 寺廟 stood as some kind of equivalent of the English word "temple", but what did I actually know? As a diligent student, I scoured the libraries (no Internet then!) for architectural drawings and photographs, and I read about monastic organisation, schools of Buddhism, Buddhist doctrine, Buddhist

philosophy, and I read Chinese stories set in monasteries—but nothing quite prepared me for the point when in October 1988, I stood at the gates of Lingyin Si in Hangzhou, and for the first time, heard the chant of "*Namo Amituo Fo*", smelled the clouds of incense swirling through the courtyards, and, in a moment of rare and deep joy, stood alone and luxuriated in the intense, forest-like silence of an ancient courtyard fresh with recent rain. Early the following year, on a visit to Tiantong Si in Zhejiang, the elderly Abbot Da Xin led me and my companion on a tour of the monastery. The final stop was the meditation hall, where for close to a thousand years, monks had been sitting in daily practice, and, as the frail old man pushed open the high double doors with a flourish, we stepped in: I immediately felt a rush of *prana* like that of the most intense meditation. For the first time, I felt I was beginning to know what *simiao* might mean, was beginning to know something of the connotations this word might evoke.

A Modest Proposal

Prades, French Pyrenees, 2002

The French philosopher, Gaston Bachelard (1884-1962) put it this way: "... all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home" (Stilgoe 1964: 5). Conversely, it could be said that the space of the "other", the space of the culture we wish to learn about, can never be inhabited in quite the same way as that of "home", just as the native speaker inhabits her language in a different way to the non-native learner. So, in essence, I will never be able to inhabit China or the Chinese language in the same way as a native speaker. (This does not of course mean that I should ever give up the attempt to learn.)

Our problem, as teachers of translators, is, as I stated above, how can we best help our students to *connect* with connotation? I would answer here that overseas experience, time lived in the L2 country, is the only solution. We cannot help the student to be sensitive to connotation in L2 unless we make it possible, even mandatory, for that student to fully experience life in-country. No matter how brilliant the teacher, how fecund the supply of books and tapes and films, no matter how virtual reality might one day make its mark on our profession, nothing can supply the effect of three-dimensional lived exposure to the sounds, smells and silences of the country whose language and culture we want our students to understand.

This, the necessity for in-country experience, is a simple enough point, but I can find nothing relating to it in the young but growing corpus of literature on translation. Surprisingly, even the literature on foreign-language acquisition spends little time on this issue, although Francis R. Jones (Jones 1998: 378-406) has touched on it, as have Rod Ellis, and Rosamund Mitchell and Florence Myles, in their overviews of second language acquisition. [2] Perhaps this is one of these fundamental issues which are so obvious as to be thought rarely worth mentioning.

Yet we in Hong Kong need to think about this. Objections will be made that it is too expensive, but in the long term, in-country experience

must be seen as an investment, and not as a cost: it can and will accelerate the learner's acquisition of L2 competence, and so shorten the time required for the novice to become a useful professional. Here in Hong Kong, it is not normal practice to have a mandatory year abroad for language students, though in the UK, for instance, the undergraduate year abroad is near-universal, and it is common throughout Europe and the Americas. Why do we in Hong Kong not insist on mandatory in-country immersion? Is it from an unwillingness to spend money on languages? Is it from wilful ignorance of the need for skilled language professionals in this so-called "bilingual, tri-glossal" city? And at the time of writing, postgraduate students from mainland China are flooding abroad: how soon will we see a mandatory undergraduate year abroad for Chinese students of foreign languages? Can Hong Kong afford to fall behind?

Let me urge you, if you are a translation student, to beg or borrow the funds to spend some time abroad, in a country which speaks the language you are learning to translate; if you are a teacher, move heaven and earth to find scholarships for your students, make reciprocal arrangements with in-country universities, persuade your university's governing body and your government organs that overseas experience is fundamental and necessary in the training of translators. And if, by some chance, you are a legislator, or a member of the governing body of a university, for goodness' sake, talk to your teachers of translation and your teachers of languages, and act on their advice. Do we really want to short-change our children?

Remember the old slogan from the UK Association of University Teachers: "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance!"

Notes

[1] For useful discussion of this sonnet, see Vendler (1997: 119-122) and Booth (1977: 161-2).

[2] For example, Ellis (1994) and Florence Myles (1998). (I am grateful to Francis R. Jones for the references.)

References

Booth, Stephen (1977). *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Ellis, Rod (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, Rosamund and Florence Myles (1998). *Second Language Learning Theories*. London: Arnold.

Stilgoe, John R., tr. (1964). *The Poetics of Space*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Jones, Francis R. (1998). "Self-Instruction and Success: A Learner-Profile Study". *Applied Linguistics* 19.3: 378-406.

Vendler, Helen (1997). *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

About the Author

Brian Holton was born in Galashiels in the Scottish Borders, grew up partly in Nigeria, and was educated at the Universities of Edinburgh and Durham. He has taught English at Ningbo University (1989), and Chinese language and literature at Edinburgh, Durham and Newcastle Universities (1985-1999). At Newcastle University, he was first director of the UK's first Chinese-English, English-Chinese Translating and Interpreting postgraduate programme. He is currently teaching Translation at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

His first published translation, in 1965, was of Latin poetry: he began publishing Chinese-Scots translations in 1981, and since then has published a variety of English translations of modern and pre-modern Chinese literature, as well as articles and essays on translation and translating.

He thinks that it is impossible to teach translation, but possible and necessary to show students new and better ways of learning how to translate. He believes that if we translators can harness our natural curiosity, broaden our knowledge base and learn to play more creatively, then we will have happy and productive careers.

虛實之間見功夫 *

余光中

Abstract

Between the "Full" and the "Empty": On the Art of Translation (*by* Yu Kwang-chung)

Content words, which refer to a thing, quality, or state, form the main body of a Chinese sentence, while function words are attachments in a syntactic structure, showing grammatical relationships in and between sentences. This is why the abundance use of function words in English creates some of the most troublesome problems for the E-C translator, as articles ("a", "an", "the"), prepositions ("over", "on", "from"), and conjunctions ("and") have little meaning on their own, their functions being grammatical or structural rather than lexical. It is also often difficult to find a proper place in a Chinese sentence to relocate the subject in the English original. The English pronoun is another empty word often denied a Chinese reincarnation. The translator meets his most difficult task when it is required of him to insert a content word for English relative adverbs such as "where" and "when". In all the above situations, this paper argues, the translator has to remain prudent and flexible, and has to allow that there is really not much to be done about nothing.

中文文法常有實字、虛字之分。所謂實字，多為句中具體可見的字，呈現的是人、物、事的動作、變化、狀態：通常是指名詞、動詞、形容詞。其他的詞類則大半承上起下，依附於實字之間，稱為虛字。實字乃句法結構之主體，求其平衡。虛字乃其附體，求其伸縮而有彈性。散文用字，往往虛實交錯；詩體則貴精鍊，多用實字。例如王維的“大漠孤煙直，長河落日圓”，孟浩然的“氣蒸雲夢澤，波撼岳陽城”，全用實字。陳子昂的“念天地之悠悠，獨愴然而涕下”，李白的“其險也如此，嗟爾遠道之人胡為乎來哉”，加入了散文的成份，也就是用了虛字，結果是失去了平衡，卻添了彈性。

英文的文法比其他西方語文簡便，但是比中文仍較苛細。久於譯道的人當會發現，把英文譯成中文時，英文句中的許多“虛字”往往不必，甚至不可譯成中文。許多虛字，在英文裏不可或缺，在中文裏則可有可無，有了成添足，沒有才乾淨。

英文的冠詞（a, an, the）為中文所無，照例可以不譯。A soldier must love his country 一句，譯成“士兵必須愛國”已足，根本不必理會冠詞，也不必理會屬有格限定詞的 his。有時候，因為中文句法忌用突兀的單字，所以 a glimpse of infinity 仍宜譯成“大千一瞥”或“一瞥無限”，而不宜譯成“無限之瞥”。

介詞在英文裏用得很多，幾乎每一句話都少不了，有時候一句之中會有幾次。中譯的時候，介詞往往不可直譯，需要改變句法，繞道而過。例如 Discuss it over lunch，只能把介詞化開，說成“吃午飯時再討論吧”。又如 Don't say now if you'll take the job: sleep on it first，後半句的介詞與代名詞都不可譯，只能說“現在別決定你接不接這個工作：考慮一晚再說吧”。有的介詞中譯

時很難交代，例如 His speech on unemployment was well received，有本詞典譯成“他那關於失業問題的演說受到了歡迎”，有點拗口，不妨忘掉介詞，譯成“他演講失業問題，頗受歡迎”，或者仍然保留介詞，譯成“他就失業問題發表演講，頗受歡迎”。再舉一例，From her looks I'd say she was Swedish，某詞典譯成“從她的相貌上看，我敢說她是瑞典人”，原也不錯。如要不理介詞，當然也可以說“看她的相貌，我敢說她是瑞典人”。其實，“她的”也可以不要。

介詞用在英文題目裏，往往譯不過來，也就不必理它。例如濟慈的 *On First Looking into Chapman's Homer*，當然不用理會介詞，逕譯《初窺蔡譯荷馬》可也。他如 *Ode to a Nightingale*，歷來都譯《夜鶯曲》。*To Autumn* 也可譯《詠秋》、《秋日吟》、《秋之頌》，犯不着保留介詞，說甚麼《給秋天》。至於格瑞（Thomas Gray）的 *On the Death of Mr. Richard West*，也不宜直譯，可以用文言，說《悼魏里查君》。羅夫雷斯（Richard Lovelace 的 *To Althea, From Prison*，介詞 to 只能改成動詞：“寄”或“贈”；詩題可譯《獄中寄艾蒂雅》。

連接詞在英文中用來連接對等的字眼，尤以 and 一字為然，出現頻率極高。在兩個以上的一連串實字或虛字（介詞、副詞、代名詞等）之中，and 必然置於最後一個字之前。中文的“夫妻”，英文一定是 husband and wife（或者 man and wife）。中文的“春夏秋冬”，英文要說成 spring, summer, autumn and winter。相比之下，中文在列舉的場合往往不用連接詞“和、與、及、以及”等；不但像“君臣、父母、天地、左右、上下”等等的二字組合中不用，甚至在“千軍萬馬、獨一無二、聲東擊西、南腔北

調、古今中外、有始有終、天地君親師、金木水火土、柴米油鹽醬醋茶”等多字組合中，也絕不會。不但名詞的組合如此，即連一串動詞的組合亦然：“地崩山摧壯士死”，“石破天驚逗秋雨”、“雲破月來花弄影”等名句都可印證。中文不好的譯者都往往見 and 就照搬；現在，連中文不差的作者也在自己母語裏畫蛇添足，濫用“和、與”之類了。我在台港之間乘飛機，就常會聽到如下的廣播：“在飛機尚未停妥和扣安全帶的燈號熄滅之前，請……希望各位乘客感到愉快和滿意。”

另一文法要件，英文必有而中文可無，是主詞。例如 How many apples are there? Have you counted them? 後一句如譯“數過了沒有？”應該最像中文，“你”字可有可無。如譯“你數過它們沒有？”就糟了。因此我們還發現：代名詞（尤其是複數代名詞）用作受詞時，可以不譯。中國古詩的語言，特有一種不即不離的美感，往往句句不提主詞，而又字字不離主題。試看五絕的《床前明月光》、《松下問童子》，都可印證。此地且看一首七絕，王維的《九月九日憶山東兄弟》：

獨在異鄉為異客
每逢佳節倍思親
遙知兄弟登高處
遍插茱萸少一人

前三句的主詞當然都是“我”，末句的主詞當然是題目所指的“山東兄弟”。《松下問童子》四句，如果都加上主詞，變成了下面的七絕，能跟王維的名作比嗎？

我來松下問童子
童子言師採藥去
師行只在此山中
雲深童子不知處

中西文法另一重大差異，在於西文好用代名詞，而中文少用。代名詞所代者，如果是具體可感的人、物、事，還可以找到原主。最可怕的是：原主竟然是抽象名詞，尤其是複雜抽象名詞。前文的 such an idea，到了後文變成 it；前文的 business interests，到了後文又變成 them，無不害人尋尋覓覓，難以還原。在英文裏，不但散文如此，連詩都難倖免。英文詩之難讀，一半要怪文法；文法之難解，一半要怪代名詞。一首詩才讀了幾行，忽然就來了幾個行跡可疑的代名詞，用障眼法在你前後出沒，不知道究竟是誰派來的。於是你睜大倦目，去前文尋找。可是前文已經有三個名詞，個個似乎都有嫌疑。讀英文詩所以疲勞，往往是因為要捕捉這些嫌疑犯。且引幾段英詩為證：

The master saw the madness rise,
His glowing checks, his ardent eyes;
And, while he heaven and earth defied,
Changed his hand, and checked his pride.

(John Dryden, *Alexander's Feast*)

詩中所詠是亞歷山大大帝打敗波斯後，樂師狄馬龍諧斯在慶功宴上奏樂，大帝聽了意氣風發。Master 是指樂師；第二行及第

三行的兩個 his 和一個 he，均指大帝；第四行的兩個 his 則各有所指，前面的 his 是指樂師手法一變，後面的 his 卻是指大帝的豪氣壓低。四句詩中竟用了五個代名詞類，足見其多；末句緊接的兩個 his，卻指不同的人，更說明了英文也會自限於文法的窘境。這兩個 his 怎能照譯過來呢？當然是譯不得的，只好不管它，勉強譯成“變了琴音，令君王頓斂豪情”。下面兩段都摘自馬羅的敘事詩《希羅與林達》（Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*）：

She wore no gloves, for neither sun nor wind
Would burn or parch her bands, but to her mind
Or warm or cool them, for they took delight
To play upon those hands, they were so white.

So lovely fair was Hero, Venus'nun,
As Nature wept, thinking she was undone,
Because she took more from her than she left
And of such wondrous beauty her bereft;

前一段說美人希羅纖手之白，日不忍曬，風不忍吹，反而照她的意思，該暖則暖，要涼就涼，因為太陽與風都樂於撫弄那雙柔荑。問題在於，後兩行一口氣來了三個複數的代名詞“它們”，中間的 they 指的是太陽與風，其他的兩個卻是指手。英文已經夾纏，譯成中文就更混亂，所以根本譯不得，只好不理，另想辦法逕稱代名詞所代的原物。

後一段說希羅太美，造化只能自認不幸，因為希羅得自造化

者（她的天生麗質）竟多於造化所剩者（指造化之美一半以上已鍾於她的一身）。這一段的代名詞加上屬有格有五個之多，偏偏造化也是女性，所以要弄清楚：第二行的“她”是指造化，第三行的三個“她（的）”依次是指希羅、造化、希羅，末行的“她的”則是指造化。好用代名詞，就容易張冠李戴；英文文法之瑣細，簡直是自設陷阱。譯者要是一一直譯交代，豈非自討苦吃？

另一可怕的迷宮，是抽象名詞也要插進來攪局，而其分身的代名詞竟然還有陽性、陰性、中性之分，而且分得無理可喻。請看下面這兩段：

And mutual fear brings peace,
Till the selfish loves increase,
Then Cruelty knits a snare,
And spread his baits with care.

He sits down with holy fears,
And waters the ground with tears;
Then Humility takes its root
Underneath his foot.

(William Blake, *The Human Abstract*)

這種強把抽象觀念擬人化的西洋詩，中國人讀來最覺詩意單薄。前段的擬人格是“殘暴”，後段的則是“自謙”，可是“殘暴”的代名詞是陽性的“他”，“自謙”的代名詞卻是中性的

"它"，實在令人困惑。也許男人比較殘暴吧，可是下面的幾段詩又推翻了這假設：

Love seeketh not Itself to please,
Nor for itself hath any care,
But for another gives its ease,
And builds a Heaven in Hell's despair.

(William Blake, *The Clod and the Pebble*)

Love is swift of foot;
Love's a man of war,
And can shoot,
And can hit from far.

Who can 'scape his bow?
That which wrought on thee,
Brought thee low,
Needs must work on me.

(George Herbert, *Discipline*)

在浪漫派詩人布雷克看來，愛是中性的或是物性的，而且連說了三次。但在玄學派詩人侯伯特的眼裏，愛卻是陽性，而且是 man of war（古代有帆的軍艦，但字面是男性戰士）。如果把布雷克詩的第一行直譯為"愛並不要滿足它自己"，中文的"它"字並無意義，還不如根本不譯。至於侯伯特詩的第五行，當然可譯"有

誰能躲過它的箭呢？"其實此地的 his 已經暗示是愛神邱比德在射箭，也許逕譯"有誰能躲過愛神的箭呢？"更易解吧。下面再看玄學派詩人克拉蕭詠耶穌降世的一段聖詩：

We saw thee in Thy balmy nest,
Young Dawn of our eternal day!
We saw Thine eyes break from their east,
And chase the trembling shades away.
We saw Thee, and we blest the sight;
We saw Thee by Thine own sweet light.

(Richard Crashaw, In *the Holy Nativity of Our Lord God*)

短短的六行詩中，竟有十三個代名詞或其屬有格，平均每行不只兩個。第三行的 their 指的原主要 eyes；原主本來是"祢的"，但目中自有的曙光，一瞬間竟換了位，變成了"它們的"。這麼曲折的文法根本與中文絕緣。如果逕譯成"我們見祢的目光從它們的東天破曙"，讀者一定不知所云。英文的文法虛字成災，真可謂"負了代名詞的重擔"（pronoun-ridden）。

最後要說到最難對付的一類虛字，包括 where、when，《牛津高階英漢雙解辭典》稱之為"關係副詞"（relative adverb）。這一類虛字，尤其是 where，在中譯裏最難安頓，直譯非常不妥，因為它後面跟的子句多半尾大不掉。其實，在許多場合，根本不必睬它，忘之為吉。丁尼生的名詩《夏洛之淑女》（Alfred Tennyson, *The Lady of Shalott*），有這麼一段：

And up and down the people go,
Gazing where the lilies blow
Round an island there below,
The Island of Shalott.

第二行如果從俗，依原文的文法譯為“望着有百合盛開的地方”，也就算不錯了，只是下句就比較難接，而本句的字序也未能遵循。所以不妨把“……的地方”那生硬的公式拋開，譯成：

行人上上下下地來往，
望着一處有百合盛放，
圍着腳底的一個島上，
叫做夏洛的小島。

有時候句法緊湊，不容“……的地方”那公式迴旋，同時 where 也往往不是指空間，而是指場合、程度或境界。例如頗普（Alexander Pope）的警句：

Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

如果譯成“天使都不敢踐踏的地方，愚人卻一衝而進”，也不算差了，可是句子太長了，全無原詩的精鍊，讀來不像警句。其實可以完全不理睬 where，而改用古詩體來譯：

天使方踟躇，愚夫相競入。

英文的成語 Where there's a will, there's a way 通常都譯成“有志者，事竟成”。當年我讀初中，面對這一個 where，兩個 there，再也想不通為甚麼要用這三個虛無縹緲的字眼來說這麼一句怪話。其實這三個虛字根本不必翻，何況要翻也翻不過來。這些轉彎抹角的虛字，只是搭了一個空架子，根本入不了中文。所以只好意譯：“有志者，事竟成”可以，“只要有決心，自然有辦法”也行。

白朗寧的名句 Where the heart lies, let the mind lie also 意思也似乎相近。同樣地，where 也不必理睬。“心”在中文裏兼有 heart 與 mind 的意思。前面的 heart 如果譯成“心”，後面的 mind 勢必另謀出路。這句詩如果譯成“心之所在，腦應相隨”，也勉強能達意了。不過在中國傳統裏，“腦”字罕見入詩，所以讀起來不像成語。也許可以改為“心之所寄，智之所出”，或者“心之所隨，智亦相隨”。

更難纏的，是佛洛斯特的這句名言：Home is the place where, when you have to go there, / They have to take you in。普通的譯者恐怕會譯成：“家是一個當你必須回去他們就必須接受你的地方。”這樣譯不但生硬累贅，而且還有個突兀的“他們”。這種句子又有關係副詞，又有代名詞，真是集虛字之大成。要化解這些，就得先擺平虛字，免得它來攪局。也許可以這樣中譯：“家是這麼一個地方，要是你非去不可，裏面的人就只好留你。”或者“有個地方，要是非去不可，裏面的人只好留你，那就是家。”

郝思曼有一首《勸酒歌》（A. E. Houseman, *Terence, This Is Stupid Stuff*），末段說到東方有位君王，為防諸侯陰謀毒害，乃

遍嚐毒物，由少而多，久之百毒不侵。最後諸侯在他的肉食與酒中暗下劇毒，視其必死，竟不得逞。此詩最後幾行如下：

They put arsenic in his meat
And stared aghast to watch him eat;
They poured strychnine in his cup
And shook to see him drink it up;
They shook, they stared as white's their shirt;
Them it was their poison hurt.
—I tell the tale as I heard told.
Mithridates, he died old.

倒數第三行的賓格代名詞（objective pronoun）them，在文法上本來是一個不起眼的弱勢字眼，經詩人破格提前，置於一個倒裝句首，彈力陡增，非常驚人。如果還原為 It was them that their poison hurt，彈力就大減了。但是對這樣的反彈句，中文完全無能為力。英文反常語法的優勢，叫再好的譯者也只有望洋興嘆了。

* 本文為 2004 年 6 月 5 日余教授於“第二屆清華－嶺南國際翻譯學術研討會”發表的主題演說。

作者簡介

余光中，1928 年生。1952 年畢業於台灣大學外文系，1959 年獲美國艾奧瓦大學藝術碩士。先後任教於台灣東吳大學、台灣大學、台灣師範大學、台灣政治大學。1972 年任台灣政治大學西語系教授兼系主任，1974-1985 年任香港中文大學中文系系主任。1985 年起，任教於台灣國立中山大學，曾任文學院院長及外文研究所所長。余先生於詩歌、散文、評論、翻譯，馳騁文壇逾半個世紀，著作共 40 種。

The Uses and Ab-use of Translation: On the Changing Conception of the Term "Translation"

Jessica Yeung

Abstract

Since Translation Studies has taken a "cultural turn", works examining translation as cultural phenomenon have proliferated. There are also many critics within and outside Translation Studies who employ the term "translation" to refer to adoptions of paradigms into other mega-structures, with transformations of these paradigms taking place during the transfer. This tendency has extended the scope of Translation Studies, and also enriched the concept of "translation", but there are also a number of drawbacks.

1. Preamble

Translation Studies is a relatively young discipline compared to older disciplines such as Philosophy, or middle-aged disciplines such as Literary Studies, or even teenage disciplines such as Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies. Scholars are active in defining and extending the scope of this young discipline, so that it can act as a productive vantage point to look at intercultural relations. This paper seeks to trace how some critics use and adopt the term "translation",

bringing it to denote a whole network of intercultural and intertextual relations, rather than confining its reference to a text derived from another through the process of linguistic transfer. The aim of this paper is not to conclude on what translation is or is not, or what is or is not Translation Studies; but to show that in the actual applications of the concept in critical cultural analyses of texts, "translation" has become a critical concept with a rich inventory of meanings and associations.

2. Theories

To say that translation is a means of communication across systems could hardly provoke any challenge. Often the "systems" in question refer to languages. Common sense would agree that translation is "reproducing" a text in a language different from the source language. Roman Jakobson calls this "interlingual translation", or "translation proper", since this is usually what people recognise as "translation" (Jakobson 1959/1992: 145). Early theorists of translation shared the same understanding of translation and emphasised the practical aspect of meaning transfer across languages. In fact until the 20th Century, most discussions on translation were offered by translators who drew conclusions on how translation should, or could, be done upon reflection of their own experience of the activity. Cicero discussed the style and force of the language in his own translation of Greek orators' speeches, while St Jerome described his own Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint Old Testament.

Major developments in more objective and systematic inquiry into the process of translation were seen in the 20th Century, with James Holmes' 1972 essay "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" generally being regarded as a defining moment in the establishment of

Translation Studies as an independent discipline. Holmes' comprehensive overview represents a systematization and mapping of various earlier strands emerging among translation scholars. The Anglo linguists Eugene Nida and Peter Newmark, for instance, had each already systematically prescribed linguistic strategies for translating, whilst J. C. Catford likewise placed emphasis on linguistic elements, identifying linguistic shift as a central method of translating. But this is not to say that these linguists/translation scholars pay no attention to the cultural elements that impact greatly on the process of translating. Eugene Nida's *Meaning Across Culture* confronts cultural problems in translating; Peter Newmark acknowledges these problems by dedicating an entire chapter in *A Textbook of Translation* to the discussion of them. He quotes numerous examples and puts them in categories such as "Ecology" and "Material cultures", as illustrations of almost untranslatable culturally specific items (Newmark 1988: 95). A Chinese-English example is the name of the traditional form of Chinese theatre. The conventional English translation of "Chinese opera" has been much rebuked as a symptom of Eurocentrism, since the translation interprets the theatrical form as being subsumed under the European operatic tradition. The term *xiqu*, a transliteration of the Chinese 戲曲, is becoming increasingly popular in discourses of theatre and cultural studies in place of the politically dubious translation "Chinese opera". English-Chinese examples are also abundant in musical terminologies. "Allegro" is often translated as *kuaiban* 快板, but the same term is traditionally used in Chinese to denote a specific kind of rhythmic pattern in *xiqu* music. [1] The pseudo-equivalent relationship of these Italian and Chinese terms, and the consequential confusion in the understanding of these concepts by readers of the opposite culture is a result of cultural untranslatability. Such cultural differences are seen, by scholars such as Newmark and Nida, as obstacles to translation felicity that should be resolved with fine translation craft. This approach to cultural elements

in translation focuses on the practicalities in translating, a focus that reflects the vocationally-oriented, training-based nature of these scholars' contributions.

Whilst a prescriptive linguistic approach was to dominate Translation Studies until the 1990s, [2] a cultural dimension in Translation Studies was already being opened up in the 1970s by the works of the Tel Aviv scholars. In his theory of the Polysystem, Itamar Even-Zohar situates translated literature within the literary system(s) of the target culture. In this theoretical model, translations are not only brought closer to the target systems rather than the source systems, but are also evaluated as literary-cultural realities in the target society rather than merely as a linguistic performance. Gideon Toury elaborates on the linguistic dimension of the systemic correlation between the target text and the target context with the concept of "norms", privileging a descriptive translation study. Toury's works have woven contextual and cultural details into the meticulous linguistic analysis of translated texts. Such works foretell the so-called "cultural turn" in Translation Studies in the 1990s. It is worth noting that Toury's success in combining textual and contextual analysis did not happen in a vacuum. It coincided with the time when Sociolinguistics was gaining ground within Linguistics in the 1960s and the 1970s, and when Sociolinguistics itself benefited from the rise of Sociology as a discipline in the same period.

The so-called "cultural turn" is also a product of its time. The year 1968 saw an outbreak of angry skepticism which unveiled the cynical conformism of the conservative. The philosophy of Deconstruction takes to task all existing hierarchies. No realm of the Humanities has not been touched by it. It has inspired a variety of "post studies", all aiming at re-examining existing structures, especially with a Foucauldian accent on exposing how power operates in these structures and how the subaltern are subject to oppression in these hierarchies. In Translation Studies, the

ideals of equivalence and faithfulness have lost ground. The image of the altruistic translation that endeavours to be *fidel* is deemed irrelevant from the deconstructive perspective. This is not to say that individual translators are ill-willed and make deliberate decisions to manipulate and misrepresent the message of the source text. Yet translators are understood to be ideological subjects and their works are inevitably interpellated by and recuperated into discourses. Critics of the so-called Manipulation School foreground how messages are manipulated in the target texts to serve certain powers. Since translation by nature deals with inter-cultural interactions, any unequal power relationship between cultures or nations is often foregrounded in translation studies of the postcolonial stance. Postcolonial critics including Tejaswini Niranjana, Michael Cronin and Maria Tymoczko, although speaking for and about different traditions and articulating different positions in the post-colonial global village, all take to task the colonial and imperialist agenda in many translations. Translation Studies are making good use of the critical space that post-colonial voices have opened up for a Foucauldian scrutiny of the process of translation, and of the various forces and their negotiations in that process. Culture and cultural elements are no longer seen as occasional obstacles to successful translation. Instead, culture is recognized as the larger framework that encompasses all translation activities. The meaning of a translated text, as differentiated from the message in the text, can only be fully understood within the framework of the two cultures in question and their relationship. This kind of studies often deals with groups of translations rather than individual texts, because it is the agenda of post-colonial studies to prove oppression as a systematic and collective action. Among these studies are marvelous works such as Tymoczko's investigation on English translations of Irish literature. Her *Translation in a Post-Colonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation* (1999) combines textual and contextual analyses of

the translated texts, allowing one to substantiate the other. But there are also other works in which generalisations of power relationships between source and target texts are drawn without much textual analysis. They are instead grounded on observations on the cultural conditions of translation. In her description of the "cultural turn" of Translation Studies, Else Vieira summarises it as a "paradigm shift" that "move[s] away from textural immanence and from the world as an operational unit in the attempt to incorporate other dimensions and parameters and shed light on other fabrics that are woven" (Vieira 1998: 171).

Also from the Cannibalist School,[3] Ovidi Carbonell describes each translation as an intercultural hermeneutic instance, and traces a hermeneutic approach to Translation Studies back to George Steiner's *After Babel* (1975). For Carbonell, the process of translation is "the way knowledge from a different cultural setting is relocated and reinterpreted according to the conditions in which knowledge is produced" (Carbonell 1996: 80). Translation is "a paradigm of culture contact". He proposes the concept of "cultural translation", as opposed to "textual translation", in order to emphasise the cultural-contextual dimension rather than the textual-linguistic dimension in translation. "As cultural translation", translation should "also [play] a significant role in the questioning of received knowledge that has taken place recently in Western thought, largely as a result of decolonisation" (Carbonell 1996: 81). Therefore, in order to grapple with the full significance of translation, post-colonial Translation Studies needs "a systematised theory of cultural translation" (Carbonell 1996: 79). This "systematised" theory would resonate with the Polysystem and Systemic Theories of the Tel Aviv School. In the present, the concept of "translation" has been much developed still further. The notion of "cultural translation" signifies more than the translated text itself. It refers to the text and its relation with the whole network of issues surrounding it, be they textual, cultural, hermeneutical

or political. It spans across all the factors involved in cross-cultural production and re-production of meaning. The translational relationship of the source and the target text is not one of equivalence, or one that seeks equivalence, but an intertextuality that is embedded in existing power structures. "Translation" in this sense has become a critical concept.

There is no doubt that since the "cultural turn", the concept of translation has been much enriched, and we have been able to understand translation in a wider context. This is definitely an advantage that Translation Studies has gained as a discipline: its scope of reference is extended. There is also more immediacy in the insights it affords into the intercultural relationship in our globalised world. But there is also a danger. Since what Vieira calls "other fabrics woven into translation" are being given prominence in some translation studies, textual analysis could lose importance. This is because studies that take translations as phenomena rather than texts can tolerate more general observations. However, any studies without close attention to textual specificities could not be very convincing since such details are the very actualisations of whatever translational relationship exists between the pair of texts and the pair of cultures. I would venture as far as to suggest that textual analysis, or at least an attention to textual details, is the defining feature to differentiate Translation Studies from Cultural Studies on translation. Therefore I would propose to see what Vieira calls the "new dimensions and parameters" as additions rather than a "shift" that involves a "move away from textural immanence". The best translation criticisms often involve brilliant close readings of the textural immanence of the texts in question.

3. Texts

In Martha Cheung's genealogy of the concept *fanyi* 翻譯

(translation) in the Chinese tradition, one of the fundamental questions she asks is: "How do we know that something—a practice, an activity—is translation? And how do we know that something is NOT [emphasis in original] translation?" (Cheung: 2004: 1) She rightly answers the question in this way:

> [it is performed] by a mental process of perception, recognition, inclusion and exclusion, a process carried out with the help of, among other things, a cognitive tool called "mental category" … To put it simply, it is the established definition of "translation" that tells us whether or not something is "translation". (Cheung 2004: 1)

If perception is cultural, and mental categories are arbitrary, there will be greater flexibility in what is being understood as "translation". The semantic field the term covers would shift according to the implications and associations we endowed the term with through actual use of the word. Since the cultural turn of Translation Studies, "translation" has accumulated an inventory of meanings that has gone far beyond the classical ideal of linguistic equivalence. This brings us back to Jakobson's definition of the three types of translation. Interlingual translation, or "translation proper", is the category that is most widely accepted as translation. He also identifies intralingual and intersemiotic transfer of meaning as translation. The former—also referred to by Jakobson as "rewording"—refers to translation within the same language, such as from Middle English into modern English. The latter denotes translation across different semiotic systems, such as from the verbal to the visual, or from novel to film. He also refers to intersemiotic translation as "transmutation" (Jakobson 1959/1992: 145), and often as "adaptation" outside Translation Studies. Jakobson's justification is Formalist. Internal integrity within sign systems is taken for granted. What is at stake in

translation is the operation of each codification system. Logically there should not be any hierarchy among linguistic and non-linguistic codification systems. If viewed this way, there is in fact nothing "improper" about referring to rewording and transmutation as translation. One critic who has taken up this point is John Sallis. Sallis problematises Jakobson's notion of interlingual translation as translation "proper", and ventures to rebuke the existence of clean-cut boundaries between languages. He casts doubt on the singularity of any language by raising the questions of loan words and foreign elements in a language. He also foregrounds some cases in which diachronic differences within the same language are very significant (Sallis 2002: 47).

One can easily understand why Translation Studies has been obsessed with interlingual translation, and with the idea of equivalence and the need for fidelity. Translation as a pursuit of the Humanities is naturally infused with humanist ideals. The presumed translatability between languages is the basis that makes intercultural communication, i.e. human understanding across cultures, possible. Equivalence therefore represents a utopian agenda from the humanist point of view, although many post-colonial critics might call this assumption a kind of imperialist pragmatics in the context of colonisation. Moreover, there is a practical side to the matter. Commissioned interlingual translations of political, commercial and legal texts can only fulfil their functions with the hypothesis of equivalence. The same is true of early translations of Scriptures, in which equivalence is a crucial concept, since the sacred Word is not to be tampered with. Equivalence and fidelity have therefore become the aim and object of interlingual translation, and of prescriptive translation studies, the purpose of which is to prevent infidelity.

Intersemiotic translation, on the other hand, is much less burdened by the notions of equivalence and fidelity. Transferring a text across media is often done with artistic and aesthetic purposes. Creativity rather

than fidelity is the main criterion. More variations are accommodated in the relationship between the source and the target texts. More flexible views are also taken on what the intertextuality should be and could be. The cinema is one area in which prolific studies on adaptation, or intersemiotic translation, have been done. Patrick Cattrysee applies methods from Translation Studies, namely Even-Zohar and Toury's theories, in his investigation of cinematic adaptations (Cattrysee 1992). His study shows the dominance of the cinematic and cultural norms of the target systems in the (re)creation of the target film texts. Cinematic and cultural idiomaticity function as the overriding norms in cinematic adaptation/translation.

The theatre is another area in which scholars are seeking methods and vocabulary to describe the intertextuality between the original and the "adaptation". In Michael Anthony Ingham's study on British theatrical adaptations of novels, he takes after Milan Kundera and describes the adaptational intertextuality as "variation", as in musical composition. But he disagrees with Kundera's position on the importance of fidelity in adaptation (Ingham 2004: 13). He places much importance on the contemporary socio-political relevance of a theatrical production to its audience. Such a stance leads him to the conclusion that "literary fidelity to the source is not very important in transmedium art forms. What matters is the creation of an autonomous work of theatre art with its distinct and coherent structure of feeling" (Ingham 2004: 352). In this study, not only are terminologies of Translation Studies such as "source", "target" and "fidelity" adopted, but indeed the entire semiotic-cum-cultural approach is very close in spirit to the systemic model of the Tel Aviv School of Translation Studies. Compared with the cinema, the theatre is technically less complicated. Ingham's approach to the issue is more ideological and less technical than that of Cattrysee's.

Like Cattrysee and Ingham, Lorna Hardwick taps into the concepts

and vocabulary of Translation Studies. Although Hardwick's concern is intra-generic (drama to drama) translation, while Ingham deals with inter-generic (novel to theatre) translation, they share a very similar position on the relationship between the source and the target texts. In her discussion on reworking classical Greek and Latin drama for the modern English theatre as political and cultural intervention, she uses the term "translation" to refer to a group of works that have made drastic changes to the classical texts. Examples of these "translations" include Brecht's *Antigone* and Heiner Müller's *Medeamaterial.* She deems the attempt to transfer meaning through literal translation of classical drama altogether futile. Meanings can only be generated through radical reworking of the classical texts. Such reworkings can create relevance, and hence meanings, for the modern audience. She quotes Müller to echo her idea of what "understanding" the classics means: "... to know [the dead] you have to eat them and then you spit out the living particles" and "one has to accept the presence of the dead as dialogue partners or dialogue disturbers—the future will emerge only out of dialogue with the dead" (Hardwick 2000: 70). The Classics (source text) to Hardwick are "materials", to borrow the title Müller gives to his reworking of *Medea.* The translator's job is to rework them, so that they stand as "productive" texts to the modern audience (Hardwick 2000: 71). She is not concerned whether "equivalent messages" are re-produced in these translations. Instead, new meanings are generated with the source materials. In the examples she quotes, the target texts have become critical, in some cases politically interventionist, texts, and they have acquired a new lease of life in the target culture. Hardwick's approach to theatrical intersemiotic translation is in the same direction as that of Ingham's, only that she has assumed a much more radical position.

Also dealing with translation of classical texts, Karlheinz Stierle examines another group of translations within the philological tradition

that conform to the principle of fidelity, a phenomenon diametrically opposite to that described by Hardwick. The temporal disparity in the relationship between the classics and their translations into vernacular languages in later centuries is described as a "vertical" dimension in translation. This is differentiated from what he calls "horizontal translation", that is, interlingual translation contemporary with the source text. Stierle reminds us that when *translatio* "first appears in the Middle Ages as a central category of political and cultural theory, [it] almost exclusively refers to a model of verticality" (Stierle 1996: 56). The early translation of the classics into the vernaculars, *translatio sapientia*, involves a vertical transfer of wisdom. Bringing into the target culture the supreme wisdom of the ancient Greek and Roman is the main purpose of this kind of translation. Apart from the straight translations of the classics, Stierle also accepts as "vertical translations" some neo-classical works that aspire to be reincarnations of the classical spirit. One of these examples is Dante's *Divina Commedia.* Stierle reads it as a recreation of Virgil's function as an epic poet. In this regard, Stierle's loose definition of "translation" is not so different from that of Hardwick's. The most important difference is in the attitude of these two groups of translation towards their sources. Historicity is at the heart of "vertical translation", while critique and intervention are the main functions of the theatrical intersemiotic translations described by Hardwick. This difference can in fact be explained by the cultural differences between the two target contexts. Classicism was the primary spirit of the Renaissance. Fidelity in translating the classics articulates the passion for the classical culture. On the contrary, 19th and 20th Century Modernism and Postmodernism strive to break away from the past. In both cases, it is the ideology of the target cultures that informs the translational relationship between the source and the target texts.

Another interesting translational relationship is shown by what

some Brazilian critics refer to as Cannibalism. This describes a movement of Brazilian translation of foreign poetry by Brazilian poets. These translations involve conscious insertion of items from Brazilian culture into the translated texts. These elements stay in the text and interact with what is carried over from the source text. A good example is a translation of a John Donne poem with lines inserted in it from a Brazilian song well-known among the Brazilian people. Else R. P. Vieira cites A. de Campos' works as an example of Cannibalist translation, describing them as:

> a conscious erasure of the boundaries between translation, criticism, anthologizing, etc. ... This is a relation in which a becomes with b and b becomes with a but neither the same again—a translation, a transformation, a transaction by means of which a third term and a third dimension emerge, not a or b, but the dynamic relation that obtains between the two. (Vieira 1998: 188)

> Translation is thus seen as a process of rewriting which also asserts the translation's cultural identity and [its] historical embeddedness. (Vieira 1998: 189)

To foreground cultural negotiation in the process of translation is to make possible duality rather than dichotomy. This kind of translation constitutes a post-colonial national identity that reflects a Bakhtinian dialogism.

Another creative use of the concept of "translation" appears in Alita Kelly's study. She cites three Andean texts as translations, although they are not often deemed so according to the more traditional linguistic definition of translation as producing an equivalent text in another language. These three texts are Gumán Poma's (1535-1615) *Corónica*,

Comentarios reales de los incas (1609) by the mestizo Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, and the works of the 20th Century Spanish fiction writer José María Argueda (1911-1969). *Corónica* is written in Spanish about Quechua culture. In some parts of the text, the use of the Spanish language shows heavy influence of the syntactic structure of the Quechua speech. *Comentarios* is an account of Inca history and culture written in high register Spanish. *Corónica* shows signs of consistent endeavours on the part of the author to find a style in Spanish to represent the characteristics of the Quechua speech, so as to convey in Spanish the Quechua characters of his personas and a Quechua vision of life (Kelly 1998). "Translation" as used by Kelly here refers to the rendering of a life lived in the native tongue but narrated in a foreign language. The source "text" is not a verbal text, but the reality lived out in the source culture. The relationship between the "source" and the "translation" is not a linguistic transfer, but a hermeneutic and cognitive act of approaching something unfamiliar or non-existent in the inventory of meaning of the Spanish language. Of the three texts, only *Comentarios* resorts to relentless appropriation. Although the intention of the mestizo Inca Garcilaso de la Vega is to present the Quechua culture in a way that reads as dignified rather than exotic and barbaric to even the most conservative of the Spanish readers, a price is being paid. For the target text to make sense for the target readers, the Quechua reality and vision of life is captured in a completely foreign linguistic mould, the shape of which does not fit the source materials. Toes and heel are being amputated to fit the shoe. In the cases of *Corónica* and the fictions of José María Argueda, the content and the form are interactive with one other. The Quechua and the Spanish voices are both given presence in the texts. The two are in constant negotiation without erasing one another.

The concept of "translation" is also adopted in other disciplines to refer to any adoption of a system into another mega-structure. These

studies often emphasise transformations of the system when it is carried over in order for it to successfully acculturate into the target structure. One example is Richard Freeman's description of the "translation" of the British National Health Service into other societies. Another example is quoted by John Sallis. The term *Übertragung* in psychoanalysis is rendered into "translation", making the point that dream-content is a translation [*Übertragung*] of the dream-thought into another expression (Sallis 2002: 7-8). Many critics seek possible extension of what is accepted as translation in order to benefit their own studies on intertexuality with the methods and concepts already accumulated in Translation Studies. This is also a gain for Translation Studies. These new cases inspire imagination on what intertextuality and translational relationships could be.

All the above approaches are made possible by Deconstruction, whose success in destabilising "meaning" has legitimised difference and heterogeneity. Many works of translation criticism also turn to celebrate discrepancy rather than similarity between the source and the target text. Indeed, Sallis takes a hermeneutic position and holds that all translation is interpretation. Therefore, when one is evaluating a piece of translation, one does not necessarily ask how well it serves as a faithful equivalent of the source text. Instead, one might venture to ask: how does it differ from the source text? Why is it so? What transformations have taken place in order for it to assimilate into the target culture? What functions does this new text perform in the target system?

However, just as "translation" is extending its scope of reference, the book *The Moving Text* (2004) by the veteran Translation scholar Anthony Pym comes as something of an anti-climax. Pym reiterates that recent Translation Studies has shown that translation is more a matter of cultural than linguistic interaction. He goes on to state that translation involves not only linguistic transfer, but also re-location of the text in material time and space. He finds that "translation" after all is most widely

accepted as a linguistic model and "linguistic models fail to conceptualise distribution as a bridging of material time and space. No movement is visible as long as the analyst places two texts side-by-side" (Pym 2004: 25). Therefore he proposes to replace the concept of "translation" with "localisation" when referring to the distribution of texts to other locales with transformations of the text involved during such a process. The concept of "localisation" is borrowed from the computer software industry. When new computer software is being promoted to foreign markets, translation and adaptation are necessary in order to make the software practical and popular. The original is neither displaced nor replaced; the relationship between the source and the "localised" text is not a dichotomy. "A localised text is not called on to represent any previous text; it is instead part of *one and the same process of constant material distribution*, which starts in one culture and may continue in many others. This is where translation theory has to learn to think differently" (Pym 2004: 5). For Pym, the semantic item "translation" is inadequate in capturing everything involved in the process of translation.

The corollary of Pym's theory is two-fold. First, he arouses a critical awareness of the material dimension in the process of translation, employing the Marxist term "distribution" to identify this dimension. This is a new perspective in Translation Studies. Second, he represents the source and the target text as co-existent entities. In the case of computer software, it is sometimes not even possible to decide which is the source text, as the designer of the programme is often unknown, and all versions, or localizations, of the same software usually appear on the markets on the same day. But Pym is not the first theorist to suggest a translational relationship devoid of hierarchical order. In 1923 Walter Benjamin expounded his theory of translation based on what he perceives as the relationship between Baudelaire's original texts of *Tableaux Parisiens* and Benjamin's own German translations. With the concept of "pure

language", he paints a picture of comprehensive co-existence of the original and its translations. A translated text does not stand in place of the original, but rather stands side by side with it. This concept negates equivalence, but acknowledges difference. Yet there is a fundamental difference between Benjamin's "pure language" and Pym's "localization". Benjamin deals with literary translation, and his approach is philosophical. The concept of pure language is idealist and utopian. Pym's approach, by contrast, is cultural-economic. He is speaking in the context of globalisation and is concerned with localisation of texts in general rather than any one text type. The concept of "localization" is borrowed from the fiercely cynical and globalised computer software industry. When he refers to the production of source and target texts as the "process of constant material distribution", his theory is devoid of the Benjaminian utopianism. What he seeks to establish is a critical materialist vision of translation in the post-modern world. In this world, the boundary between creating an original text (writing) and the proliferation of its localisations (translation) is blurred for the consumers of these texts. The localised text does not replace the original, but exists and functions alongside the original in another locale. Since the prime aim of a localised text is to function at the target locale, there would be no restriction on whatever transformations it has to go through in order to fit into the structure of the target locale. In the localisation of computer software, this structure includes differences in language, time zone, currency and the many factors that can make the software user-friendly in that particular locale.

The concept of "translation" has travelled a long way. It has gone beyond its original sense of derivation and come to assert its own function and intention. One may even be allowed to talk about a translation's subjectivity. The boundary between what is a translation and what is not will continue to shift, according to the cultural factors Translation Studies is subject to at any one point of time. People might differ in what they

think a translation is. But one can perhaps at least be more certain as to what a translation is not: it is not simply a vampire-like text, for such a text lives a life prolonged only by the life-force of another (in this case, a language), existing merely as a secondary being in the nether-world of the meta-text, with a life that has no purpose but to perpetuate the past. As the above review of developments in our conception of translation has shown, a translation can be anything but that.

Notes

[1] A detailed discussion on translating European musical terminology into Chinese with numerous examples of this kind was presented by C. C. Liu in a one-day seminar entitled "Translation and Arts" organized by the Hong Kong Translation Society and the Hong Kong Central Library on 29th May 2005. A recording of the discussion is available at the Audio-visual Section of the Library.

[2] Such dominance does not, of course, imply the non-existence of other positions. For instance, a philosophical approach that understands translation as a hermeneutic phenomenon was taken by Walter Benjamin in as early as 1923. In the 1980s, Jacques Derrida's Deconstructionist writing on translation was also made available in English. These works will be dealt with in a later part of this article.

[3] A more detailed discussion of the Cannibalist School is provided in a later part of this article.

References

Benjamin, Walter (1923/1969/2000). "The Task of the Translator". Trans. H. Zohn (1969). In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. L. Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 15-25.

Carbonell, Ovidi (1996). "The Exotic Space of Cultural Translation". In *Translation Power Subversion*. Ed. Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 79-98.

Cattrysee, Patrick (1992). *Pour une theorie de l'adaptation filmique: Le film noir american*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Cheung, Martha (2004). " 'To Translation' Means 'To Exchange' in Ancient China? A Study of Some Key Terms in Chinese Discourse on Translation". Keynote paper delivered at the FIT Fourth Asian Translators' Forum, Beijing, 29th-31st October 2004.

Freeman, Richard (2002). "Transfer as Translation". On-line article: http://www.pol.ed.ac.uk/freeman/workingpapers/transfer_as_translation.pdf.

Hardwick, Lorna (2000). *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd.

Ingham, Michael Anthony (2004). *The Prose Fiction Stage Adaptation as Social Allegory in Contemporary British Drama: Stage Fictions*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Jakobson, Roman (1959/1992). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Kelly, Alita (1998). "Conveying a World: The Andean Text as Translation, and Translation of the Andean Text". In *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. LXXV: 69-82.

Newmark, Peter (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall International.

Nida, Eugene (1981). *Meaning Across Culture*. New York: Orbis.

Pym, Anthony (2004). *The Moving Text: Localisation, Translation and Distribution*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sallis, John (2002). *On Translation*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Stierle, Karlheinz (1996). "From Vertical to Horizontal Translation". In *The Translatability of Cultures*. Ed. Sandford Budick and Wolfgang Iser. California: Stanford University Press, pp. 55-67.

Vieira, Else R. P. (1998). "New Registers for Translation in Latin America". In *Rimbaud's Rainbow*. Ed. Peter Bush and Kirsten Malmkjier. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co, pp. 171-195.

About the Author

Jessica Yeung is Assistant Professor of the Programme of Translation of the Hong Kong Baptist University. She is also Research Fellow of the Centre of Translation of the Baptist University.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Where Translation Studies, Literary Studies and Anthropology Meet

Leo Tak-hung Chan

Yunte Huang. *Transpacific Displacement: Ethnography, Translation, and Intertextual Travel in Twentieth-Century American Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, xv + 209 pp. ISBN 0-520-23223-2.

A question that translation scholars have often asked themselves these days is where we are headed for, now that translation research has taken a linguistic, a hermeneutic, and a cultural turn. The efforts made in recent years to sum up the achievements of Translation Studies have, ironically, left us even more bewildered about the direction translation research is to take in the new century, when so many of the conceivable possibilities seem to have been exhausted. In this context, Yunte Huang's *Transpacific Displacement: Ethnography, Translation, and Intertextual Travel in Twentieth-Century American Literature* figures as a welcome addition to the spate of recently published monographs that do not label themselves as studies in the field of translation and yet are clearly important contributions to the scholarship.

Huang's subject is apparently one facet of twentieth-century American literary history, the way in which American literature is affected by her "transpacific experience", especially her imaginings of China. Noting, very early on in his monograph, his departure from traditional

influence or inspiration studies, Huang focuses on a number of texts—mostly literary ones, though a few non-literary ones also fall within his purview—from an intertextual perspective whereby writers' use of so-called source texts can be unraveled so that the actual process of text migration to an American context can be pinpointed. In this way, one can readily notice that his approach is not just literary or textual, but also "translational"—though again it is not the traditional approach used in translation research where the relationship between source and target texts is semantically compared. Huang's recourse to concepts like "appropriation" (3, 58), "transposition" (68, 105, 153), "transmutation" (65, 66), and "transcreation" (125) should clue the Translation Studies scholar to the fact that what Huang says is of relevance to his or her own work.

Another prominent feature of Huang's approach is his deployment of anthropological methods; he considers the work of anthropologists like Franz Boas especially pertinent to the task at hand. Some of the texts subjected to close scrutiny in this monograph are in fact ethnographies, and their significance comes to light much more clearly when they are viewed as stories collected and interpreted for their cultural meanings. The link between ethnography and literature is overtly stated in the "Introduction". For Huang, enthnography is a hybrid genre of literature and anthropology, "produced by the intertextual tactics of absorbing other texts and transforming them into an account that fulfills the enthnographer's conception of a culture" (4). He further asserts that translation is comparable to ethnography because it can operate on similar premises. One thinks of how, in translating, one can manipulate the "original" so that the version becomes one in which one's agenda is foregrounded. In this manner, Huang establishes firmly the three-way connection between translation, literature and anthropology. He works precisely from a site where the three meet.

Huang begins, in Chapter One, with a close examination of the work of three American ethnographers who dabbled in Chinese cultural materials, at the same time showing keen interest in the Chinese language. All of them—Percival Lowell, Ernest Fenollosa and Florence Ayscough—had a significant impact on an entire generation of Imagists. Either prejudiced or misled (in some cases by Japanese intermediaries), they nevertheless helped perpetuate a number of misconceptions, most notably that of Chinese characters as completely "pictorial" or visualizable. Yet it is precisely through their efforts to understand the Chinese language that the ground is laid for the achievements and innovations of the leading Imagist poets, Ezra Pound and Amy Lowell, treated in Chapters Two and Three respectively.

Pound's project of re-Orientalizing Chinese texts is studied at some length, primarily in relation to "The River Song", a poem collected in *Cathay* (1915) that was translated from Chinese (in which, of course, Pound had no proficiency whatsoever to speak of) with the aid of notes provided by Fenollosa. The "misreadings", pointed out by generations of Poundian researchers as fruitful and productive, are understood slightly differently by Huang: they reflect brilliantly the (inter)textual strategies used by ethnographers who have been denied the opportunity to undertake fieldwork or observe the culture firsthand. In contrast to Pound, Amy Lowell did come into contact with China not just textually, but also in her travels, so that she can be said to have "dwelt in the Other". Just as Pound relied on Fenollosa, Lowell reworked the more literal renditions of Chinese poems already undertaken by Florence Ayscough, turning out adaptations that are wildly experimental works. The interesting fact is that, whether direct or indirect experience of the Other takes place does not seem to matter significantly, since Lowell, like Pound, managed to manipulate with her source text and rework literal renderings to achieve something equally experimental.

As in a series of expanding concentric circles, Huang widens further the scope of his discussion in Chapter Four, "The Multifarious Faces of the Chinese Language", to analyze a completely different perspective on the Chinese language—in this case a demeaning and negative one—that was exemplified in American popular culture. Apparently, this chapter, which deals with Earl Derr Biggers's Charlie Chan novels, Lin Yutang's English publications and John Yau's poetry, has little to do with translation *per se*, since the texts chosen for discussion, after all, are not translated texts. Yet in every one of these instances, a "source" Chinese-language text is found lurking right beneath the English text; it exists ventriloquially, thereby turning the surface text into a translation.

Like all the previous chapters, the one on Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* (Chapter Five) deals with inaccuracies in translation. In this case it is the myths that constitute the crux of the problem, in particular Kingston's re-presentation of the stories of Fa Mulan and Yue Fei, where departures from the originals have for decades been singled out by critics for either censure or approbation. Here Huang introduces another key concept in contemporary translation studies, made popular by Lawrence Venuti: the concept of "transparent" or "invisible" translation. Kingston's attempt to smooth over the fractures that could have appeared in her transplantation of Chinese myths to an American context is not one that poststructuralist translation theorists would find congenial, since it erases the foreign, the abusive and the resistant.

The last chapter, which deals with problems in American translations of contemporary Chinese poetry (by Bei Dao, Yu Jian and Che Qianzi, among others), redirects attention to what in Translation Studies circles have been called prototypical translations. Particularly worth noting is Huang's discussion of Jeffrey Twitchell's inclusion of an abundance of annotations in the poems he has translated from Chinese. The use of footnotes is, of course, an ethnographic method. In

translation, however, it is a means to allow the foreign to remain in the text. It permits the adoption of a literal translation method, since detailed explanations of semantic points can be relegated to the margins (in this case, to the bottom).

In fact, in a tangential manner, Huang has in the course of his monograph made mention of many of the key issues that have engaged the attention of translation scholars recently. One cannot fail to notice the direct or oblique consideration of issues related to re-creation, appropriation, adaptation, translation as reading, retranslation, collaborative translation, and so on. It is perhaps a pity that on the dust jacket the book is described as belonging to the categories of "American literature, comparative literature, Asian studies and anthropology". It should find a place, too, in the category of "Translation Studies".

It is possible, in my opinion, to see *Transpacific Displacement* in the context of recent attempts to apply the "discoveries" made in Translation Studies to other disciplinary areas, especially (comparative) literature and anthropology. The links between these disciplines have been long-standing, and Translation Studies has benefited enormously in the past two decades or so from insights obtained in the two neighbor disciplines. Perhaps it is time we surveyed how it can give something back to its benefactors. The issue of cross-disciplinary give-and-take has attracted the attention of a handful of scholars, and I would like to conclude the present review article by referring, briefly, to two such examples where the relevance of Translation Studies to comparative literature and anthropology is pondered: Timothy Weiss' *Translating Orients*, and Paula G. Rubel and Abraham Rosman's *Translating Cultures*.

On the basis of his conviction that translation reveals the amazingly complex "networking of languages and literary and cultural imaginaries" (123), Weiss advocates the use of a "translational approach" to literary studies, explicating the works of authors who inhabit a liminal zone

between cultures: South American writer Jorges Luis Borges, who made use of sources as diverse as Persian, Arabic, Indian, Chinese and Japanese; American writer Paul Bowles, who sojourned in Morocco, North Africa, for more than fifty years; Hong Kong/London writer David T. K. Wong, who "translated" Hong Kong for Western readers in his anthology *Hong Kong Stories*; British-born writers of foreign ancestry like Kazuo Ishiguro and Salman Rushdie; and so on. In recent years much use has been made by comparatists of the concepts and terminology of Translation Studies in the interpretation of works which represent a world neither monolingual nor monocultural, though the writers of such works never themselves actively undertake to translate. Weiss, however, seeks to go beyond attempting to re-interpret individual works and instead theorize about the approach itself, which has already gained gradual ascendancy in literary circles.

For the benefit of translation scholars, I will briefly summarize Weiss' main arguments in favor of the translational approach to literature. First, it provides a means to deal with and characterize a newly emergent reality. Second, unlike more traditional and positivistic approaches, it highlights relationships and connections, many of which are intertextual ones. One might add that, it is particularly powerful in dealing with works employing multilingual registers and evincing mixed cultural perspectives, as well as rewritings and adaptations of foreign source materials. In any case, its strengths are encapsulated in the final chapter of *Translating Orients* in terms of its ability to resist the imposition of meaning, to counter fundamentalisms and ideology, and to allow for movement and openness. Weiss puts it most succinctly in this manner:

> The translational approach, which takes a subject matter and changes it from one place, state, form, or appearance to another, recomposing it in other registers, involves three linked processes: (1) resistance, (2) identity

shedding and identity making, and (3) possibility seeking. (204)

The power of translation in affecting literary and cultural processes has, in my opinion, seldom been more cogently expressed.

With reference to the way in which Translation Studies can make a contribution to anthropology, I should like to refer, in closing, to another recent publication which takes as its subject the role of the anthropologist as translator—*Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*, in which eleven papers from a conference on Translation and Anthropology held at Barnard College in 1998 are anthologized. What in particular interests me is the "Introduction" to this book written by the two editors, Paula G. Rubel and Abraham Rosman. Here Rubel and Rosman begin by surveying the changes in anthropological research through the past century and delineating the ways in which translation theory can help refocus attention on anthropological translations. As they put it, Translation Studies has recently emerged in the United States as a "distinct discipline dealing not only with the historical and cultural context of translation, but also with the problems associated with translating texts". As such, it "may offer some assistance to anthropologists confronting similar problems in their work" (5). This claim the two anthologists seek then to substantiate with reference to Lawrence Venuti's theories of foreignization vs. domestication, Eugene Nida's ideas of "dynamic equivalence" and "naturalness of expression", and Tejaswini Niranjana's discussion of the ideological implications of translation for colonial peoples.

Nevertheless, the editors do not seem to view the contribution of the "translation approach" with unmitigated approbation. Their argument takes a different turn toward the end of their "Introduction". With reference to an article by Aram A. Yengoyan, the two editors note that "many of the issues with which literary translation and the literary critiques

of translation are concerned do not parallel issues of concern to anthropologists in their translations" (20). Citing specific examples, they point out that literary translations evince a concern about aesthetic form while anthropological "translations" do not. For them, too, anthropologists "translate" materials collected through fieldwork *in terms of conceptual categories at a higher level.* Furthermore, anthropologists may even question whether faithfulness of translation is always of paramount importance. In this light, it seems that there is still some room for closer, more transparent dialogue between translation scholars and anthropologists. Nevertheless, as we have seen, Yunte Huang's adroit use of the anthropological approach in his study of a handful of twentieth-century American texts in which cultural meanings can be seen to have been displaced brilliantly demonstrates that collaboration between the two disciplines can be immensely fruitful. It is an encouraging sign of the significant contribution that Translation Studies research can make.

References

Rubel, Paula G. and Abraham Rosman, ed. (2004). *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*. New York: Berg.

Weiss, Timothy (2004). *Translating Orients: Between Ideology and Utopia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

About the Author

Leo Tak-hung Chan is currently Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Translation, Lingnan University. His articles have appeared in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, TTR, Babel, Across Languages and Cultures, The Translator, Journal of Oriental Studies* and *Asian Folklore Studies*. His recent books include *The Discourse on Foxes*

and Ghosts (University of Hawaii Press, 1998), *Masterpieces in Western Translation Theory* (co-edited, City University of HK Press, 2000), *One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature* (Rodopi, 2003) and *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory: Modes, Issues and Debates* (John Benjamins, 2004).

稿約凡例

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

一、稿件格式

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

二、標點符號

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

三、子　目

各段落之大小標題，請依各級子目標明，次序如下：

一、／A.／1.／a.／(1)／(a)

四、專有名詞及引文

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

一段原引文為整段引錄，首行需入四格。

五、注　釋

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

六、版　權

來稿刊登後，版權歸出版者所有，任何轉載，均須出版者同意。

七、書　評

中文書評格式與中文稿例同。

八、贈閱本

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

九、評　審

來稿經本學報編輯委員會審閱後，再以匿名方式送交專家評審，方決定是否採用。

十、來稿請寄：香港屯門嶺南大學翻譯系轉《翻譯季刊》主編陳德鴻博士。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. *Translation Quarterly* is a journal published by the Hong Kong Translation Society. Contributions, in either Chinese or English, should be original, hitherto unpublished, and not being considered for publication elsewhere. Once a submission is accepted, its copyright is transferred to the publisher. Translated articles should be submitted with a copy of the source-text and a brief introduction of the source-text author. It is the translator's responsibility to obtain written permission to translate.

2. Abstracts in English of 200-300 words are required. Please attach to the manuscript with your name, address, telephone and fax numbers and email address where applicable.

3. In addition to original articles and book reviews, review articles related to the evaluation or interpretation of a major substantive or methodological issue may also be submitted.

4. Endnotes should be kept to a minimum and typed single-spaced. Page references should be given in parentheses, with the page number(s) following the author's name and the year of publication. Manuscript styles should be consistent; authors are advised to consult the *MLA Handbook* for proper formats.

5. Chinese names and book titles in the text should be romanised according to the "modified" Wade-Giles or the pinyin system, and then, where they first appear, followed immediately by the Chinese characters and translations. Translations of Chinese terms obvious to the readers (like *wenxue*), however, are not necessary.

6. There should be a separate reference section containing all the works referred to in the body of the article. Pertinent information should be given on the variety of editions available, as well as the date and place of publication, to facilitate use by the readers.

7. All contributions will be first reviewed by the Editorial Board members and then anonymously by referees for its suitability for publication in *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves on the first page, in the top or bottom margins, or in endnotes. A separate cover page with the title of the article, the name of the author and his/her institutional affiliation should be provided.

8. Book reviews are to follow the same format as that for submitted articles; they should be typed and doubled-spaced, giving at the outset the full citation for the work reviewed, plus information about special features (like appendices and illustrations) and prices. Unsolicited book reviews are as a rule not accepted.

9. Contributions should be submitted in both soft and hard copies, to Dr. Leo Tak-hung Chan, c/o Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong.

10. Contributors of articles will receive three complimentary copies of the journal, but these will be shared in the case of joint authorship. Book reviewers will receive two complimentary copies.