Translation Quarterly

No. 67 2013

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

香港翻譯學會出版

翻譯季刊

二〇一三年
第六十七期

第四屆嶺南——清華翻譯研討會（二）

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

《翻譯季刊》 *Translation Quarterly*
二〇一三年三月　第六十七期 No. 67, March 2013

ISSN 1027-8559-67

翻譯季刊
Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會
The Hong Kong Translation Society

Translation Quarterly **No. 67, March 2013**

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

目錄 CONTENTS

論文 Articles

書評 Book Review

Rhetoric, Logic and Silence in "Sailing to Byzantium" and Its Chinese Translations

Lennet Daigle

Abstract

Gayatri Spivak's "The Politics of Translation" examines political subjectivity and linguistic agency at work in translation practices. Central to her argument is the interplay of rhetoric, logic and silence in creating the conditions of possibility for the emergence of subjectivity and agency. In this paper the author will attempt to clarify this 'three-tiered notion' with help from Spivak's own writings and those of Paul de Man. In the second part I apply Spivak's ideas to Yeats' poem "Sailing to Byzantium" and examine several different Chinese translations to demonstrate how Spivak's ideas can be applied to literary translation.

The three-tiered notion of language mentioned repeatedly in Gayatri Spivak's essay "The Politics of Translation" seems to provide a tidy summary of her ideas, especially for readers who might be confused about her distinction between 'translation as reading' and 'reading as translation', or who do not care to entertain Hegel and Zizek on the sublime. The three terms—rhetoric, logic and silence—are first used together in a sentence that reads: "Post-structuralism has shown some of us a staging of the agent within a three-tiered notion of language (as rhetoric, logic, silence)" (1992: 399). But attempts at summarization are frustrated by the complexities of the text, and students who come across Spivak's essay in The Translation

Studies Reader with little or no preparation might be forgiven for asking what all this means. Why post-structuralism? Why staging of the agent? Even the title of Spivak's paper—which seems simple enough—is misleading, in that readers expecting a discussion of institutional interference in translation activities or ideological manipulation of translations by governments will be disappointed to find a meandering discussion of language, feminism and agency, and of Spivak's own experiences translating Bengali literature. The politics of the title is used in a broad way that brings political issues to a personal level. Governments are hardly mentioned. This is the politics of the individual, a look at the small individual choices that have political and ethical ramifications, and that shape the environments in which institutional politics operate: bottom up rather than top down politics.

In what follows I attempt to clarify this 'three-tiered notion' with help from Spivak's own writings and those of her teacher Paul de Man. In the second part I apply Spivak's ideas to Yeats' poem "Sailing to Byzantium" and examine several different Chinese translations to demonstrate how Spivak's ideas can be applied to literary translation.

Spivak's "The Politics of Translation"

Why post-structuralism? Why staging of the agent? Insight into both questions can be found in the work of Paul de Man, particularly his essay "Semiology and Rhetoric". De Man was Spivak's thesis director at Cornell, where she received her Ph.D. for a study of Yeats' poetry (later published as *Myself Must I Remake: The Life and Poetry of W.B. Yeats*). "Semiology and Rhetoric" begins by noting a trend in literary criticism away from formalism and towards a focus on the relationship between literature and the real world:

> …as if, with the problems of literary form resolved once and forever, and

> with the techniques of structural analysis refined to near-perfection, we could now move 'beyond formalism' towards the questions that really interest us. . . . With the internal law and order of literature well policed, we can now confidently devote ourselves to the foreign affairs, the external politics of literature. (de Man 1979: 3)

De Man sees this as morally admirable but theoretically misguided because it leaves the nature of the debate unchanged, still dominated by a "metaphorical model of literature as a kind of box that separates an inside from an outside" (1979: 5). In traditional approaches to criticism, literary form was considered to be the outside and literary content the inside (and reading a text was a kind of unwrapping, a casting off of form to get at the content), while in more recent formalist approaches the opposite held true. But as de Man says, "It matters little whether we call the inside of the box the content or the form, the outside the meaning or the appearance" (1979: 5). Instead of simply inverting the binary opposition content/form, De Man suggests changing the terms of the debate and focusing instead on the distinction between rhetoric and grammar, which is not a binary opposition, and which "disrupts and confuses the neat antithesis of the inside/outside pattern" (1979: 12).

Moving beyond formalism to the "foreign affairs, the external politics of literature" is precisely what Spivak wants to do; but as a post-structuralist she wants to do so in a way that doesn't simply reverse existing hierarchies, that doesn't treat literature as a box to be 'unpacked' for its meaning, whether that meaning be found in its form or its content. De Man reminds us that semiology is not semantics, that semiology "explodes the myth of semantic correspondence between sign and referent" (1979: 6). Spivak's "staging of the agent within a three-tiered notion of language" can be thought of as a way to rebuild this link, to re-establish this correspondence between linguistic form and political content without moving back to pre-structuralist notions of natural links between word and world. Since her aims are political, she must be wary of anti-formalism, of privileging reference (content) at the expense of form. Spivak's commitment to post-structuralism prevents her from assuming that words refer directly to things, or that language can show us how the world should be—that by working with language we are working with the world—and her focus on the staging of the agent helps avoid this pitfall. Language can and does make a difference, by affecting the way people understand themselves and by opening or closing channels of linguistic agency; and the text, or language in general, can be thought of as a kind of platform or conduit for human action and for human relationships with the world via language, a space where agency comes into being, creating a link between the formerly distinct interior and exterior. As Spivak says, "language is not everything" (1992: 398), and saying something does not make it so. But language does mould the subject and give the agent tools to work with, tools that can be used to act, to make a difference, to change the world.

The grammatical distinction between subject and agent is relevant here, and helps explain the nature of agency. In English (or broadly Western) grammar, the subject is the noun that governs the verb, and the agent is the one who carries out the action. The subject can be the same as the agent, but need not be, and agency can be distorted, misconstrued, or lost all together when nominalization or passive constructions are used. The subject and the agent, or subjectivity and agency, are closely related, and Spivak admits that the difference between them is open to doubt and misunderstanding. She underscores their similarities when she says in an essay on Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* that "agent and subject are different codings of something we call being" (1989: 89). But she also suggests, perhaps most importantly for the purposes of this article, that the relationship between the two can be understood as a relationship of potential: subjects can become agents. In "The Politics of Translation" she refers to "...the way in which the staging of language produces not only the sexed subject but the gendered agent, by a version of centering, persistently disrupted by rhetoricity, indicating contingency" (1992: 408). Here the distinction is between physiological traits and social roles, between biology and culture, with sex influencing but not determining gender and opening instead various possibilities. Rhetoricity disrupts subjectivity and provides room in which the agent gains freedom to act.

The mechanisms of this (or any other) staging are not explained, and a perusal of some of Spivak's other writings shows the term to be relentlessly vague. I believe, however, that we would not be amiss to identify a quite literal 'staging of agency' in action on the new generation of TV reality shows, some of which make no pretense to be 'real', yet are certainly not 100% 'fake'. The US reality series *The Hills*, which ran on MTV from 2006-2010, attracted criticism for being far too fake for reality TV, though it seemed fairly clear that it was not scripted. For me, however, evidence of staging was not to be found in the dialogue or even the situations in which the characters found themselves, which were occasionally contrived but, as such, perhaps an accurate portrayal of life in the posh sections of Los Angeles. Rather, the staging announced itself in the camera angles and mise-en-scène, which even during brief or impromptu encounters between the characters were far too constructed for documentary style film making, suggesting that certain seemingly fortuitous events were planned in advance, at least long enough for camera and lighting crews to figure out how to get the best shot. Actors who are allowed to improvise under such circumstances, while supposedly going about their lives, are neither acting in the traditional sense, nor 'just being filmed'. Their reality is not scripted but it is staged; certain things are decided in advance, but these decisions are not entirely out of the actors' control, as production decisions are made episode by episode, depending to some extent on what happened in the previous episode and therefore on the behavior of the actors themselves. Likewise a staging of agency is not a determination, an imposition of a destiny, or a scripting. It need not be overly intrusive. Rather, it can be thought of as a setting in which actions take place, a setting which is acted in and acted on, and which in turn constrains but also makes possible the actions of the one who acts (the agent).

De Man's essay also, and primarily, sheds light on the relationship between rhetoric and logic. To begin with, Spivak seems to start with the same definition of rhetoric used by de Man in "Semiology and Rhetoric", clearly stated by de Man as "the study of tropes and of figures (which is how the term 'rhetoric' is used throughout this paper, and not in the derived sense of comment or of eloquence or persuasion)" (1979: 6). Just as Spivak's use of the word 'politics' refers not to institutions and parties but to ethics and responsibility, her use of 'rhetoric' follows de Man in referring not to the art of persuasion but broadly to figurative language and rhetorical tropes. She seems to use the terms 'rhetoric' and 'figuration' interchangeably, and in one case uses them in tandem ("rhetorical figuration"). But the scope of rhetoric does not stop there. In an interview published in the *Journal of Advanced Composition* in 1990, Spivak gives an even broader definition. In response to the question "How do you conceptualize rhetoric, both as an activity and as a discipline?", Spivak replies, in part:

> In Paul de Man's "The Resistance to Theory", rhetoric is the name for the residue of indeterminacy which escapes the system. In this reading, the idea that rhetoric is tropology is not adequate to the notion that it is the name of what escapes even an exhaustive system of tropological analysis. (Sipiora and Atwill 1990)

She is referring presumably to the following passage in the essay "The Resistance to Theory", in which de Man establishes a distinction between reading and decoding, and argues for a residue which resists grammatical decoding:

> To stress the by no means self-evident necessity of reading implies at least two things. First of all, it implies that literature is not a transparent message in which it can be taken for granted that the distinction between the message

> and the means of communication is clearly established. Second, and more problematically, it implies that the grammatical decoding of a text leaves a residue of indetermination that has to be, but cannot be, resolved by grammatical means, however extensively conceived (1982: 15)

The purpose of reading then, as opposed to decoding, is to acknowledge and come to terms with this residue; *not* to master it, situate it, or fix its meaning. Rhetoric need not be ungrammatical, but it can and will, according to de Man, escape the grasp of grammatical analysis. On these grounds, rhetoric would show up in translation as that which resists translation, or provides the translator with too many options.

Spivak goes a step further than de Man by linking linguistic logic with social logic, and rhetoric with "the disruptiveness of figuration in social practice" (1992: 403). She doesn't give any specific justifications for this move; perhaps she feels that the linguistic staging of human agency is a strong enough link to bind language and society. Or perhaps the notion is merely metaphorical and illustrative, and therefore exempt from justification. Regardless, the staging of the agent becomes easier to understand when the three-tiered notion is politicized. The agent (the one who acts) might have access to the logic of the political or ideological mainstream, to be able to affect change in ways considered reasonable. But people denied this access, marginalized, may be forced to rely on rhetoric to make themselves heard in ways still considered understandable or meaningful. Beyond marginalization lies silence, the dismissal of speech as meaningless. This phenomenon is frequently seen in political contexts, with politicians dismissing the speech of their opponents as political rhetoric and constantly seeking to establish the 'true meaning' of contested terms. US politics in particular is constantly presenting us with examples of rhetorics that become logics, thereby eventually losing their disruptive potential. The drawing and redrawing of the boundaries between logic and rhetoric and between rhetoric and silence shifts the ground under the agent's feet; and conversely the efforts of the agent may be devoted to contesting these boundaries (and participating in this linguistic gerrymandering).

We find then, in Spivak and de Man as well, both positive and negative characterizations of rhetoric: first as figuration, figurative language, rhetorical tropes; and then, by extension, as that aspect or quality of the text that does not yield to decoding, that is not amenable to grammatical analysis. Availing ourselves of this later broader definition helps clarify the first two parts of the three-part model with respect to language, thus leaving us with silence. Spivak seems to think of silence less as a 'what' than a 'where', as a "space outside language" (1992: 398) whose existence can be inferred by the workings of rhetoric: "[The translator] must solicit the text to show the limits of its language, because that rhetorical aspect will point at the silence of the absolute fraying of language that the text wards off, in its special manner" (1992: 400). This fraying of language is compared to dissemination, presumably in the sense used by Derrida. It might be useful, and even correct, to think of rhetoric and logic as different degrees of dissemination, and silence as dissemination that has gotten out of control. De Man provides specific examples in "Semiology and Rhetoric" of the fraying induced by rhetoric, one of them drawn from Yeats' poem "Among School Children" (de Man 1979: 11-12) in which rhetoric (in this case a rhetorical question) produces two meanings and leads to two interpretations that are equally valid yet contradictory. As language continues to fray, we can imagine these interpretations multiplying, becoming a cancerous growth, until meaning is choked out. Something that can mean anything doesn't mean anything. Spivak hints at such an interpretation when she refers to "the founding violence of silence" (1992: 399), as if the proper functioning of language, its normal operation (regardless of its political content) depends on the foreclosure of the meaningless, of the space beyond language, of things that are not "semiotically organized" (1992: 403). She repeatedly contrasts language with contingency, as if language represents organization or knowledge as such, a charted space surrounded by an abyss of meaninglessness: "Rhetoric points at absolute contingency, not the sequentiality of time, not even the cycle of seasons, but only 'weather'" (1992: 410).

"Sailing to Byzantium" in Translation

"Sailing to Byzantium" is full of rhetorical snares for the translator. Below I offer a reading of "Sailing to Byzantium" with a focus on rhetoric, logic and silence. I also examine extracts from three published Chinese translations of the poem done by 傅浩 (Fu Hao), 查良錚 (Zha Liangzheng), and 裘小龍 (Qiu Xiaolong) to illustrate Spivak's ideas in action.

Line 1

That is no country for old men.

Is this rhetorical or not? Does 'country' refer to a political entity, or to a vaguely defined landscape? Does 'men' refer to males, or does it refer, via figuration, to all humans? This is something Spivak might take an interest in. "Sailing to Byzantium" is not explicitly concerned with the relations between the sexes, but does distinguish between the two on several occasions ('man' again in line 9, and 'lords and ladies' in line 31). It is natural to assume that Yeats himself is speaking in the poem, and that 'men' does refer specifically to males. All three of the Chinese translations, however, use a gender neutral term 老年人 (old person) both here and in the first line of the following stanza ("an aged man is but a paltry thing..."). It is not difficult to see this as a staging of agency, since it is only a small step from using the word for men to refer to all humans, to denying women full participation in society. In the context of the poem, we can see how rhetoric works even when it is not at work, how the potential for rhetorical disruption colors our understanding of non-figurative language, and how it can shape translation, even in its absence. The potential for rhetoric means that rhetoric is working even when it is not working. Why have all three translators chosen to read this line figuratively in a way that degenders the poem? How does Yeats' poem change if we substitute "old people" and "old person" for 'men' and 'man'? I would suggest that it avoids the problem of the gendered soul, and the question of whether the escape from nature is an option only for men and not for women. There is also the issue of the gender of the sages in line 17, whom I would assume to be primarily male, and the role of gender in the relationship between mortals and immortals.

Spivak tells us that "the task of the feminist translator is to consider language as a clue to the workings of gendered agency" (1992: 397). Here the feminist translator working into Chinese might choose instead to retain the surface or logical meaning of the original, which would at least leave 'that country' as a place potentially suitable for women. In "The Politics of Translation", Spivak gives another example (the translation of Devi's story "Breast-Giver") in which the rhetorically sensitive translation is the literal one, one that refuses to re-euphemize a term that has been de-euphemized to take advantage of its disruptive potential, and choosing instead a term "…enough like wet-nurse to make sense, enough unlike to shock" (1992: 400). This suggests that the rhetoric/logic pairing may well be a way for translation studies to move beyond the literal/free impasse.

Lines 2 and 3

…birds in the trees - / those dying generations - at their song

"Dying generations" is surely rhetorical in the classical sense, and looks very much like an oxymoron. But it is also strictly contingent, in a linguistic sense. The English word for 'cohort of contemporaries' shares a root with a word meaning 'to beget', thus creating the possibility for wordplay. The Chinese counterparts do not, as far as I know, share an etymology. The Chinese translations use 瀕死 or 垂死 (both meaning 'near death') for 'dying' and 世代 or 一代代 ('generation' or 'era', 一代代 implying the plural) for 'generations'. The disruptive potential of 'dying generations' is evident in the implied insistence that what is dying should be living or creating life, suggesting unjust death. Is there any way to capture this in Chinese? The answer would seem to rest on the ingenuity of the translator, another contingency.

What interests me more about this line, however, is the indeterminacy of the demonstrative, something that occurs throughout the poem. By the third line the reader has encountered two demonstratives of indeterminate reference, 'that' country and 'those' dying generations. I am not sure if rhetoric in the classical sense is involved here, but it certainly meets de Man's expanded criteria of being impenetrable to grammatical decoding. In the first case the external referent is unclear, though it is generally taken to be Ireland. In the second case it is internal reference that is unclear – who is dying? Which generations? The translators seem to agree that using 那 (that) and 那些 (those) is the best way to proceed, and all three translations start with 那, namely 那絕非 (that is absolutely not) or 那不是 (that is not). This may strike a strange note with contemporary readers given the use of 那 as a semantically empty placeholder in modern spoken Mandarin, a note distinctly different from the aural and semantic curtness of 'that' in English.

From the point of view of the agent, indeterminacy of this type (i.e. 'those dying generations') creates a bit of linguistic wiggle room—being able to speak about something without specifying what is being spoken about increases ones options, linguistically and rhetorically (in the persuasive sense). It's a way of hedging ones bets. Indeterminacy of reference intensifies in the second stanza and continues through the third, coming to a crescendo in the three iterations of 'it', which initially refers to 'soul' (no article, definite or indefinite), but is subsequently stretched to its limit, in what Spivak might allow us to refer to as an example of the limits of language. The rogue pronoun is first used in a striking, puzzling, bewildering even, bit of figuration: "...unless/ Soul clap its hands and sing". Regardless of how the line is understood, the referent of the pronoun is unambiguous. In the following line 'it' appears again (for every tatter in its mortal dress), surely again referring to 'soul' but even stranger now, as a soul not only has hands and the ability to sing, but is clothed, if only in tatters. The use of the possessive with 'tatters' refers not only back to 'soul', but all the way back to 'an aged man', as 'tattered' could only refer to the tattered coat. Yeats uses pronouns to create a complex web of self reference, each subsequent use expanding the characterization of the original referent and the reach of signification, until in line 14, the final 'it', again in the possessive form, would be easier to understand in what is most probably the wrong reading—that is referring to the singing school. How much longer could the poet keep talking about an 'it' originally referring to something as intractable as the notion of soul? Such an extended chain of pronoun reference, increasingly ambiguous, could certainly be used as a rhetorical (persuasive) device, starting with an innocent reference and moving farther and farther away, maintaining a grammatical link while shifting the understood reference away from its logical correspondent and toward the desired persuasive goal, whatever that may be.

> **Lines 8**
>
> Monuments of unageing intellect

The two 'monuments' in "Sailing to Byzantium" almost seem to have been custom made for reading à la Spivak: a politically charged term used in a rhetorically disruptive way. At issue is not only the logic of the monument (discussed below), but the preposition connecting the monuments with their objects. "Monuments of" is ambiguous - one thinks of "monuments of bronze" (made of bronze), or "monuments of lasting splendor". It is not clear whether "monuments of unageing intellect" refers to monuments to unageing intellect or monuments made from the timeless achievements of the human intellect. Given that the metrical constraints would have been equally well satisfied with 'to', the ambiguity must be considered intentional. Likewise the phrase "monuments of the revolution" need not refer to monuments glorifying the revolution, but may imply something more like "remnants of the revolution", suggesting a neutral or even negative assessment of the revolutionary aims. 'Of' here is logically indeterminate, implying correlation but leaving causation unspecified. This pregnant indeterminacy allows us to see these monuments not only as either/or, but as both: a monument of unageing intellect as a monument to unageing intellect.

Given the role that the monuments play in the speaker's actions—their neglect is his reason for leaving that country, and their respected place in Byzantium is his reason for sailing—they are an important part of the stagings that occur in the poem, and their rhetorical disruption disrupts whatever agency awaits Yeats in his fantasy world. The timelessness of the monuments in the first stanza is contrasted with the sensual, mortal world of 'that country' and things that are begotten, born, and die; while the magnificence of the monuments in the second stanza is contrasted with the tattered paltry old man. Does magnificence make the monument, or is magnificence being memorialized? Or both?

The distinction is not unimportant. In her essay "Sculpture in the Expanded Field", Rosalind Krauss points out the link between the logic of the sculpture and the logic of the monument:

> The logic of sculpture, it would seem, is inseparable from the logic of

> the monument. By virtue of this logic a sculpture is a commemorative representation. It sits in a particular place and speaks in a symbolical tongue about the meaning or use of that place…Because they thus function in relation to the logic of representation and marking, sculptures are normally figurative and vertical, their pedestals an important part of the structure since they mediate between actual site and representational sign. (1979: 33)

If we follow Krauss in saying that monuments speak (authoritatively) about the meaning of a place (a space), then it becomes clear why monuments and even talk of monuments are so fiercely contested, and how monuments (as makers of meaning) can be involved in rhetorical disruptions. The creation of a monument effectively speaks for the past, or allows the past to speak, but it also helps to silence those voices not chosen for commemoration. It is difficult to imagine monuments to two opposing groups erected on the same site; it is not normally done. Monuments are typically erected in 'safe' places that have been cleared of ideological opponents. Were two conflicting monuments to share the same ground a tension would certainly exist. [1]

In "Sailing to Byzantium", the word 'monument' is used twice, once in reference to something that not only has not passed away but is not getting any older and has not lost its significance (why then would it need a monument?), and again referring (in one reading) to a monument built by the subject of commemoration, the imposed monument, a monument to oneself, and therefore perhaps not a 'true' monument—an ineffectual monument, the kind that is quickly toppled once its object is out of favor. The rhetorical ambiguity created by the preposition disrupts the logic of the monument: if the monument is made *of* unageing intellect (truly a "monument of"), then it can be a monument to most anything; but if it is a monument to unageing intellect, then opposing monuments must not be allowed in the vicinity. The question becomes, then, whom does the unageing intellect serve? Or does it only serve itself? What does the magnificence of the soul memorialize? Here a rhetorical disruption creates questions rather than answers. The past can be silent, or silenced. Indeed, selective remembering is a key political strategy for all political regimes. Certain voices are silenced, certain voices are amplified, and monuments are built, but rarely are people or events allowed to speak for themselves. This seems to be one of the core concerns of Spivak's work as a whole, allowing people to speak (providing them space in which to speak, giving them 'the floor', learning to ignore the voices that drown them out), and then listening.

With monuments (and sculptures) we have something that would seem fairly universal. The question for the translator is, how far does this universality extend? We could perhaps go to any inhabited place on earth and find something we could identify as a monument, but this doesn't guarantee that we can translate the word for it in the local language into the English 'monument', or that its cultural logic is the same. The Chinese translations reflect this ambiguity. Fu Hao opts for abstraction, translating 'monument' first as 傑作 (masterpiece) and then 樂章 (a musical passage or movement). The other translators use 紀念物 (memorial, but also souvenir) or 紀念碑 (memorial stone tablet, monument). More importantly, Chinese grammar creates different potentials for rhetorical disruption. The translators all use two 的's (a grammatical particle used to indicate attribution or possession and lacking a clear English counterpart) in translating the line, e.g. 萬古長青的理性的紀念物 (monuments to unageing rationality), creating logical relationships of attribution or belonging between the three semantic elements (unageing 的 rationality 的 monument). Other options are available, however, and a translation found online and attributed to Taiwanese scholar 周英雄 (Ying-hsiung Chou) uses only one 的, i.e. 不朽智慧的紀念牌 (unageing intellect 的 monument). Fecund ambiguity arises in both cases, roughly equivalent to the potential groupings of mathematical terms A, B and C as (AB)C or A(BC). Direct juxtaposition of the terms with no 的, something like 萬古長青理性紀念物 (unageing intellectual monuments) would also be possible, and may release even greater potential for rhetorical disturbance, as attribution itself would be called into question. The use of one 的 creates the possibility for ambiguities very much like in the English original, since an implied 做 (to make or do) as in 不朽智慧做的紀念碑 (monuments made from unageing intellect) would raise issues similar to those that arise out of the of/to distinction discussed above.

Lines 19

perne in a gyre

This is very nearly private language, or, to the extent that it is public, is known to the majority of people only as 'one of those strange things that Yeats says from time to time'. I cite it as an example of decoding. We can consult a glossary or annotated edition to find out how to decipher it, but I don't see how it could be considered rhetorically disruptive. Within Spivak's scheme I see it moving towards silence. Yeats' terms have not been widely adopted; they are spoken only by him. And despite his stature and the continued strength of his voice, it is still only one among many. One way (the only way?) to rescue language from silence is to put it to use, provide it with linguistic environments in which it can live and grow. Private language (the possibility of which is very much in doubt) is limited to a very narrow linguistic habitat, and would seem to be divorced from the life-giving tension between logic and rhetoric, and on the losing side of the battle between rhetoric and silence.

Lines 21 and 22

sick with desire / and fastened to a dying animal

The whole passage runs: "Consume my heart away / Sick with desire and fastened to a dying animal / It knows not what it is; and gather me /

Into the artifice of eternity". What interests me here is something like the truth value of these lines taken as a proposition. "Sick with desire" sounds distinctly Freudian, especially if desire is understood as sexual desire, while "fastened to a dying animal" is easily Darwinian. Both of these theories of the self were introduced during Yeats' lifetime, and were, for him, relatively modern ways of thinking, or at least not yet 'monuments' from an earlier time. Both can also be seen as revolutions of the Copernican type, debunkings that permanently displaced humanity from its unique status as self-aware and separate from the beasts (and left us little more than great apes in thrall to our unconscious minds and neuroses). As such they represent a considerable obstacle to the fulfillment of the poem's narrative logic, which is driving toward a radical and complete break with nature and union (reunion?) with "the artifice of eternity". Reading them as figures of speech, as harmless metaphors leaves open the possibility of escape from nature; but reading them as scientific knowledge (as peerless 'monuments of unageing intellect') forces us to read the final stanza as pure fantasy. Here we seem to have a disruption of logic of the type de Man warns about, one that leads inevitably to contradiction. For the poet's aims to be true, or come true, the poet's words must be false (rhetorical).

It is hard for me to judge whether the Chinese translations resonate with Freud and Darwin like the original, though I suspect that without an extremely precise and directed translation (directed toward or into the territory of Freudian and Darwinian terminology in Chinese), the resonance is lost.

Lines 25

Once out of nature

Finally, the metaphysical core of the poem, a problem somewhat beyond the scope of this study. The question, for me, is whether or not the concept of escaping from nature even makes sense in a Chinese context. It may not, at least not in the classical Chinese tradition:

> *Wen hua*—generally translated as "culture"—signifies the process through which one adopts *wen*. However, this process in not simply one of civilizational mimesis or imitation but the "creation" of a new pattern. Most important is that this pattern appears within a constellation in which the opposition "nature versus culture" does not have the same meaning as in a Western cultural context; the pattern of *wen* is found not only in those things that a Western mind would usually see as "cultural" but also in animals, vegetation, and cosmological phenomena. (Botz-Bornstein 2010: 167)

"Sailing to Byzantium" is dualistic to the core, hyper-dualistic, a tangle of dualisms neatly expressed in binary oppositions—old/young, sensual/intellectual, body/soul, nature/artifice, mortal/eternal—which frame the subject and stage the agent. In each case the leading term is what the speaker is sailing away from, and the second term what he (she) is longing for and sailing towards. The poet is asking for nothing less than a complete separation from nature. "Sailing to Byzantium" couldn't be more explicit about the relationship between nature and art (artifice, or what we might be forgiven for calling culture in the narrow sense), and between the body and soul. The poet's immortal soul is bewildered, befuddled, stuck with (and to) a dying animal, trapped in nature, and wants no part of it. A rhetorical disruption at this level would be hard to gauge, as it would throw everything else about the text into doubt. It is instructive, however, to note the presence of such a master rhetoric, and the existence of a web of subordinate rhetorical/logical relations. What is their effect on agency? This particular issue goes to the core of agency—the connection between mind and body, interior and exterior world. Are humans 'stuck' in the material realm? Does the firing of millions of neurons amount to anything more than the sum of its parts?

Tellingly, the Chinese translations are remarkably similar, small variations on 一旦超脱自然 (once free of nature). An exception, a translation found online and attributed to Taiwanese poet Yang Mu, reads 既已和自然相違 (now that [I am] mutually estranged from nature), which raises the intriguing possibility of a *mutual* desertion—the poet rejects nature, which in turn rejects the poet. This last is creative misreading at its finest, enrichment through disruption, fidelity through betrayal.

Conclusion

This study has focused on only one of the many ideas advanced in "The Politics of Translation", which as mentioned resists summarization. Yet it is a key idea that does to some extent help to unify the text, and that provides insights into both translation theory and practice. Spivak's three-tiered notion was shown to be indebted to the work of Paul de Man, another scholar whose research into the workings of rhetoric has implications for the translator. Rhetoric, logic and silence provide the translator and the translation theorist with an alternative to traditional and unproductive binary oppositions, and point the way toward a richer understanding of language and languages.

References

Botz-Bornsetin, Thorsten (2010). "Genes, Memes, and the Chinese Concept of *Wen*: Toward a Nature/Culture Model of Genetics". *Philosophy East and West* 60.2: 167-186.

De Man, Paul (1979). "Semiology and Rhetoric". In *Allegories of Reading*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 3–19.

____(1982). "The Resistance to Theory". *Yale French Studies* 63: 3-20.

Fu Hao 傅浩 (1994). *Ye Zhi shuqingshi quanji* 葉芝抒情詩全集. Beijing: China Workers'

Publishing House.

Krauss, Rosalind (1979). "Sculpture in the Expanded Field". *October* 8: 30-44.

Qiu Xiaolong 裘小龍 (1986). *Shuqing shiren Ye Zhi shixuan* 抒情詩人葉芝詩選. Chengdu: Sichuan Literature and Art Publishing House.

Sipiora, Phillip, and Janet Atwill (1990). "Rhetoric and Cultural Explanation: A Discussion with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak". *Journal of Advanced Composition* 10.2: no page.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1992/2000). "The Politics of Translation". In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge. 397-417.

____ (1989). "Reading *The Satanic Verses*". *Public Culture* 2.1: 79-99.

Yeats, William Butler (1983). *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats*. London: Macmillan.

Zha Liangzheng 查良錚 (1985). *Yingguo xiandai shixuan* 英國現代詩選. Changsha: Hunan People's Publishing House.

Notes

[1] The US Supreme Court took on this issue in 2009 in relation to a case about an attempt by a small religious group to erect their own monument nearby, and in opposition, to a monument to the Ten Commandments in a national park in Utah.

About the Author

Lennet Daigle is a translator and graduate of the Graduate Institute of Interpretation and Translation at Shanghai International Studies University.

比較與會通

——安樂哲、羅思文的《論語》英譯

譚曉麗

Abstract

A Comparative Study of Chinese and Western Philosophy: A Case Study of *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (*by* Tan Xiaoli)

The translation of The Analects *by Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont was meant to contest the cultural universalism propagated by Western scholars with their pride in Western philosophy and religion. The text is characterised by post-structuralist features—the co-existence of transliteration and interpretation, creative writing and imitation, subversion and fluency. Some prominent elements of* The Analects of Confucius*:* A Philosophical Translation *are discussed at length in this article: the emphasis on process rather than result, the focus on social interaction rather than on isolated individuals. The translation is also noted for the translators' creative interpretation, their use of quotations from various sources and their artistic language. The article analyses the translators' strategies embodied therein and generalise about the project's relevance to translation studies.*

一、引言

在發軔於後結構主義、後殖民主義，洶湧於全球化語境的文化翻

譯浪潮中，安樂哲（Roger Ames）、羅思文（Henry Rosement）無疑是順應時代潮流的中國典籍譯者。身為西方學者，諳熟西方哲學、語言學，他們卻醉心於中國古典舊學，在浩瀚如海的儒家、道家經典中找到棲身之所。他們對中國哲學遭西方漠視的現狀深為不滿，將其主要原因歸咎於以往傳教士、漢學家以西釋儒、釋道的翻譯，強調中國思想、語言的獨特性，在提倡差異的後現代翻譯話語中，格外引人注目。

翻譯給固有的語言和文化帶來衝擊。一個文化在吸納“他者”的同時，也會抵制外來的“異質”，以確保本族文化的“純粹”與“完整”性。於是乎多年以來，無論西方還是中國，“歸化”的翻譯一直遙居上風。直到後結構主義的興起，“異化”的呼聲才日漸高漲，尤其是當今全球一體化的時代，不同文化接觸、碰撞、交融的程度勝過以往，民族文化面臨全球化的挑戰，“異化”似乎成為文化翻譯最主要的手段。但是，在翻譯中反對文化普適主義，批判結構主義的“求同倫理”，追求文化差異性的同時，後結構主義又過度張揚這種差異，認為翻譯過程的核心內容就是對原文中具有差異性的因素進行處理。其實，一些宣揚差異的翻譯理論家所關心的說到底是翻譯如何影響譯入文化，而不是譯入與譯出文化之間的關係，他們認為翻譯的終極目標是“促進本土文化的更新和變化”（蔣童，2010: 83）。因此不可能解決自我與他者之間的關係問題。全球化語境下，文化價值的雙向訴求反映著人們矛盾而又真實的心態：既要全球化、世界性，又要地域化、民族性。在文化的存在和發展中，這兩者既凸顯文化要求上的一種內在張力，又反映著文化取向上的交互性。翻譯面臨的問題比以往任何時候都要複雜。正如愛德溫・根茨勒和瑪麗雅・提莫契科（Tymoczko & Gentzler 2002: xx）所說：

> 當代大多數從事翻譯研究的學者認為翻譯的過程是複雜多樣的，不同譯者在不同的時間、地點解決各種類型翻譯中的各種問題，根據具體的歷史語境和具體的文本材料來制定翻譯策略。(筆者譯)

文化翻譯研究想要有進一步發展，就要從具體的翻譯文本出發，解決不同文化之間的交流問題，解決普遍與差異、自我與他者之間的關係問題。

從1993到2009的16年間，安樂哲分別與劉殿爵(D.C. Lau)、郝大維(David Hall)、羅思文三位譯者合作翻譯了七部中國古代典籍，他和羅思文合作譯著的《論語的哲學闡釋》(The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation)已引起海內外研究者的關注，本文對安樂哲翻譯策略的探討，即以《論語》為主，旁及其他譯本。

二、翻譯目的和動機

儒經的西譯，早有耶穌會士開其端，漢學家理雅各(James Legge)集大成，新一代漢學家承其緒，安樂哲等人重譯的意義又何在呢？原來，安氏等人翻譯儒家典籍的目的，是要會通中西，讓西方人認識真正的中國哲學，為改造自己的世界所用。安樂哲在他的學術講演叢書中說道：

> 我們要做的不只是研究中國傳統，而是設法化之為豐富和改造我們自己世界的一種文化資源。儒家從社會的角度定義人的觀念是否可以用來修改和加強西方自由主義模式？[…]我們自己的宗教經驗怎樣才能通過思索中國的有關觀點而得以豐富呢？（安樂哲，2002: 15）

時隔七年，羅思文和安樂哲在他們最新出版的《孝經》譯本裏表達了同樣的目的：

> 在此，我們雖聚焦於儒學的勸導，但總體目的卻很簡單，即能夠更好地理解和欣賞另一　種思維方式，並能更好地瞭解和評價我們自己，促進一種兼包並蓄的文化對話而非排他性的爭論。（Rosemont & Ames 2009: xii）

因此，安樂哲對西方學者的中國哲學研究和典籍英譯甚為失望，他評論說：

> 當我們把“天”譯為帶大寫的“H”的“Heaven”，無論你願意不願意，在西方讀者頭腦裏出現的是超越現世的造物主形象，以及靈魂、罪孽、來世等概念。當我們將“命”譯成Fate，我們實際上夾雜了不可改變性、困境、悲劇以及目的論等含義，而這些意義與中國古典傳統並無什麼相關之處。（安樂哲，2002: 18）

由此可見，安樂哲等人在西方價值觀產生嚴重危機之時重譯儒經，其目的和動機是雙重的，他們要借助翻譯，改變被漢學家誤讀了的中國哲學、文化，突出中國哲學的獨特和差異性，同時又要讓其研究和翻譯為改造西方世界所用。這些目的和動機直接影響了他們的翻譯策略。

三、翻譯策略

安氏既然認定了以往的儒經英譯套用了西方認知模式，那麼，他與合作者又採取了哪些策略來產生他們心目中“真正的”中國哲學話語呢？筆者以為，安氏等人的翻譯策略，體現在其譯本的基本特色之中。現以《論語》為例，舉其大端如下。

(一) 凸顯儒家思想中的社會性與過程性

儒經翻譯，難在術語傳譯。核心概念有提綱挈領、一以貫之的作

用，翻譯得當，則綱舉目張，儒學的堂奧不難窺見。譯者對儒學是否有整體的理解，於此也可以看出。

安樂哲認為西方哲學是“超越性”的，他給“超越性”下了一個定義：甲是乙的原則，如果不訴諸甲，乙的意義和涵義就無法得到充分解釋，則甲對於乙是超越的；反之則不然（安樂哲，2002: 27）。在安氏看來，與這樣一種超越性思維方式相聯繫的，是西方哲學典型的超越性語言及其範疇概念體系。譬如，“God”是一個完美的、完整的、獨立的存在，人類既不可能對他有任何增益，也無法對他施加影響；“truth”所指的是絕對真理；而“virtue”則是西方人孜孜追求的“至善”道德。與西方“超越性思維”相區別，安樂哲把中國古代思想（漢哲學）的思維描述為“關聯性思維”（relational thinking），並把與此相聯繫的漢語哲學語言稱為“關聯性語言”（relational language）或過程性語言（process language），它是對“一切皆流”的事物流變過程的直覺，它關注的是過程、變化和特殊性，而不是終極的實在（安樂哲，2002: 81）。

對中西方思維和語言差異的獨特理解促使譯者們在英語中尋找新的儒學關鍵字譯名。在安樂哲和羅思文的《論語》譯本中，“道”是“way”而不是常見的“the Way”，兩者區別在於，前者反映了儒家思想對過程性的考量，強調的是得“道”之途中個人對自身內在修養的不斷追求，而非西方形而上思想中對於絕對真理和權威的獲取。

關於儒學的核心概念“仁”，安樂哲和羅思文並未使用“humanity”這一傳統譯法。他們認為，“humanity”是一個普適概念，與羅馬語的“humanitas”相關，意指唯一的、普遍的、本質性的對象。若將“仁”視為一個普適性概念，就會破壞它的個別性。“仁”的另一個傳統譯名“benevolence”只是表達一種狹隘心

理態度的簡單辭彙。因此，譯者們選擇了“authoritative person”作為“仁”的譯名。“Authoritative”具有“禮貌”、“創作”、“權威”等含義，意味著成“仁”必須先事“禮”，有威信的人必須是一個探路之人，成“仁”之路是一個把傳統化為自身品質的創造過程。

“知”或“智”的幾種常見的英譯是“knowledge”，“wisdom”和“to know”。安樂哲、羅思文認為，這些譯法在強調了“知”的重要價值的同時，阻礙了人們對智慧的全面理解。基於對儒家“知行合一”思想的考慮，兩位譯者用“realize”來翻譯“知”，旨在強調古漢語中“知”字蘊涵的“思維”之意，這一點恰好填平了英語中“知識”與“智慧”二者的鴻溝。這樣，“to realize”的含義既是“使之成為現實”，也巧妙地截斷了“moral”和“knowledge”引起的西方哲學聯想。類似的辭彙還有“禮”，被譯作有參與過程含義的動名詞組“observing ritual propriety”， 而不是“ritual”這個在英語裏既空洞又無價值的名詞。

由是觀之，譯者無論採用替換還是解釋的方法，目的都是要強調儒家思想中人的社會性及其成長的過程性，這正是它區別於西方哲學對人的本質規定以及強調個人主義的關鍵所在。儒家思想崇尚自我修養、堅持從社會的角度來看待個人，使得個人在行為上有了道德約束，這對目前西方社會的混亂狀況能起到一定的規範作用。還需注意的是，安、羅譯本中每個哲學關鍵字的翻譯後都帶有該辭彙的漢字和中文拼音，譯者盡一切努力提醒讀者，他們接觸的是中國本土哲學概念。

（二）凸顯漢思維的關聯性和過程性

語法和語言表達的方式不僅僅是語言學的問題，而且體現著一種世界觀和思維方式。安樂哲和羅思文認為，相對於西方人習慣的因果思維

來說，中國人習慣於關聯性思維，它是一種出自自然的思維，是由進行相互關聯的人從其自身的角度選擇和聯繫在一起的諸成分所構成的（安樂哲，2002: 61）。例如，中國古代哲學講求“觀物取象”，近取諸身，遠取諸物，加工成為象徵意義的符號，來反映、認識客觀事物的規律。中國思想典籍注重事物的關聯性，它們不描述事物怎樣成其為自身，而描述事物在具體時間與其他事物的關係如何。例如，《周易》之“易”，或涵指日月，或取象蜥蜴；老子之“道”，或喻之“惟恍惟惚”，或譬以“大道氾兮，其可左右”。兩位譯者還聲稱英語（及其他一些印歐語言）基本上屬實質性（substantial）語言，而古漢語則是事件性（eventful）語言（Ames&Rosemont1998: 20），前者著重的是事物的“本質”、“實質”，後者則強調“過程”、“事件”。比方說，英語的定冠詞表示“僅且唯一”，一個句子裏使用的同一個代詞必須指向同一個事物，而古漢語沒有定冠詞，代詞的功能也不盡相同，動態性、跳躍性較強。

因此，譯者們特別注意區分所選辭彙的性質，例如，《論語・學而》篇有：子曰：“學而時習之，不亦樂乎？” The Master said: “Having studied, then repeatedly apply what you have learned – is this not a source of pleasure?”(71)[1] 譯者分別使用了“study”和“learn”兩個詞，原因在於他們參照 Gilbert Ryle (1942) 的做法，把英語動詞分為“過程性”（process words）和“達成性”（success words）兩大類，前者包括“study”，強調“學習、鑽研”的過程；後者則包含“learn”這樣的動詞。此外，譯者們還大量使用了英語的動名詞詞組，如：有子曰：“禮之用，和為貴。”/ Master You said: “Achieving harmony is the most valuable function of observing ritual propriety.”(74) 原文的“禮”與“和”兩個名詞譯成了動名詞組“observing ritual propriety”和“achieving harmony”，就是為了

說明“禮”及“和”乃中國人的生存方式。類似譯法在安氏譯本中比比皆是。

在早期中國哲學文獻中，“德”有一種強烈的宇宙學意味，一貫表達事物及人的個別性。譯者擯棄了“virtue”和“power”這些傳統英譯，一方面不想給譯文強加上西方哲學式的解讀，因為“virtue”與“freedom”，“individual”，“reason”，“autonomy”等術語一起構成一個西方哲學的辭彙場；另一方面，“power”一詞有“強制”的涵義，與儒家提倡以“德”來治理社會的理念相佐。譯者們把“德”譯為“excellence”，有時也譯成名詞語組“consummate excellence”，它們既可表示人的品性，也可表示人的行為，意為在實現自我的過程中卓爾不凡。筆者認為，譯者對“德”這一術語的解釋和翻譯強調的是它的關聯性意義。按照古代漢字訓詁的規則，“德”與“得”相通，所謂“外得於人”就是能夠“以善德施之於他人，使眾人各得其益”；而“內得於己”則是能夠“以善念存諸心中，使身心互得其益”。安樂哲、羅思文譯文中的“excellence”（德）意在傳達儒家君子“以善念存諸心中”和“以善德施之他人”的品行。

最能突出漢語關聯性特徵的譯例要數孔子的“正名”說：“君君、臣臣、父父、子子”/“The ruler must rule, the minister minister, the father father, and the son son”（156）。該句譯文中，原文的名詞讓位給譯文的動詞，“事物”讓位給“事件”，強調漢語傳統中作為基礎預設的過程性。譯者們想通過譯文告訴讀者，孔子哲學所謂的“實”並非先驗的、預設的“實體”、“存在”，而是要經過具體實踐才能成立的“實”。要想名副其實，就需行動去證明。

試比較以“忠實”著稱的理雅各的譯文[2]和“西方最受尊重的典籍英譯家之一”（安樂哲語）劉殿爵的譯文[3]。

> Legge: The prince is prince, the minister is minister, the father is father and the son is son. (171)
> Lau: Let the ruler be a ruler, the subject a subject, the father a father, the son a son. (213)

相比之下，安、羅的譯文體現了漢思維的動態性、過程性和關聯性，而理氏和劉氏的譯文則是靜態的、本質性的，更像在表達英語思維。

（三）創造性詮釋、表達譯者關懷

以己意釋經，在經學史上屢見不鮮。這些創造性闡釋，又叫“誤讀”，一向為傳統的翻譯觀念所忌諱。但從接受美學的角度而言，經典的意義不是封閉的，而是期待著讀者的闡釋，只要是合理的解讀，都能賦予經典以鮮活的新意，這也是經典創作的意義所在。在力求整體地、準確地理解儒家思想的基礎上，安樂哲故作新詮，借題發揮，以此來達到借中國哲學補足西方思想的目的，同時也挖掘出儒家典籍更多的內涵。

最明顯的一處創造性詮釋就是在《論語》譯文中多次出現了原文本不具備的“道”的形象，並且從頭到尾一以貫之。筆者拿安樂哲、羅思文的譯文與理雅各、劉殿爵的譯文做比較，請看以下幾例：

> 子曰：“《詩》三百，一言以蔽之，曰：‘思無邪。’”《為政》
> The Master said: “Although The Songs are three hundred in number, they can be covered in one expression: ‘Go vigorously without swerving.’” (76)

比較理雅各對“思無邪”的翻譯“having no depraved thoughts”(71)，安氏、羅氏的譯文裏隱含了一個“道”(the way or path) 的意象，意味著“思想不偏離正軌”。

子曰：“朝聞道，夕死可矣。”《裏仁》

Legge: The Master said: “If a man in the morning hears the right way, he may die in the evening without regret.” (91)

Lau: “He has not lived in vain who dies in the evening, having been told about the Way in the morning.” (55)

Ames: The Master said, “If at dawn you learn of and tread the way (dao), you can face death at dusk.” (91)

劉殿爵把“道”譯成首字母大寫的“theWay”，儘管也具備“事理的總源”這種含義，但容易讓讀者聯想到《聖經》中的上帝之“道”，“主”為人指明的通向神聖的“道”。按照安樂哲的說法，“[…]Way 的首字母大寫使得這個‘道’在語義學的意義上帶有了‘超驗’和‘神’的換喻意味”（安樂哲、郝大維著，何金俐譯，2004: 15）。理譯中的“道”具有“事理”、“原則”的意味，但採用的是意譯，沒有“道路”這一形象。而在安樂哲、羅思文的筆下，“道”不僅是“事理”、“原則”，它還是“成人之路”，是人在不斷成長、修養過程中追求的目標。

子曰：“過而不改，是謂過矣。”《衛靈公》

Legge: To have faults and not to reform them — this, indeed, should be pronounced having faults. (211)

Lau: Not to mend one’s ways when one has erred is to err indeed. (291)

Ames: The Master said, “Having gone astray, to fail to get right back on track is to stray indeed.” (190)

原句中並未出現“道”，但安、羅譯文中的“having gone astray”，“get right back on track”中明顯帶有“way”，“path”這一比喻。

子曰：“予欲無言。”子貢曰：“子如不言，則小子何述焉？”《陽貨》

> Legge: "If you, Master, do not speak, what shall we, your disciples, have to record?" (233)
> Lau: If you did not speak, what would there be for us, your juniors, to transmit?" (329)
> Ames: The Master said, "I think I will leave off speaking." "If you do not speak," Zigong replied, "how will we your followers find the proper way?" (208)

"小子何述"本指"晚輩學生轉述老師的話"，到安樂哲和羅思文的筆下，卻成了"how will we your followers find the proper way?"（我們這群您的追隨者如何尋找正'道'）。在不違背原文總體精神的前提下，譯者有意轉換了原文內容，突出了"道"在儒家思想的重要地位。

"道"之形象頻頻出現、引人注目，大有取代《論語》的核心概念"仁"的傾向。其實，譯者真正的意圖是強調儒家思想的獨特性，西方人對"仁"這一概念並不陌生，基督教就宣揚"仁慈"，"仁愛"，因此，"仁"並不能起到補充或修正西方思想的作用，而"道"所包涵的過程性對於西方人來說更有借鑒意義。

另一處創造性詮釋是"proper"一詞的頻繁使用，如"正"一詞譯作"proper"而非傳統的"correct"或"rectify"。還有，譯者多處填加了"proper"一詞，如《憲問》中的"子路問事君"／"Zilu asked how to serve one's lord properly"(177)，譯文增加了"properly"一詞；《衛靈公》中的"無為而治者其舜也與？"的譯文"If anyone could be said to have effected proper order while remaining nonassertive"(185) 也增加了"proper"一詞。之所以如此，原因有二：一方面，拉丁辭彙"proprius"在"appropriate"或"property"中的意義為"making something one's own"，這與儒家把傳統化為自身氣質的思想比較接近。另一方面，譯者把關鍵字"正"譯為"proper"，

就他們對孔學的認識，“正”與“正確”、“錯誤”並無關係，而指“合適的”、“適宜的”。事實也如此，《論語》有兩處提到孔子對“正”的見解，一處是在《微子》篇中，孔子表達對一些忠臣能人的看法，提出：“我則異於是，無可無不可”，表示凡事並無“是非”、“對錯”、“可以不可以”之分，而是要靈活處理。《子路篇》中，葉公說到一個人檢舉其父偷羊，並稱讚這種行為“直”。孔子卻表達了不同意見：為達到教育的目的，父親應當“為子隱”，兒子也應“為父隱”，即“父慈子孝”，才是真正的“直”。這並不意味孔子無能判斷是非曲直，而是強調儒家教義因時、因地、因人變化的靈活性。也就是說，凡事做到了“合適”、“適當”就算達到了最高境界。由此看來，譯者對“proper”一詞的創造性運用體現了儒家的中庸之道，並以此來修正西方看待是非問題的二元對立的傳統觀念。

（四）多視角的引用，爲譯者觀點服務

安樂哲、羅思文關注的是儒學的獨特性，是它與西方道德文明所區別的個性。也因此，他們在譯本的注釋中旁徵博引其他中國古代典籍中的得“道”之言，與《論語》相互印證，相互闡發。短短一篇《論語》，譯者僅在注釋中就直接引用《孟子》、《莊子》、《荀子》、《禮記》、《左氏春秋》、《詩經》、《說文》等經典，最長的注釋長達大半頁，還要借助附錄繼續發揮，可謂在中國古典文獻中左右逢源。

不過，譯者也十分重視西方學者的有關研究，所引西方學者，文學家有 Thoreau，哲學家有 John Dewey，Alfred North Whitehead，語言學家 Noam Chomsky，Bernhard Karlgren，其他學者有 I. A. Richards，George Steiner 等等，不一而足。更

有甚者，譯者們還拿西方思想做比較，指出其中的一些相通、相似之處。例如，《中庸》第9條注釋裏，譯者們把“莫見乎隱，莫顯乎微”與美國哲學家約翰・杜威（John Dewey）的“The visible is set in the invisible; and in the end the unseen decides what happens in the seen; the tangible rests precariously upon the untouched and un-grasped”（可見見於不見之中，不見最終決定可見之事；可感棲於不可感知、不可把握之中；筆者譯）作比較。《中庸》裏的“慎其獨”教人在閒居獨處之時也要戒慎恐懼，檢點內心，遏人欲於將萌，不使違失本性，譯者卻理解為“一個人為繁榮社會服務所形成的各種具體關係之獨特性”（It refers to the uniqueness of one's particular relations as they contribute to a flourishing community），還由此聯想到英國哲學家懷特海（Whitehead）的一句話：“Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness” (Ames & Hall 2001: 118)，意為“宗教是以其獨所行之事”（筆者譯），讓我們看到，原來基督教也有慎獨、修身的說法。

安樂哲等人一貫堅持突出中西哲學的差異。為何在此一反常態，拿西方哲學做比附呢？首先，安樂哲認為中西文化除了差異之外，也有共同之處。譬如，西方詮釋學、新實用主義、後現代主義、解構主義等等都把依賴某種唯一性的系統哲學作為批判對象。在這一點上，它們與中國哲學相互契合，而杜威的新實用主義、懷特海的過程哲學就是與中國哲學相互印證的例子。其次，安氏等人的譯文是為普通讀者所做，偶爾拿西方哲學來做比附，會減少讀者對原文文化的陌生程度，而產生“南學北學、道術未裂；東海西海、心理攸同”之感。可見，譯者並未把西方思想看作是鐵板一塊，只要是能夠支持他們對儒學總體認識的理論，就會靈活採納，為其觀點服務。

（五）譯筆流暢，展現經典魅力

先前的漢學家和傳教士翻譯儒學原典，改動原作內容，拋棄原作文體，是出於強權文化的意識形態對弱勢文化的蓄意扭曲，體現當時西方在對待中國文化上的一種普遍的侮慢態度。對中國文化較為尊重的理雅各，從語言學的角度意識到內容的忠實與文體的一致很難兩全。出於西方當時的需要，理氏以傳達原文的意思為主要目的，通過各種手段讓西方人瞭解中國，"至於文學作品的可觀賞性對於理雅各來說則是次要的"（嶽峰，2004: 165）。

當然，理氏忽視中國經典的文學特色也有單純詩學上的動因。理氏從語言學的角度意識到內容的忠實與文體的一致很難兩全，因此，他"不僅不把原作的文學性放在重要的地位，還堅決反對'以詩譯詩'的操作方法，把精力更多放在內容的考證上，不注重追求詩韻"（辛紅娟，2008: 339）。他的這種翻譯主張，為後來漢學家模仿。

英國漢學家、翻譯家亞瑟・韋利在他的《道德經》譯本前言中明確說道：

> 依我看來，如果將譯作的文字優美放在重要的地位，同時又要重視原文在譯文中的品質，讀者就得準備犧牲大量精確的細節。這種翻譯，我把它叫做"文學翻譯"，相對應的是"文字翻譯"。我要表明的是，這個《道德經》譯本不是"文學翻譯"。理由很簡單，原文的重要性並不存在于其文學品質，而在於它所要表達的哲理。我的一個目的是要在細節上精確地表達原文的哲學思想。[4]（Waley 1934: 14）

理氏和韋氏顯然將中國典籍的內容與形式割裂開來，並以孤立、靜止的眼光看待文本分類，導致了以上的說法和做法。然而，他們卻忽視了中國思想典籍大多也是文學典範這一事實。[5] 中國古人云："言之

無文，行而不遠”。能夠流傳後世，廣為引用，並為思想家、批評家反覆研究的經典作品，不僅在內容上有深刻之處，在形式上也往往獨樹一幟。西方文化中，不少哲學、宗教典籍也有其不可忽視的文學功能。例如，《聖經》除了是基督教經書之外，還是舉世公認的文學經典，其語言文辭之優美，比喻之形象、貼切對現代英語語言、文學產生了巨大的影響。可以毫不誇張地說，無論西方還是東方，一部作品的文學價值越高，就越可能上升到經典的地位。因為就文學意義而言，經典必定是指那些已經載入史冊的優秀文學作品。

幾十年以後，劉殿爵的譯本才讓英美讀者感受到中國典籍的文體之美。劉殿爵在《道德經》已有多種英譯本的情況下動手翻譯這一古代文化典籍，其主要原因如他所說：

> 毫無疑問，《老子》是被翻譯得最頻繁的中國典籍。但遺憾的是，許多譯者沒能使讀者意識到中國思想的博大和語言的美，只是滿足了一些人瞭解東方玄秘思想的需求。（Lau 1963: 7）

在傳達中國經典語言美、文體美這一問題上，安樂哲深受其師劉殿爵的影響。他與合譯者的譯筆流暢優美，富於文采。這一方面是因為安樂哲等譯者深受後現代思想的影響，堅決反對以往西方傳教士、漢學家們不顧中國思想典籍富含審美價值這一做法，力求在西方當代語境中重新樹立漢語經典的地位；另一方面，哲學文本中的文學樣式，如詩歌，起著表達深刻哲學思想、增強論證力度的作用。安樂哲和郝大維在《中庸》英譯本的附錄裏就專門討論了中英詩歌中重覆表現法的說理功能，以此來證明，文學作品中形式與內容並非互不相干或彼此矛盾的兩套體系，而是相互支撐，相輔相成。[6] 為此，安樂哲及合譯者在保留儒學典籍的美學特徵上特別下了工夫。

安樂哲、羅思文譯文保存原文的美學特色，主要體現在以下幾個方面：

首先，在兼顧語法正確和意義可解的基礎上採用較小的翻譯單位，甚至逐字翻譯，較好地反映出原文的句序詞序。

> 子曰：“學而/時/習之，不亦/樂乎？有朋/自遠方來，不亦/樂乎？人不知/而不慍，不亦/君子乎？”《學而》
> The Master said: “Having studied, /to then repeatedly/apply what you have learned—is this not /a source of pleasure? To have friends/come from distant quarters—is this not /a source of enjoyment? To go unacknowledged by others/ without harboring frustration—is this not /the mark of an exemplary person (junzi)?” (71)

> 子曰：“知之者/不如/好之者，好之者/不如/樂之者。”《雍也》
> The Master said, “To truly love it/ is better than /just to understand it,/ and to enjoy it /is better than /simply to love it.” (108)

其次，原文本為語錄體，口語化程度較重，感歎、反詰、設問、猜測等說話人的各種語氣都需譯者去揣測、模仿。安、羅的譯文對原文的語氣把握到位，句式對應相當成功，說話人的語氣躍然紙上。

> 孔子謂季氏，八佾舞於庭，是可忍也，孰不可忍也。《八佾》(設問)
> Confucius remarked on the Ji clan: “If the Ji clan’s use of the imperial eight rows of eight dancers in the courtyard of their estate can be condoned, what cannot be?” (82)

> 子曰：“視其所以，觀其所由，察其所安。人焉瘦哉？人焉瘦哉？”《為政》(反詰)
> The Master said; “Watch their actions, observe their motives, examine wherein they dwell content; won’t you know what kind of person they are? Won’t you know what kind of person they are?” (78)

試比較理雅各和劉殿爵的譯文。

> Legge: How can a man conceal his character? (73)
> Lau: In what way is a man's true character hidden from view? (21)

安氏的譯文可說是依字序譯出。原文反詰的語氣譯得尤見功夫，譯文也更接近口語體，不像其他兩個譯文書面語程度較強。

文質彬彬是《論語》文體的一大特點，儒學那些精微、深奧的道理，都盡可能採用恰當的例子以淺喻深，化抽象為形象，變枯燥為生動。比喻，感歎，排比、對偶等現代語言學的各種修辭格，在《論語》中幾乎都能找到。安、羅的譯文注重再現原文的修辭手法。

> 子曰："人而無信，不知其可也。大車無輗，小車無軏，其何以行之哉？"《為政》(暗喻)
> The Master said, " I am not sure that anyone who does not make good on their word (xin) is viable as a person. If a large carriage does not have the pin for its yoke, or a small carriage does not have the pin for its crossbar, how can you drive them anywhere?" (81)

> 子曰："飯疏食飲水，曲肘而枕之，樂亦在其中矣。不義而富且貴，於我如浮雲。"《述而》(明喻)
> The Master said, "To eat coarse food, drink plain water, and pillow oneself on a bent arm—there is pleasure to be found in these things. But wealth and position gained through inappropriate (buyi) means — these are to me like floating clouds." (114)

> 子曰："知者樂水，仁者樂山。知者動、仁者靜、知者樂、仁者壽。"《雍也》(排比、對偶)
> The Master said, "The wise (zhi) enjoy water; those authoritative in their conduct (ren) enjoy mountains. The wise are active; the authoritative are still. The wise find enjoyment; the authoritative are long-enduring." (109)

《論語》等經典還常引用《詩經》等作品中的詩歌來增強說理的效果。作為一名詩歌愛好者，安樂哲以詩譯詩，運用分行、押韻等手段翻譯原作中引用的詩歌，較好地傳遞了原作的文學性。同時，安樂哲也注意到原文借詩詠志的特點，並力求在譯文中保留該特色。這樣做既滿足了譯入語讀者欣賞異質文學的審美期待，也體現了譯者借助中西方以詩言志的文化共通性傳遞儒家思想的用心。

請看一例：子夏問曰：“‘巧笑倩兮。美目盼兮，素以為絢兮。’何謂也？”（《八佾》）安樂哲、羅思文的譯文是這樣的：

> Zixia inquired: “ What does the song mean when it says:
> Her smiling cheeks—so radiant,
> Her dazzing eyes—so sharp and clear,
> It is the unadorned that enhances color?” (84)

譯文運用分行、押韻（後兩行半諧韻）的手段表明翻譯的是一首詩歌。原詩前兩行為四字，後一行五字，譯詩前兩行為七音節、三音步（第二行不太整齊），後一行為十音節、五音步；詩遵循的是短長律，而譯詩是抑揚格，以抑揚格對短長律。譯文版式的排列、句式的長短、音調的高低起伏，再現了原文句式錯落、音聲相和的修辭特色。

四、結語

安樂哲和羅思文的儒經翻譯具有反對西方通過宣揚其哲學和宗教的普世性來實現文化全球化的初衷，具有鮮明的解構主義翻譯特色。譯者們運用雜合的、新穎的術語翻譯顛覆了以往漢語哲學典籍英譯中西方話語的流暢性；譯文的譴詞造句表現了譯者對動態性、過程

性等漢思維特徵的理解；在引言、注釋和附錄中，廣泛引用中西哲學言論，印證關聯性、過程性、實用性等儒學思想特徵；他們抓住詮釋製造的機會，利用創造性闡釋和同源詞聯想等方法試圖實現儒學改造西學的目的；以豐厚的文學素養，流暢地道的譯筆，讓儒家經典以清新、優美的面貌出現在讀者面前，文質彬彬，耐人玩味。

對全球化語境下文化翻譯的研究，安譯的啟示在於：全球化把翻譯置於多樣化的國際文化、經濟、政治的中心，翻譯一方面要展示文化的多樣性，一方面需促進文化對話與和解，構建新的文化。這就需要譯者對兩種語言、文化有全面、整體的研究，並發揮創造力，根據不同的翻譯對象，採取、研發各種翻譯策略。“抵抗式的翻譯”不一定總是有效的反對文化普遍主義的策略，對於哲學著作的翻譯而言，它可能導致誤解，阻礙文化交流。反之，創造、解釋、歸化等方法並不一定歪曲原文、削弱原文文化的異質性，相反，它們可以成為民族宣示其文化文本的思想性與文學性，贏取廣泛理解與認同的手段。

注 釋

[1] 本節及以後出現的安樂哲、羅思文《論語》英譯文，均出自Ames & Rosemont (1998)。凡引此書，隨文標示頁碼，不另作注。

[2] 本節及以後出現的理雅各《論語》英譯文，均出自理雅各譯，楊伯峻今譯，劉重德、羅志野校注 (1992)，《四書》，長沙：湖南出版社。 凡引此書，隨文標示頁碼，不另作注。

[3] 本節及以後出現的劉殿爵《論語》英譯文，均出自Lau (2008)。凡引此書，隨文標示頁碼，不另作注。

[4] 譯文部分參考《（漢英對照）老子》中傅惠生所作“前言”，長沙：湖南人民出版社，1999: 34-35。

[5] 有關《論語》、《中庸》、《孟子》、《莊子》、《道德經》等典籍的文學價值已有諸多專著和論文討論，筆者查閱了2007年至2012年中國期刊網的記錄，以每部典籍的名稱和文學價值為主題進行精確檢索，共有12篇有關該主題的文章。

[6] 詳見Ames & Hall (2001) 一書的附錄。

參考文獻

Ames, Roger T. and David L. Hall (2001). *Focusing the Familiar: A Translation and Philosophical Interpretation of the Zhongyong.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ames, Roger T. and Henry Rosemont (1998). *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: The Ballantine Publishing Group.

Lau, D. C. (1963). *Lao Tzu Tao Te Ching*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

____(2008). *The Analects*. Hong Kong: Chung Hwa Bookstore.

Rosemont, Henry Jr. and Roger T. Ames (2009). *The Chinese Classic of Family Reverence: A Philosophical Translation of the Xiaojing*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ryle, Gilbert (1949). *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson.

Tymoczko, Maria and Edwin Gentzler (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Waley, Arthur (1934). *The Way and Its Power: A Study of* Tao Te Ching *and Its Place in Chinese Thought*. London: Allen & Unwin.

安樂哲 (2002)，《和而不同：比較哲學與中西會通》，溫海明編，北京：北京大學出版社。

____、郝大維 (2004)，《道不遠人：比較哲學視域中的〈老子〉》，何金俐譯，北京：學苑出版社。

嶽峰（2004），《架設東西方的橋樑：英國漢學家理雅各研究》，福州：福建人民出版社。

辛紅娟（2008），《〈道德經〉在英語世界：文本行旅與世界想像》，上海：上海譯文出版社。

作者簡介

譚曉麗，衡陽師範學院外語系副教授，復旦大學博士。研究方向：翻譯理論、典籍翻譯。主持省級社科課題3項，國家哲學社會科學基金項目“新興本科翻譯專業課程體系及教學模式的構建研究”的主要參與人。出版專著一部，在《中國翻譯》、《外語與外語教學》、《上海翻譯》、《西安外語學院學報》、《外語與翻譯》等學術期刊以及高校學報發表學術論文二十餘篇。

對語言層面的翻譯問題的再認識
——《魯拜集新譯》譯後言

覃學嵐

Abstract

Language Matters More Than We Thought in Translation: An Afterword to My Chinese Translation of *The Rubáiyát* of Omar Khayyám (*by* Qin Xuelan)

The essence of translation is accommodation, a means to neutralize the differences between the source language and target language. In this paper the author gives a very brief review of some contemporary translation theories and argues that culture and language should be regarded as two isolated items instead of one in translation studies. Then a distinction is made between two kinds of differences, namely, those between languages (langue) and those between utterances or speeches (parole), followed by some examples illustrating that a translator should first try to neutralize the differences between languages and then to show the differences between utterances. The former kind occurs between two languages, a failure to neutralize which will lead to unreadable translations, while the latter kind occurs in the same language and an unsuccessful handling will make different authors' styles "your" style. In addition, the author also emphasizes the importance of properly handling the different rhetorical features between the source text and target text. A translation without accommodation is unimaginable, yet in some cases, accommodation may lead to the loss of some specific items, like the proper nouns in the seven-character version of the Rubáiyát.

引言

嚴又陵譯完《天演論》後寫過一個《譯例言》，提出了“譯事三難：信、達、雅”，迄今仍為譯界所津津樂道；本雅明譯完波德賴爾（Baudelaire）《惡之花》（Fleurs du Mal）中的第二部分“巴黎風光”後寫過一篇“譯者的任務（The Task of the Translator）”，被解構主義翻譯理論奉為經典。譯者譯完《魯拜集》後亦多有感慨，且已有二位先賢在前，是故，也寫一個譯後言，借此談談自己翻譯的心得和對當前翻譯理論的思考。

首先，說一說重譯《魯拜集》的緣起。眾所周知，《魯拜集》中文版甚多，[1] 有從波斯文直接翻譯過來的，也有同譯者一樣，根據菲茨傑拉德的英文版翻譯過來的。其中比較有影響的當屬郭沫若譯本和黃克孫譯本，郭氏譯本採用的是比較偏向直譯的譯法，黃氏譯本採用的則是意譯法，譯成了七言體。二位譯者的翻譯功底都非常深厚，譯文也是各有千秋，堪稱《魯拜集》的經典漢譯本。但細細讀來，似乎又都有所欠缺：郭氏譯本有些地方有拘泥于原文之嫌，[2] 而黃氏譯本則又似嫌過分歸化，譯詩中引用了不少漢語文學方面的典故，讀者若不知道這些典故則無法欣賞。筆者之所以萌生重譯《魯拜集》的念頭，原因之一就是想在詩歌翻譯方面進行一次新的嘗試，這種嘗試不是簡單的文字轉換處理，或者說企圖超越現有的譯本，而是想借此體現一種翻譯思想；原因之二則是希望通過重譯來檢討一下目前的一些主流翻譯理論，並澄清一些似是而非的概念。

1. 對目前主流翻譯理論的質疑

說到目前的主流翻譯理論，有幾點需要說明一下：第一、近二

三十年來翻譯學發展的一個最大特點就是：研究的視野拓寬了，越來越多的學者開始關注更為宏觀的問題，國際上新的轉向層出不窮，譬如，文化轉向、權力轉向等，國內學者也不甘落後，提出了生態轉向。經過這些接二連三的轉向，很多傳統的翻譯概念已經被顛覆了，翻譯成了“改寫”或“操縱”，翻譯的忠實原則也貌似被動搖了；第二、不少學者急於與傳統的翻譯研究劃清界線，跟上學科的前沿發展步伐，翻譯學越來越不屑於語言層面的研究，早已擴展到文化層面了，連翻譯的基本單位都由詞、短語、句子、篇章發展到了文化，從而導致了翻譯學的建設研究與翻譯實踐的脫節，致使翻譯學研究由傳統的過分注重經驗性的概括這一極端而走到了完全忽視翻譯實踐過程的另一個極端。關於這些問題，恕譯者不能在此一一細述，而只能僅就一些最核心的問題略加討論。

誠然，翻譯學研究不能只拘泥於語言層面的轉換技巧，但同時也不能只顧理論建樹，不觸及翻譯實踐，這兩種研究路子都有各自失之偏頗之處。在注重拓寬視野、強調跨學科研究及各種轉向大行其道的今天，筆者覺得尤其應該警惕後一種路子的不利影響。之所以如此，主要出於幾個方面的考慮，其一、掌握目前翻譯學研究話語權的學者正是這後一種路子的權威，而其中不乏輕視翻譯實踐者，如文化派的代表人物在新近的著作中指出：翻譯的單位既非詞語、句子，也非段落、篇章，而是文化，國內亦有學者明確地將語言層面的研究斥為落伍，痛心疾首地指出我們的研究“依然還停留在語言的層面；甚至還停留在一個多世紀前的嚴復的‘三字經’上”，“至今還停留在原文與譯文的關係上”。這樣的態度如果不加以糾正，很可能出現大家越來越注重所謂的“理論建樹”，而忽視語言層面的轉換問題，而這一層面的問題其實還遠未解決。實際上，如果語言層面的問題解決

了，又有誰還會停留不前呢？這正好說明語言層面的問題是翻譯中久攻不克的難題，應該長期加以關注，力爭攻克。其二、許多新型的翻譯學學者誇大了文化及其他因素在翻譯研究中的地位和作用，其實這些問題雖然與翻譯問題有著千絲萬縷的聯繫，有些問題甚至觸及到什麼能翻什麼不能翻的問題，但與實際的翻譯過程聯繫卻不甚緊密，只要動筆翻譯，就會發現核心的問題永遠是語言問題。這裡，筆者想指出一點：語言與文化的關係問題一直是很多學者沒搞清楚的一個問題，就翻譯而言，我們不能把語言視為文化的一部分，而應視為文化的載體，是皮與毛的關係，在翻譯過程中，離開了語言的轉換，文化的傳輸將無所着落。須知，需要翻譯的是內容（文化），而非載體（語言），載體本身是無需翻譯也是不能翻譯的，英語永遠是英語，漢語永遠是漢語，不會因為翻譯，英語就不復存在，而化成漢語了，反之亦然。李河在其大部頭著作《巴別塔的重建與解構——解釋學視野中的翻譯問題》中用了很大篇幅來談"外語的他在性"（2005: 202-235），從理論上論證了語言的不可譯性。請注意，我這裡強調的是語言的不可譯性，而非作品的不可譯性。其實，語言與文化雖然聯繫緊密，有的學者甚至以"世界上沒有沒有語言的文化，也沒有沒有文化的語言"來強調語言與文化的密不可分，但對於從事翻譯學研究的學者而言，我們務必清醒地認識到語言與文化也是可以分開的，否則，漢語就只能成為漢語文化的載體了，瞭解英美文化就只能是懂英語的人士的專利了，實則不然，不懂英語的人照樣也不乏熟諳英美文化的學者，這就說明他們是通過漢語這個載體來瞭解英美文化的，而且大多數人都是通過自己的母語來瞭解異域文化的。明白了這一點，我們才會明白，翻譯中可以異化而且應該異化的是文化內容而不是語言，而可以歸化且應當歸化的是語言。這也正是本人重譯《魯拜集》

時所遵循的原則，在這一點上拙譯與黃克孫先生的譯本有著很大的差別，試比較：

1. 原詩第3首：
And, as the Cock crew, those who stood before
The Tavern shouted – "Open then the Door!
You know how little while we have to stay,
And, once departed, may return no more."

黃譯：
晨雞一唱起南柯，
門外羈人擊節歌：
"大地蒼天原逆旅，
忽忽客歲已無多"。（黃克孫譯，2009）

拙譯：
白話譯文
恰聞雄雞報曉，便聽酒肆門前,
"開門，開門！"的喊聲一片,
"我們只能稍事停頓，
且此一去，恐再返無緣。"

七言譯文
茅店雞鳴客叫門，
羈時無多隻少頃！
今日揖別他鄉去，
但恐無緣再登門。（覃學嵐譯，2011）

2. 原詩第19首：
I sometimes think that never blows so red

The Rose as where some buried Caesar bled;
That every Hyacinth the Garden wears
Dropt in her Lap from some once lovely Head.

黃譯：
紅花底事紅如此，
想是莨弘血裡開。
一地落英愁欲語：
“當年曾伴美人來。”（黃克孫譯，2009）

拙譯：
白話譯文
有時我想玫瑰再紅,
也不及愷撒血染的土地紅；
裝點花園的風信子，
全來自昔日的一個個英容。

七言譯文
玫瑰綻蕊紅彤彤，
不敵愷撒血染壟；
風信綴園朵朵豔，
托身前世一英容。（覃學嵐譯，2011）

同時，也只有明白了這一點，我們也才不至於在翻譯研究中把文化問題看得高於語言問題了。當然，筆者不是說文化問題不重要，不需要研究，而是要提醒一下：翻譯研究中文化角度的研究和語言層面的研究是不可偏廢的，也是不可取代的。如果說哪方面的研究更基礎、更切中翻譯問題的要害的話，筆者認為：不是像文化派學者所認為的那樣是文化層面的研究，而是恰恰相反，是語言層面的研究。

1.1 對本雅明“譯者的任務”的再解讀[3]

翻譯學近幾十年的發展主要是受西方後現代思潮的影響，其中就有本文開頭提到的解構主義翻譯理論，而該理論的經典文獻之一就是本雅明的那篇“譯者的任務”。該文開門見山第一句話就是：

> 鑒賞一件藝術作品或一種藝術形式時，接受者的意見歷來都被證明是毫無裨益的。[4]

這裡，有兩個問題值得探討：第一，鑒賞肯定離不開鑒賞者，鑒賞者是不是也是接受者？顯然，在本雅明眼裡，鑒賞者不是接受者，至於是誰？可能只有問他本人才知道了。第二，從邏輯上講，鑒賞者肯定也是接受者中的一員，如果承認這一點的話，那豈不是說鑒賞者的意見也毫無裨益了嗎？是過於高深玄奧，還是自相矛盾，不合邏輯？相信讀者自有判斷。

接著，本雅明來了一個修辭性的設問：

> “譯作不就是為不懂原作的讀者而譯的嗎？”[5]

這是一個只能做肯定回答的問題。那麼好了：

> 如果是的話，那便似乎足以說明讀者在藝術領域中的水準是參差不齊的。而且，這似乎也是把“同一內容”重說一遍的唯一可以想見的理由。[6]

這似乎可以看成他對“接受者的意見歷來都被證明是毫無裨益的”這一斷言的證明。然而，應該指出的是，本雅明在這裡跟我們玩了一個偷換概念的把戲：此不懂原作的讀者非彼不懂原作的讀者，不懂原作的讀者有兩種：一是因為語言的障礙而不懂原作，一是因為藝術修養

不夠而不懂原作。譯作確實是為不懂原作的讀者而譯的，但決不是為因藝術水準不高而不懂原作的讀者而譯的，因而根本不足以說明讀者在藝術領域中的水準是參差不齊的。至於什麼把“同一內容”重說一遍，則硬是把用另一種語言表述簡單地混同成“重說”，真是叫人哭笑不得！

該文中還有一個概念“來世”或曰“再生”(afterlife)，據此，該派學者認為是譯作使得原作再生了，所以譯作不是原作的附庸，譯作沒有忠實於原作的義務，這樣就將傳統的忠實原則給否定了。這裡同樣也有兩個問題值得思考：首先，是不是所有的譯作都能使原作再生？本雅明自己認為不是，而是有條件的，用他自己的話說，就是要有“恰當的譯者”。其次，如果要否認忠實原則，就要提出反證，證明凡是忠實於原作的譯作都不能使其再生，否則，結論就不能成立。錢鍾書先生對壞翻譯有過一段精彩的論述：“壞翻譯會發生一種消滅原作的功效。拙劣晦澀的譯文無形中替作者拒絕讀者；他對譯本看不下去，就連原作也不想看了。這類翻譯不是居間，而是離間，摧毀了讀者進一步和原作直接聯繫的可能性，掃盡讀者的興趣，同時也破壞原作的名譽”(錢鍾書，1994: 81-82)。這段話明確地告訴我們，其實糟糕蹩腳的翻譯不僅不能給原著一個“afterlife”，而且會消滅原著。

1.2 對以“互文性”爲據否認“忠實”原則的質疑

當然，否認忠實原則的依據還不限於此，如文化派學者巴斯內特就是根據羅蘭．巴特所有文本都依賴於先在成分的論述，斷定世間不存在真正意義的“原著”，並以此否定“原著”及“忠實”、“對等”等原則的。其實，這裡混淆了一個重要的概念：在同一語言或文學體系內部，也許因為互文性（intertextuality）而不存在所謂真正意義上

的“原著（original work，原創性作品）”，但此“原著”與作為與譯著相對而言的彼“原著（source text）”是兩個不同的概念，一部作品在其自身文化內部或許不能算作“原著”，但這並不能否認其作為翻譯過程中的“原著”地位。任何一部作品只要一經翻譯，都毫無例外地會成為其譯作的原著。其實，翻譯學中所謂的原著，說得更準確一點，應該稱為“藍本”，但只要牢記我們是從翻譯學的意義上談論“原著”，似也沒有必要去更改這一長期使用的術語。就翻譯學而言，不單單是“原著（用源語寫成的著作）”可以成為翻譯學意義上的“原著”（藍本），就連本身是譯著的作品也有可能成為翻譯學意義上的原著，如根據英文版的《魯拜集》翻譯成漢語，這本英文版的《魯拜集》就成了翻譯學研究的原著。

有一點值得指出：否定忠實原則表面上看起到了提高譯作乃至譯者地位的作用，但其實不然。原作和譯作，作者和譯者屬於不同的範疇，不具可比性，此乃其一。其二，若真是不忠實於原作，那麼譯作可能就無優劣之分，譯者也就無高下之別了。承認原作的“源”地位和譯作的“派生”地位並不可怕，可怕的是不承認。“源”與“派生”的關係不存在孰優孰劣的問題，正如莎士比亞的父母是莎士比亞的“源”一樣，這只是一種無法改變的歷史事實，我們並不能由此得出結論，莎士比亞就一定不如他的父母，反之亦然；再說，莎士比亞的父母雖為莎士比亞之“源”，且他的父母也有各自之源，但是我們不能由此就否定他們自身為“源”的事實。

基於上述思考，譯者在重譯《魯拜集》過程中，還是像先前的諸多譯者一樣，盡可能地奉行了“忠實”原則。

筆者下面想談的一個問題是一個一直困擾譯界乃至於譯學界的問題：直譯還是意譯？異化還是歸化？迄今為止，這仍然是一個懸而未

決的問題。與以往所不同的是，現在沒有了像魯迅那樣的旗幟鮮明的直譯派，也沒有了徹底的意譯派，更多的是取折衷態度。譯者經過多年的翻譯實踐和翻譯研究，發現在這個問題上，普遍存在著一個糊塗認識，而這個糊塗認識又與我們不清楚語言差異與言語差異之間的關係有着重要的聯繫。

2. 語言本身的差異在翻譯過程中的化解

所謂語言本身的差異，是指甲語言區別於乙語言的一些根本特徵。說到根本特徵，自然就會令人想到非根本特徵，所以這裡先說說根本特徵和非根本特徵的區別，一種語言與另一種語言最明顯的區別在於二者在語音和詞彙上的差異，人們很容易判斷對方跟自己講的是不是同一種語言，一聽便知，這種明顯的差異不見得是根本的差異，而初學外語的人一開始往往以為這便是本質差異，於是錯誤地認為學習外語的任務就是完成這種詞彙層面的替換，後來才會漸漸發現事情遠沒有這樣簡單，原因即在於語言的根本差異在於語法句法方面的差異，即便把每一個詞都換成了另外一種語言的詞彙，但如果不遵從另一種語言的語法句法，這樣替換後的句子仍然不是另一種語言所認可的句子，這便是語言間的根本差異。所以，就翻譯學而論，語言差異是語言之間的差異，翻譯的首要任務就是要化解這一差異。當然，這種差異有大有小，小的時候化解起來自然就會容易一些，而大的時候則會非常困難。譬如：

She is the youngest girl and the youngest child but one.

這句話若逐字對譯則是：

> 她是最小的女孩也是最小的孩子但要除去一個。

雖然每個詞都譯成了漢字，但這句話仍然不是漢語，究其原因，就是語言差異沒有得到化解。由於語言差異過大，所以這時的翻譯所需要做的變通也就會越大：

> 姐妹中她最小，下面還有個弟弟。

由此可見，因為語言差異過大而必須採取的變通，即便很大，恐怕也不能算作意譯。再看一例：We had a flat tyre. 這句話也不能採用逐字對譯的譯法："我們有了一個癟胎。" 雖然能懂，但非常彆扭，所以這裡，變通也是必不可少的："我們有個胎爆/癟/破/漏氣了。" 當然，若譯為 "我們的胎爆了" 也完全無可厚非，雖然字面上少了一個 "a"，貌似不如英語原文準確，但中國人聽到 "我們的胎爆了" 這句話後，完全不會以為四個胎或者更多的胎同時爆了。至於譯為 "我們有了一個平胎"，貌似字字對應，實則連語言的差異也未化解掉。英譯漢如此，漢譯英亦然，如："你有孩子了嗎？" 若譯成：Do you have any children? 肯定讓人莫名其妙，而應換一種習慣表達：Are you a father/mother/parent?

從形態學上 (morphologically) 劃分，漢語屬於孤立語 (isolating language)，英語屬於屈折語 (inflected language)，現代英語雖不屬於典型的屈折語，但仍帶有屈折語的許多特點。孤立語的特點是注重意合 (parataxis)，屈折語的特點是注重形合 (hypotaxis)。所謂意合，即指句中各成分之間或句子之間的結合多依靠語義的貫通，少用連接性詞語，所以句法結構形式短小精悍。所謂形合，是指句子內部的連接或句子間的

連接採用句法手段 (syntactic devices) 或詞彙手段 (lexical devices)。從語法上講，漢語靈活性很強，可伸可縮，表示銜接或邏輯關係的詞語可隱可顯，而且只要不影響理解，很多情況下可以省去的顯性詞語均可省去，有“點到為止”的特點，而英語則與之相反，句子的各成分之間或句與句之間要求語法上的一致（agreement），頗有“牽一髮而動全身”的特點，我們以幾個最簡單的例子來說明這一問題：

例1：停車放氣！

這是某大學校園一隅中的一句警示語，乍看也許不明白什麼意思，但當你準備在此處停車時，意思一下子就明白了，實際上是一個緊縮的條件句，相當於“如果你在此處停車，我們就把你車胎的氣給放了”，當然，譯成英文完全可以不按照這樣的理解來譯，而可以直接譯成：No parking !

例2：有事外出，有事請明天再來。

這個句子也很能體現漢語的特點，兩個“有事”前都有省略，而且省略的內容還不相同，一個是“我”，一個是“你”，但中國人看了這句話，誰心裡都明白；後半句又是一個緊縮條件句。

例3 : a. This is a hot topic.
b. These are hot topics.

a句和b句由單數概念變成複數概念，每一處都發生了變化。a句譯作中文即是“這是一個熱門話題”，當然也可以譯為“這是個熱門話

題”或“這是熱門話題”。b句譯為中文“這些是熱門話題”，變化的地方少多了，相對於a句的第三種譯法，更是只多了一個“些”字。由此可見，漢語從某種意義上說，似乎與人類的認知水準更為同步一些，沒有那麼多繁複的東西，當然也有人會因此認為漢語不夠嚴謹，表面上看，的確如此，似乎數量詞是可有可無的東西，數詞“一”可以去掉，量詞“個”也可以不要，好像有點兒叫人無所適從。但是並不是所有情形下都是這樣的，要不要數量詞，或者是只要數詞，不要量詞，還是只要量詞不要數詞在某些句子中是個事關重大的問題，譬如：

請給我一把刀。

如果把數詞去掉，即：

請給我把刀。

雖覺彆扭，口語中似也可以說得過去，意思出入不大。但若將量詞去掉，即：

請給我一刀。

意思可就大不一樣了。反之，有的句子，有了量詞，句子就不通，如“他給了她一拳”。這種情形下，我們看到漢語還是有一些硬性規定的，而且也是嚴謹的。

例4：He put his hands into his pockets and then shrugged his shoulders.

這句話譯為漢語時最好將其中反覆出現的代詞his統統省去，即“他把雙手插進兜兒裡，然後聳了聳肩”，若譯為“他把他的雙手插進了他的兜兒裡，然後聳了聳他的肩”，口語中也許還將就（因為你可以把句中的幾個“他的”都弱讀），但若是寫下來，顯然就不合適了（不妨試一試將句中的幾個“他的”都重讀一遍，看看是什麼效果）：一般而言，將手插進兜兒裡，只能是將自己的手插進自己的兜兒裡，這是自不待言的事情，否則不成了扒手了嗎？至於聳肩，則更是只能聳自己的肩了。可見，本句在譯成漢語時若保留其中的那些“his”不僅不會使譯文意思清楚準確，反而會徒生誤會。反之，將“他把雙手插進兜兒裡，然後聳了聳肩”譯成英文時，若不在相應的地方加上這些“his”，則更是不合英語文法。當然，本例中除了刪掉幾個“his”外，也有增譯的地方，那就是一個“shrugged（聳了）”變成“聳了聳”。又如：

> 例5：Quietly, so as not to disturb the child's mother, he rose from the bed and inched toward the cradle. Reaching down, he gently lifted the warm bundle to his shoulder. Then, as he tiptoed from the bedroom, she lifted her head, opened her eyes and—daily dose of magic—smiled up at her dad.

譯作中文應是：

> 為了不驚動孩子的母親，他輕手輕腳地下了地，一步一步地挪到了搖籃邊，彎下腰，輕輕地將繈褓中的女兒抱起來，踮著腳尖兒出了臥室，這時，女兒抬起頭，睜開眼，沖他笑了。每天，女兒的這一笑都會令他心曠神怡。

試想，如果把“抬起頭，睜開眼”譯作“抬起她的頭，睜開她的眼”，豈不是非常冗餘嗎？

對於漢語與西洋語的差別，已故著名語言學家王力先生曾有過一

段精闢的論述："西洋語的結構好像連環，雖則環與環都聯絡起來，畢竟有聯絡的痕跡；中國語的結構好像無縫天衣，只是一塊一塊的硬湊，湊起來還不讓它有痕跡。西洋語法是硬的，沒有彈性的；中國語法是軟的，富於彈性的。惟其是硬的，所以西洋語法有許多呆板的要求，如每一個 clause 裡必須有一個主語；惟其是軟的，所以中國語法只以達意為主，如初系的目的位元可兼次系的主語，又如相關的兩件事可以硬湊在一起，不用任何的 connective word"（王力，1984: 474）。

熟悉了語言上的差異，即可在英漢互譯中自覺地採用增譯法或省譯法，一般而言，從語法上考慮，英譯漢時，更多的是考慮用省譯法；漢譯英時則多採用增譯法，以上幾例已可見一斑，下面我們再舉幾例，以資補充：

1. Even if you go there it won't do any good.
你去了也白搭／去了也是白去。

2. Of late years the public have been trying to tackle me in every way they possibly can, and failing to make anything of it they have turned to treating me as a great man. This is a dreadful fate to overtake anybody. There has been a distinct attempt to do it again now, and for that reason I absolutely decline to say anything about the celebration of my seventieth birthday. (George Bernard Shaw)
近年來，公眾輿論一直千方百計想要把我搞臭。此計不成，又反過來把我捧成一個偉人。這種倒楣事，誰碰上了都會吃不消。現在，顯然又有人企圖幹這樣的事了。因為這個緣故，對於慶祝本人70歲生日的活動，我拒絕發表任何意見。

3. 這幾天心裡頗不寧靜。今晚在院子裡坐著乘涼，忽然想起日日走過的荷塘，在這滿月的光裡，總該另有一番樣子吧。（朱自清《荷塘月色》）

The last few days have found me very restless. This evening as I sat in the yard to enjoy the cool, it struck me how different the lotus pool I pass every day must look under a full moon.（楊憲益 戴乃迭 譯）

4. 麻將桌上白天也開著強光燈，洗牌的時候一隻鑽戒光芒四射。白桌布四角縛在桌腿上，繃緊了越發一片雪白，白得耀眼。酷烈的光與影更托出佳芝的胸前丘壑，一張臉也經得起無情的當頭照射。稍嫌尖窄的額，發腳也參差不齊，不知道怎麼倒給那秀麗的六角臉更添了幾分秀氣。臉上淡妝，只有兩片精工雕琢的薄嘴唇塗得亮汪汪的，嬌紅欲滴，雲鬢蓬鬆往上掃，後發齊肩，光著手臂，電藍水漬紋緞齊膝旗袍，小圓角衣領只半寸高，像洋服一樣。領口一隻別針，與碎鑽鑲藍寶石的"紐扣"耳環成套。（張愛玲《色戒》）

Though it was still daylight, the hot lamp was shining full-beam over the mahjong table. Diamond rings flashed under its glare as their wearers clacked and reshuffled their tiles. The tablecloth, tied down over the table legs, streched out into a sleek plain of blinding white. The harsh artificial light silhouetted to full advantage the generous curve of Chia-chih's bosom, and laid bare the elegant lines of her hexagonal face, its beauty somehow accentuated by the imperfectly narrow forehead, by the careless, framing wisps of hair. Her makeup was understated, except for the glossily rouged arcs of her lips. Her hair she had pinned nonchalantly back from her face, then allowed to hang down to her shoulders. Her sleeveless cheongsam of electric blue moiré satin reached to the knees, its shallow, rounded collar standing only half an inch tall, in the Western style. A brooch fixed to the collar matched her diamond-studded sapphire button earrings. (Julia Lovell 譯)

具體到《魯拜集》的翻譯上，以前的譯本在語言差異的化解上基本上都是無可挑剔的，但也有一些不盡如人意之處，如郭沫若譯本的第3首和第82首（另附拙譯供參考）：

原詩第3首：（參見第45頁）

郭譯：
時候正在雞鳴，
人們在茅店之前叫應——
“開門罷！我們只能羈留片時，
一朝去後，怕是再無回程。”（郭沫若譯，1937）

拙譯：（參見第45頁）

原詩第82首：
As under cover of departing Day
Slunk hunger-stricken Ramazán away,
Once more within the Potter’s house alone
I stood, surrounded by the Shapes of Clay.

郭譯：
餓瘦了的，“拉麻桑”
在黃昏的衣被中爬去，
我又獨立在陶人屋中，
環繞著一些土盂。（郭沫若譯，1937）

拙譯：
白話譯文
恰如齋月裡轆轆饑腸的日子
在日暮黃昏的天幕下溜走一樣，
我又一次隻身立于陶坊裡，
惟有泥壇土罐相偎依。

七言譯文
天幕之下日近晚，
齋月饑腸逃紛紛，
孤身又把陶坊探，
放眼四周皆土罐。（覃學嵐譯，2011）

值得指出的是，有些主張直譯的人往往認為直譯法可以豐富譯入語的表達法，殊不知，對於語言而言，能豐富的更多的是詞彙，而不是句法結構和表達習慣。其實，有很多以豐富譯入語為由而主張在語言上採取“異化”策略的人，往往缺乏的就是換位思考，持這種觀點的人一般都只是從事將外語譯成母語（如英譯漢）的翻譯，要是讓他們反過來將母語譯成外語（如漢譯英）時，勢必就會改弦易轍，盡可能地使自己語言符合譯入語的規範，亦即轉而贊成語言上的“歸化”了。

翻譯說到底是一門講究變通的藝術，尤其是語言上的變通，離開了變通，語言的差異基本上就得不到化解。但是，切記，“歸化”策略更多的也應該是針對語言而言的，就文化而論，我們主張不宜過分採用歸化策略，因為翻譯的真正目的在於介紹異質文化，你把人家的文化全都歸化了，那麼翻譯的意義又何在呢？當然了，涉及到價值觀等大的意識形態方面的問題時，或多或少都難免有歸化的情況存在，但總體而言，還是不宜過分歸化的。

黃克孫先生所譯的《魯拜集》，由於採用了嚴格的七言體，所以讀來有時難免有過分歸化之嫌，單就譯詩語言而論，恰如錢鍾書先生所言，黃譯當不遜於菲茨傑拉德的英譯，但就文化內容而言，黃譯卻顯得過於歸化，似不足取。僅以第18首為例：

They say the Lion and the Lizard keep
The Courts where Jamshyd gloried and drank deep;
And Bahram, that great hunter — the Wild Ass
Stamps o'er his Head, but cannot break his Sleep.

華表丹墀一例空，
荒涼台榭走蛇蟲。
虎蹤今遍英雄墓，

無複驚聞李廣弓。（黃克孫譯，2009）

其中的“華表”、“丹墀”、“李廣”等都是用中華傳統文化中的成分替代了原詩中的文化內容，一些專有名詞在譯詩中更是無從尋覓，如 Jamshyd 和 Bahram，這也不能不說是一種遺憾，拙譯在七言譯文中也體會到了這種無奈，倒是稍微偏向直譯的白話譯文能夠保留這些成分。試比較：

拙譯：
白話譯文
人說昔日詹姆西紙醉金迷的宮廷
如今已是獅子和蜥蜴當道橫行；
巴赫拉姆這個當年無與倫比的獵手，
野驢踢頭也不能將他從長眠中喚醒。（覃學嵐譯，2011）
七言譯文
昔日人君逍遙宮，
如今獸王安樂籠；
當年獵驢大將軍，
眼下驢踢不醒蟲。（覃學嵐譯，2011）

3. 修辭差異在翻譯過程中的體現

英漢兩種語言在語法方面有著很大的差異，這一點我們從上一節的討論中已略窺一斑。同樣，在修辭上，英漢兩種語言也存在著很大的差異，而這一點，過去似乎尚未引起我們足夠的重視。如果說從語法上而言，漢語較之英語要遠為簡潔，遠為缺少羈絆的話，那麼就修辭而言，則正好反過來了，漢語在修辭上往往有囉嗦冗餘之嫌，雖然中國人作文向來也崇尚簡練，反對堆砌詞藻，但行文過於簡練的文字往往又不被看好，難免有缺乏文采之嫌，由於在遣詞造句方面中國人

有著自己獨特的審美取向，如工整對仗，張弛有度，詳略得當等等偏好，往往仍然會使我們的文章中含有很多可以擠掉的水分。比如：

> 天津衛這地方，大馬路不種五穀雜糧，小胡同不長瓜果梨桃。（林希《天津閒人》）

這句話，無論從哪個方面看，似乎都是無可挑剔、令中文讀者非常舒服的句子，絲毫不會讓人覺得有什麼多餘的冗詞贅語。然而，這是從習慣了中文的讀者的角度得出的結論。換成老外，或許就另當別論了。現在我們就站在外國讀者的角度來分析分析這句話：先說“天津衛這地方”，如果從語義的角度說，“這地方”純屬多餘，去掉語義照樣完整；再看“大馬路不種五穀雜糧，小胡同不長瓜果梨桃”，這不廢話嗎？請問：哪兒的大馬路有種五穀雜糧？哪兒的小胡同又長瓜果梨桃？由此看來，此處的“大馬路”、“小胡同”似乎不僅多餘，還給人以邏輯混亂之感；最後，我們再來說說這“五穀雜糧”和“瓜果梨桃”。五穀雜糧在漢語中是個四字熟語，若要較真的話，究竟何為五穀？《皇帝內經》認為五穀即“粳米、小豆、麥、大豆、黃黍”;《孟子騰文公》認為五穀乃“稻、黍、稷、麥、菽”; 佛教祭祀時所說的五穀為“大麥、小麥、稻、小豆、胡麻”。如此看來，這還真是個沒有定論的問題。至於雜糧，就字面不難猜出是指主糧（也許就是所謂的五穀，按照現在的情況，則可能指米、麵粉、玉米等）之外的糧食。所以，五穀雜糧實際上就是泛指各種各樣的糧食，在本句中完全可以用糧食來取而代之。而“瓜果梨桃”卻不是一個現成的四字熟語，可以說是作者臨時湊成的一個詞語，用它來泛指水果，之所以不直接

說“水果”而要說“瓜果梨桃”，原因就在於前面沒用“糧食”而是用的“五穀雜糧”，這就是咱們中國人作文時崇尚的工整與對仗。經過上面這一番分析，如果說只求把意思表達完整的話，上面這句話似乎完全可以改寫為：

天津衛不種糧食，也不長水果。

然而改動後的句子，較之原來的句子，在中國讀者的眼中，可能在文采方面差遠了。所以，我們說，這就是漢語在修辭方面的特色。現在我們回頭再站在中國讀者的角度來剖析一下原來的這個句子。其實“天津衛這地方”，從中文修辭的角度說，是一個字不多，一個字不少，恰到好處，中國人說話寫文章，都來得比較從容，有點娓娓道來的意思，就本句而言，“天津衛這地方”等於提出了一個話題，在這裡先停頓一下，給自己也給對方一個喘息的機會，如果只說“天津衛”而丟掉那看似多餘的“這地方”則會顯得過於突兀，於是，我們可以說從修辭上說，有“這地方”比沒有好；再看“大馬路”和“小胡同”，它們的作用在於變相地重提“天津衛這地方”，從句法功能上講，有點兒類似英語中的形式主語，從修辭上講，去掉它們後，後半句則會顯得非常唐突，不信，試讀之：天津衛這地方，不種五穀雜糧，不長瓜果梨桃。由此可見，從修辭上講，它們一點兒也不多餘。

孫藝風曾將該句譯為：The city of Tianjian produces neither grain nor fruit 後又改譯為：The city of Tianjin, with all its streets and lanes, produces neither grain nor fruit。孫先生自認為後來的改譯更接近原文，但筆者卻覺得似反倒不及原譯了，因為，添加進來的“with all its streets and lanes”表面上把原譯中丟到的“大馬路”和“小胡同”

給找補回來了，但實質上整個 with 短語卻改變了原文的意思，成了“天津這座城市，雖然大馬路和小巷子一樣不缺，但卻既不產糧食也不產水果”。筆者倒以為原譯更佳，若嫌文采不夠的話，似可在 grain 和 fruit 上再做點文章，如將 grain 換為 food。

下面我們就以幾個實例來看一看英漢兩種語言在修辭方面的這種差異：

> They never confine themselves to one science, but are inevitably masters of several. The big book of Nature they know by heart. Only the other day I was reading an account of a great novelist, a most sophisticated and subtle person, and was told that he knew the name and habits and history of every wild flower and plant and tree and bird in the country. Nor is that all. There is not one of these bigwigs who is not (I quote the customary phrases) a sensitive and accomplished musician, or an extraordinarily fine amateur water-colourist, or the possessor of a magnificent prose style. We are always told that, had circumstance been different, their talents were such that they need only have given their serious attention to one or other of these arts to have procured for themselves lasting and perhaps world-wide reputations. So runs the legend of the eulogists.

我們先來看一看下面的這段譯文：

> 他們從來不把他們自己局限於一門學科，而是不可避免地成了好幾個學科的大師。大自然這本巨著他們爛熟在胸。前幾天，我看到一個偉大小説家的事蹟報導，説他是一個見多識廣、見微知著的人，對當地樹木花鳥的名稱、習性以及掌故無所不知。還遠不止這些。這些大腕兒(説句套話)沒有一個不是敏感而且有造詣的音樂家，或者特別傑出的業餘水彩畫家，或者一種華麗的散文風格的擁有者。我們總是被告知：即便環境不一樣，憑藉他們如此的天賦，他們只需認真地把注意力放到這些藝術的一門或另一門上，就足以為他們自己贏得持久或許世界範圍的名聲。讚頌者們筆下的傳奇就是這樣寫的。

應該說這段譯文基本上還是把原文的意思翻譯過來了，但是由於譯者沒能把握住英漢兩種語言在修辭上各自的特色，所以譯文讀起來總嫌平淡乏味，幾無文采可言。而下面的這段譯文則充分體現了英漢兩種語言在修辭方面的差異：

> 他們從不只鑽一門學問，而是廣涉博獵，最終個個都不可避免地成了若干領域的大師。連大自然這本大部頭他們也是爛熟於胸，了若指掌。就在前不多時，我還在拜讀一文壇巨擘的傳記來著，此公見多識廣，無所不精，據稱對本土花草樹鳥的名字、習性和來龍去脈，他是如數家珍，無一不知，無一不曉。而且這還算不上什麼。這些大腕兒級的人物，套用一句流行的說法，沒有哪一個不是樂感敏銳，造詣匪淺的音樂大師、筆走龍蛇，卓爾不群的水彩高手、文如錦繡，風格雋永的散文名家。書上還常常這樣寫道：縱然是身處別樣環境，憑他們的天賦，在這些方面稍稍鑽研一下，也足以使他們留名丹青，沒準兒還會名揚天下。在為他們樹碑立傳者的筆下，我們看到的就是這樣的神話。

分析起來，不難發現，譯文不少地方根據漢語的修辭特色進行了增譯，請注意下面這些短語："從不知鑽一門學問，而是廣涉博獵"、"爛熟於胸，了若指掌"、"如數家珍，無一不知，無一不曉"、"樂感敏銳，造詣匪淺"、"筆走龍蛇，卓爾不群"、"文如錦繡、風格雋永"。可以說，這些黑體部分從語義上說純屬冗餘，但從修辭上講，去掉了反而會使文采頓減三分。又如：

> He walked every day, rain or fine, for exactly one hour, but if the weather was threatening, his servant walked behind him with a big umbrella.

> 譯文1：他每天都散步不多不少一個小時，無論天晴還是下雨，不過要是天氣嚇人，他的僕人就會拿著一把大傘，跟在他的後面。

> 譯文2：晴也好，雨也罷，他每天都散步一個小時，一分鐘不多，一分鐘不

少。不過，要是天色不好，他的僕人便會拿著一把大傘，尾隨其後。

比較譯文1和譯文2，譯文1將"for exactly one hour"譯作"不多不少一個小時"，就惜墨而言，與原文相當，譯文2則譯作"一個小時，一分鐘不多，一分鐘不少"，字數多了一些，但修辭效果卻比譯文1明顯勝一籌。

當然，我們這裡所說的增譯並不是憑空的無中生有，而是根據漢語的修辭需要而進行的適當增譯，也不是提倡囉嗦。我們說過，漢語行文，修辭上講究工整對仗，也講究詳略得當，注重措辭的簡潔凝練。所以，英譯漢時，省譯或縮譯有時也是體現漢語修辭特色的有效手段。如：

> I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places shall be made plain, and the crooked places shall be made straight and the glory of the Lord will be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.

> 譯文1：我有一個夢想，那就是有一天，每一個峽谷都將被抬高，每一座小山和大山都將被削低，坎坷的地方都將被變為平地，彎曲的地方都將被變得筆直，上帝的榮耀將被展現，所有的人都將一起看見它。

> 譯文2：我夢想有一天，深谷彌合，高山夷平，歧路化坦途，曲徑成通衢，上帝的光華再現，普天下生靈共謁。

兩相比較，我們發現：譯文2恰到好處地用洗練簡潔的四五個漢語詞彙表達了若干英語詞彙才能表達的意思，在文采方面遠勝於譯文1。那麼，這是不是說，我們上面所說的英譯漢時，就修辭而言，往往會

更多地採用增譯法就值得打上問號了呢？我們的回答是：不是。請大家注意，這裡的省譯，說到底，實際上還是對英漢兩種語言在語法上的差異化解，而正是這種化解才成就了譯文2的文采。

說到這裡，必須澄清一下，雖然我們說就體現英漢修辭差異而言，英譯漢時，總體上以增譯（或曰加點兒水份）居多，漢譯英則以省譯（或曰擠掉點兒水份）居多，但這並不是絕對的，因為前面我們說過，漢語的伸縮性和靈活性是很強的，如下面這幾句話的概念意義幾乎是完全一樣的：

- 此乃生死一役。
- 這是一場生死之戰。
- 這是一場生死存亡的戰爭。
- 這是一場關乎生死存亡的決戰。
- 這是一場關係到生死存亡的關鍵之戰。

在具體的翻譯過程中，究竟選用哪一句，一取決整個文體特徵方面的要求，二取決於前後相鄰的句子結構。

以上所談，乃是甲語言與乙語言在廣義的修辭方面存在的總體性差異，這種差異是一種群體性差異，而非個體性差異，而且只有在兩種不同的語言之間進行修辭方面的對比時才能彰顯出來。

4. 翻譯過程中體現言語差異的手段和策略

除了上述語言差異的化解和修辭差異的體現之外，翻譯過程中還要注意另外一個重要問題，這便是言語差異的體現。請先看一例：

He must be the most stupid person in the world.

似可譯成：

> 他他肯定是天底下最蠢的傢伙了。
> 他肯定是世界上最大的傻冒兒。
> 天底下像他那樣的傻冒兒怕是再也找不出第二個了。

問題是最後一種譯文英文完全可以表達為：

> It seems that you cannot find another person/there is no other person who is so stupid as he in the world/under the sun.

那麼，這裡就出現了一個值得引起我們注意的問題：譯者在譯文的行文中究竟有多大的自由度？

要回答這個問題，我們首先必須明白，同樣的意思是可以有千差萬別的表達形式的。而這千差萬別的表現形式往往就是構成一個作家個人言語差異或風格的因素。明白了這一點，我們就會發現，翻譯的任務不只是把原文的意思翻譯過來就完事了，更重要的是要把原文意思的表達方式翻譯過來。

言語差異與語言差異是兩個不同的概念。語言差異是指兩種不同的語言之間的差異，而言語差異則是指操同一語言的個體之間存在的差異，這種差異再大，也還是屬於同一種語言。翻譯的任務，首先是化解語言差異，只有在化解了語言差異的基礎上，才談得上言語差異的體現。所謂言語差異的體現，就是要在化解語言差異的基礎上，在譯入語內部找到一種近似的個人言語風格，如原文陽春白雪，那麼譯文也就要相應地陽春白雪一點，而不能下里巴人；原文拐彎抹角，譯文就不能直來直去，如：You're late for the last time 若譯成"你被解雇了"就不妥，因為"你被解雇了"在英文裡完全可以找到更對應的說法：You're sacked/fired。不瞭解語言差異與言語差異之別，就難免把語言差異當作言語差異來處理，結果自然是譯文佶屈聱牙，不堪卒讀；另一方面，則有可能把化解語言差異看作翻譯任務的全部，忽視言語差異的化解，其結果自然就會是千人一面。說得具體一點，海明威的風格和福克納的風格，可能經過你一譯，全都變成了你自己的風格了。

為了盡可能地體現言語差異或曰原作者的個人風格，我們所應採取的策略就是在化解了語言差異的基礎之上，要盡可能地在譯入語中找到能體現相應言語差異的表現方式去化解這種個人差異。比較保險的一種做法就是在化解語言差異的前提下，盡可能地採用偏向直譯的方法去處理譯文。下面我們以 Max Weber 的一首詩作“Night”的不同譯文來說明這個問題：

NIGHT
Max Weber
Fainter, dimmer, stiller each moment,
Now night.

我們先來看一看郭沫若先生的譯文：

愈近黃昏，
暗愈暗，
靜愈靜，
每刻每分，
已入夜境。

這首譯詩，總體上說，不算很成功，理由有三：第一、形式上與原詩相去甚遠；第二、在理解與表達的度上沒能把握好；第三、犯了一些

不該犯的忌諱。下面分述之：首先，譯詩與原詩在形式上相去甚遠，說明譯者沒有仔細去琢磨原詩作者緣何要將第一行拉這麼長而把第二行寫得這麼短。反復吟詠，不難體會原詩作者之良苦用心在於描摹人們對由黃昏而轉入黑夜的那種感受，黃昏是漫長的，而入夜卻是不知不覺剎那間的事兒；其次，理解與表達有一個度的問題，有些東西理解了，表達時是不能明說或寫出來的，如本例中，原詩第一行確實如郭沫若先生所理解的那樣，是在寫黃昏，但原詩並未明言自己是在寫黃昏，而是希望讀者自己去讀出來的，因此，我們說郭沫若先生犯了一個很大的忌諱，即把不該道破的東西給道破了，另外，“每刻每分，已入夜境”邏輯上存在問題。

接下來我們再來看看辜正坤先生的譯文：

一刻比一刻縹渺，晦暗，安寧，
於是夜來臨。[7]

相比郭譯，筆者更傾向於辜譯，尤其是辜譯的第一行。首先，辜譯很好地再現了原詩的形式，從而把審美的過程交換給了讀者，郭譯所失正是辜譯所得；其次就態度而言，辜譯非常認真負責，原詩中那三個來得極其自然、絲毫不露雕琢之痕的“-er”雖未能在譯詩中得到完美的體現，這是語言的差異所使然，任何人也無能為力，但辜譯卻採用了一個“失之東隅，收之桑榆”的策略，選用了三組雙字詞，這三組詞每組偏旁或部首相同，更為難能可貴的是這種精心安排，也同樣絲毫不露雕琢之痕。

當然，譯詩的第二行似稍嫌不足，辜先生自己也不是很滿意，筆者以為首先是用字太多了，不及原詩，其次，原詩用了頭韻（alliteration）而譯詩未能再現這一修辭手段，所以筆者覺得，不妨

改為“嘿，黑了。”當然，若後一行採用筆者所提議的“嘿，黑了”，第一行也得另行考慮，否則整首詩的風格會顯得不太協調。

下面我們再結合一封家信的翻譯來談談言語差異或曰風格的體現問題：

> Dear son,
>
> I'm writing this slow, cause I know you can't read fast. We don't live where we did when you first left. Your Dad read in the paper that most accidents happen within 20 miles of home, so we moved. I won't be able to send you the address as the last family here took the numbers with them for their next house, so they wouldn't have to change their address. This place has a washing machine. The first day I put four shirts in, pulled the chain, and I haven't seen 'em since. It only rained twice this week, three days the first time and four days this time. The coat you wanted me to send you your Aunt Sue said it would be a little too heavy to send in the mail with the heavy buttons, so we cut them off and put them in the pockets. About your sister, she had a baby this morning. I haven't found out whether it's a girl or a boy, so I don't know if you are an Aunt or an Uncle. Not much more news this time, write soon.
>
> Love, Mom
>
> P.S. Was going to send you money, but the envelope was already sealed.

仔細閱讀這封信，不難發現寫這封信的人不僅文化修養不高，而且思維混亂。面對這樣一封信，翻譯的時候，首先就要考慮風格說言語差異的體現問題，所以抬頭若譯為“親愛的兒子”就不太妥，而可以考慮譯成“娃兒”之類的稱呼，通篇而言，宜儘量採用“下里巴人”的語言來譯，此外，像“P.S.”雖在英文別無其他標記法，但漢譯時卻有多種選擇，如“又、又及、另”等，而具體到這裡，似乎只能譯作“又”或“另”，否則就會出現前後風格的不一致。順便說一句，

上面我們在談到 Max Weber 的那首“Night”的翻譯，曾經提到理解與表達的度的把握問題，這封信的翻譯可以加深我們對這一點的認識，該信中部有一句話：This place has a washing machine. The first day I put four shirts in, pulled the chain, and I haven't seen 'em since。明眼的讀者一看便知，這裡所謂的“洗衣機”絕非什麼洗衣機，而是抽水馬桶，但是理解到位了，並不能如實捅破，個中道理，相信各位自能悟透。

讀者不同，其期待也是不盡一致的，譬如，對於一般的讀者而言，你的譯文語言越地道，就越容易得到肯定或認可，而對於從事對比研究或本身也從事翻譯的讀者而言，可能你的譯文越是偏離原文，越出乎其意外，往往越能得到其首肯乃至佩服。譬如，I'm sorry but I've done it just for your good 這句話如果作“對不起，不過我也是為你好”就不如譯作“不好意思，不過人家也是為你好嘛”更能贏得同行的好感。

此外，任何文體都有自己的風格，雖然有時候很難有嚴格的界定，但讀者一般憑語感都能意會出來，譬如，我們常說“詩一樣的語言”，究竟是什麼樣的語言並非三兩句就能說清楚，但只要讓讀者一讀，馬上就能告訴你答案。

5. 結束語

譯學研究雖然不能只停留在語言的層面，但時至今日，仍不乏從語言層面來探討翻譯問題的論文，這無疑說明了語言層面的問題還遠未解決，同時也說明了譯學研究的核心問題仍然是語言問題。本文對當前部分主流翻譯理論進行了質疑，並從語言本身的差異、語言間修辭方面的差異以及言語差異三方面探討了化解這些差異的一些手段

和策略，如用省譯法化解英譯漢時的語言差異，用增譯法來體現英譯漢時的修辭差異等，同時提出了體現言語差異的策略和手段。限於篇幅，最後一個問題未能展開，惟期能起到一個拋磚引玉的作用。

注 釋

[1] 據不完全統計，染指魯拜集的中文譯者應在50餘位（不含網路譯者）：胡適（1920）、聞一多（1922、郭沫若（1924）、徐志摩（1924）、鐘天心（1924）、吳宓（1924）、林語堂（1925）、劉半農（1926）、張采真（1926）、吳劍嵐（1934）、李唯建（1934）、朱湘（1936）、鄭振鐸（1937）、孫毓棠（1941）、趙宋慶、李竟容（1942）、潘家柏（1942）、黃克孫（1956）、黃杲炘（1982）、施穎洲（1972）、孟祥森（1971）、陳次雲（1971）、梁實秋（1985）、虞爾昌（1985）、張暉（1988）、瞿煒（1988）、飛白（1989）、張鴻年（1991）、穆宏燕（1994）、沙卡布拉揚（鄭天送 1996）、李霽野 （2004）、柏麗（1990）、傅一勤（2003）、屠岸（2007）、王寵（2009）、陳之藩（1996）、辜正坤（1998）、邢秉順（1998）、童元方（2000）、李敖（2001）、薛春美（2006）、鄧均吾（2007）、蔡天新（2007）、王虹（飄紅 2010）、程侃聲（鶴西 2010）、眭謙（伯昏子 2011）等，當然，所譯數量各不相同。

[2] 這裡所說的拘泥於原文之嫌，不包括因為郭譯所處的現代漢語（白話文）尚處於未定型階段這一因素，主要是指郭譯個別地方對原文的變通不夠而造成的譯文生硬情況。另外需要說明的是，郭譯的整體水準是非常高的。

[3] 限於篇幅，本文只對該文的前幾句做了一個再解讀，其實該文還存在著很多值得進一步解讀的地方，筆者將另文轉述。

[4][5][6] 原文為英文，收於 *The Translation Studies Reader* (2000) 一書，此處引文為筆者試譯。

[7] 辜先生對該行的最新修改為：“夜，來了”（參見辜正坤，2010: 350）。

參考文獻

Benjamin, Walter (2000). “The Task of the Translator”. In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge. 15-24.

王力（1984），《中國語法理論》（《王力文集》第一卷），濟南：山東教育出版社。

李河(2005),《巴別塔的重建與解構——解釋學視野中的翻譯問題》,昆明：雲南大學出版社。

夏基松(2006),《現代西方哲學》,上海：上海人民出版社。

孫藝風(2004),《視角 • 闡釋 • 文化——文學翻譯與翻譯理論》,北京：清華大學出版社。

郭沫若譯(1937),《魯拜集》,上海：泰東書局。

覃學嵐譯(2011),《魯拜集新譯》,北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司。

辜正坤(2010),《中西詩比較鑒賞與翻譯理論》(第二版),北京：清華大學出版社。

黃克孫譯(2009),《魯拜集》,南京：譯林出版社。

錢鐘書(1994)《七綴集》,上海：上海古籍出版社。

作者簡介

覃學嵐，文學碩士，現任清華大學外文系黨總支副書記、副教授，中國翻譯協會專家會員，曾任清華大學出版社外語事業部第一編輯室主任、高級編輯。主要譯作：莎士比亞歷史劇《亨利六世》(上、中、下）,《魯拜集新譯》、《暮光之城·暮色》、《讀心人》、《疾速天使·命運密碼》、《論幸福生活》(即出）、《莎士比亞傳》(即出）、《狄更斯傳》(即出）、《七面鐘之謎》、《生命的七大精神法則》、《比較詩學》及短篇小說、散文若干。

A Cognitive-Pragmatic Approach to Discourse Markers in Simultaneous Interpretation

Zheng Wenbo

Abstract

Drawing on the interpretive framework of Relevance Theory, this article presents the findings of an empirical study into such issues. It begins with a short introduction of the research literature on relevance and translation, as well as a brief review of cognitive-pragmatic studies of discourse markers and simultaneous interpretation. It then proceeds to a detailed analysis of discourse markers in an original speech and four interpreted versions. Seven key issues are addressed: the frequencies of discourse markers, the correspondence between the original and target speeches, the understanding of discourse markers in the original speech, the different interpreting strategies used, different translations of the same discourse markers, individual preferences, and translation errors. The study offers cognitive-pragmatic explanations for the phenomena observed, and concludes with related suggestions for interpreter training.

Discourse markers provide pragmatic clues for the audience to update existing contextual assumptions. In simultaneous interpretation, discourse markers help the interpreter grasp the speaker's communicative intention, and interpreters in turn use such devices in the target language to render the original information without putting the audience to unnecessary effort.

1. Theoretical Framework

Before the cognitive-pragmatic approach was introduced, there were mainly two schools of thought in simultaneous interpreting research. One was the interpretive school led by Seleskovitch and Lederer from Paris, who advocated "deverbalization", and the other, the information processing school led by Daniel Gile, who put forward the influential "effort model". In 1999, Robin Setton, in his book *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*, constructed the cognitive-pragmatic model for simultaneous interpreting based on Relevance Theory, frame semantics and mental model theory.

The current study draws inspiration from Setton's framework, with a focus on the Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (constructed in 1986 and revised in 1995), who believe communication to be an "ostensive-inferential" and dynamic process.

According to Relevance Theory, translation may be viewed as a two-step ostensive-inferential process of interaction, first between the speaker and the translator, and then between the translator and the reader, aspects which have been explored in detail by Gutt (1991). This also applies to interpreting and carries special implications for simultaneous interpreting, as the two steps happen at the same time. As simultaneous interpreting is such an intensive mental exercise, saving energy and achieving the best communicative effect in the relevance-seeking efforts are crucial for the interpreter. To this end, discourse markers are a linguistic device of high value for interpreters.

The first studies on discourse markers were carried out from the perspectives of syntax and semantics but since the 1970s a pragmatic turn has been witnessed (Schiffrin 1987; Blakemore 1992; Rouchota 1996). According to Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995), discourse markers provide pragmatic clues for the audience to update existing contextual assumptions with the minimum processing efforts. So at the first ostensive-inferential stage in simultaneous interpretation, discourse markers help the interpreter figure out the speaker's communicative intention. In the second, the interpreter uses such devices in the target language to render the original information without putting the audience to unnecessary effort.

2. The Case Study

The data for the study comes from the recorded performance of a graduating class in the Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation, Beijing Foreign Studies University. The graduating students have mastered all the basic skills and competencies for simultaneous interpreting and have accumulated some interpreting experience.

The speech was delivered in English by Jerry Yang, the founder of Yahoo, on the subject of the Internet and business development. The whole speech lasted 30 minutes and 40 seconds. Ten students sat in five booths, that is to say, there were two interpreters in a booth taking turns to interpret. The first 14 minutes and 12 seconds of the original speech and the corresponding interpreted speeches were transcribed word for word, recording the complete versions of the first interpreter in each pair. This provided a total of five recordings. However, due to technical problems, one of the recordings was of poor sound quality and thus could not be used. So altogether, four interpreted versions of the first half of the speech were examined.

Three of the interpreters are female, and the fourth is male. All of them speak Chinese as their mother tongue and English as their second language, which means they are here interpreting from their B language into their A language. This and all the other working conditions in the study are consistent with the standards laid down by AIIC.

2.1. Frequencies of discourse markers

The first research question is how often the speaker and the interpreters use the discourse markers and what the popular choices are. Table 2.1 presents the frequencies of discourse markers in the original and target language.

Table 2.1 Frequencies of Discourse Markers

	Number of words	Number of sentences	Frequencies of discourse markers [1]	Average words per sentence	Discourse markers/ number of words	Average number of discourse markers per sentence
Speaker	2114	101	152	20.93	7%	1.50
Interpreter1	3383	113	215	29.94	6%	1.90
Interpreter2	2909	106	108	27.44	4%	1.01
Interpreter3	2801	97	218	28.88	8%	2.25
Interpreter4	2495	96	97	25.99	4%	1.01

As Table 2.1 shows, the speaker and the four interpreters all use discourse markers. The speaker uses them 152 times, with an average of 1.5 discourse markers in each sentence. The interpreters use them 215, 108, 218 and 97 times respectively, with an average of 1.90, 1.01, 2.25 and 1.01 discourse markers in each sentence. The proportions of discourse markers in the speeches, including both the original and the interpreted speech, range from 4% to 8%, not comparable to the other phrases which are thought to carry concrete meanings. This also partly explains why interpreters and researchers often overlook the function of these small linguistic devices.

Table 2.2 and Table 2.3 list the detailed calculation of different discourse markers and their frequencies in the original and target languages.

Table 2.2 Discourse Markers Used by the Speaker

No.	Discourse marker	Frequency
1	also	1
2	and	95
3	as a result	1
4	as many of you know	1
5	At least there are some examples here.	1
6	but	7
7	else	1
8	em	1
9	especially	1
10	for example	15
11	in fact	4
12	instead of	1
13	Let me talk a little about the history.	1
14	like	1
15	many of you know	1
16	more than	1
17	not only, but also	3
18	One of the key things I shared with you earlier was that	1
19	or	3
20	rather than	1
21	so	6
22	such as	1
23	to give you an example	1
24	So I want to show you this chart.	1
25	then	1
26	well	1
Sum		152

Table 2.3 Discourse Markers Used by the Four Interpreters

No.	Discourse marker	Interpreter 1	Interpreter 2	Interpreter 3	Interpreter 4
1	比方說	2	0	1	0
2	比如	8	5	2	4

3	不僅	5	4	3	2
4	等等	5	5	1	0
5	呃	6	0	94	14
6	而	4	6	13	2
7	和	11	9	4	9
8	還有	2	2	0	4
9	咳	0	0	8	0
10	另外	1	2	0	1
11	那 (麼)	39	8	34	6
12	呢	57	0	2	1
13	嗯	0	0	6	4
14	然後	4	1	0	1
15	實際上	4	3	1	2
16	所以	17	11	11	8
17	特別是	2	0	0	0
18	同時	4	7	0	1
19	也	32	16	9	4
20	以及	2	6	9	0
21	因此	0	0	4	0
22	因為	10	10	10	9
23	尤其是	0	1	0	1
24	於是	0	1	0	0
25	這個	25	11	6	24
Sum		215	108	218	97

The calculation reveals a noticeable difference in the occurrences of different discourse markers. As the above tables show, the speaker adopts 26 discourse markers in his speech, repeating four of them for more than five times, namely, *and, but, for example* and *so*, among which *and* is repeated 95 times and *for example* 15 times. Other discourse markers such as *in fact, not only, but also* and *or* are mentioned 4, 3, and 3 times respectively and the rest of the discourse markers once.

The interpreters use 25 discourse markers altogether. The ten common choices for the four interpreters include “比如”, “不僅”, “而”,“和”,“那(麼)”, “實際上”, “所以”, “也”, “因為” and “這個”. Popular choices which are repeated for more than five times by all the four include “那(麼)”, “所以”, “因為” and “這個”. Less popular choices which are used by only one or two interpreters are “比方說”, “咳”, “嗯”, “特別是”, “因此”, “尤其是” and “於是”.

2.2. Correspondence of discourse markers

As Table 2.1 clearly shows, discourse markers in the original and target speeches do not always correspond to each other. On the one hand, we know that the preference of discourse markers is language-specific. On the other, discourse markers, according to Relevance Theory, are used to highlight the link between the discourse and its context. As the original and the target speech are supposed to be logically consistent, then, what might be the corresponding relationship between the discourse markers in the original and the target speech?

Generally speaking, the Chinese language (especially spoken Chinese) uses discourse markers less often than English, which could be partly attributed to the implicit and concise nature of the language (He 2006: 274). But the experiment does not support this finding. While the speaker uses discourse markers 152 times, Interpreters 2 and 4 use such devices 108 and 97 times respectively, less than the speaker. However, Interpreters 1 and 3 seem to prefer discourse markers much more, with 215 and 218 usages respectively, which surpass that of the speaker significantly. Here it should be noted that an interpreted speech in Chinese is different from a spontaneous Chinese speech. When interpreters are at work, they may unconsciously be affected by the structure of the original language, resulting in obvious influence of syntactic transfer.

2.3. Discourse markers in the original language

In the first phase, in which the interpreters listen to the speech in English, there are mainly three types of relevance indicated by the discourse markers which help the interpreters to understand the speaker, based on the three general types of interaction of new and old information indicated by discourse markers, which are 1) to strengthen the existing contextual assumption by adding elements using devices such as "not only, but also" and "in fact"; 2) to contradict the existing contextual assumption by using "but", "rather than", etc.; 3) to explain or elaborate on the existing contextual assumption by using "because", "for example", "especially" and so on.

The discourse markers from the original speech are categorized according to the type of relevance indicated by them in Table 2.4

Table 2.4 Types of Relevance Indicated by Discourse Markers in the Original Speech

Types of relevance	Logical subdivision	Discourse markers in the original speech
1) to strengthen the existing contextual assumption	addition	and not only, but also also in fact
	alternative	or
	exemplification	as many of you know many of you know
2) to contradict the existing contextual assumption	transition	but
	comparison	more than
	correction	em
	elimination	rather than instead of
3) to explain or elaborate on the existing contextual assumption	causality	as a result so
	explanation	for example especially to give you an example like such as At least there are some examples here.
	continuity	and then
	turn-taking	and well

So at the first ostensive-inferential stage, in which interpreters act as listeners, discourse markers highlight the logical turning points, thus facilitating the interpreters in locating the message within the specific context. For example, "and" as a discourse marker indicates that the two parts before and after it bear the same status or have certain things in common, while "not only, but also" has the same function and in many cases further implies the latter is more important than the former.

For example, in the speech, we find the following sentence:

> (1) And we really believe that our business, the Internet business is a global business, and so we have **not only** 8 offices in the US, **but also** have offices in 10 countries around the world.

According to Relevance Theory, the interpreter as the listener will decode the meaning of the words first and locate it in the context. In this case, as mentioned, the discourse marker as a language device reminds us that there will be two parts, and that the latter somehow prevails over the former. Then as the context comes into play, three things should be noted: 1) Jerry Yang said "the Internet business is a GLOBAL business"; with the information provided by the teacher beforehand and common business knowledge, we know 2) Jerry Yang represents Yahoo; 3) Yahoo is based in the US.

Thus, the interpreters may well anticipate after hearing the "the internet is a global business" and "not only" that the speaker is likely to emphasize the fact Yahoo started from "the US" but more importantly, it now operates "around the world". This is indeed exactly what the speaker says, and the interpreter, with anticipation beforehand, may feel a sense of relief after his or her guess is proved right.

While in written texts, we have the spaces and punctuation marks to divide the paragraphs and make it easier to grasp the overall picture, in oral speeches, interpreters normally do not have the privilege of identifying the structure and logical arrangements of the speech. That is why they may heavily rely on discourse markers such as "first", "second" and "finally" as road signs in their understanding. This is why the significance of discourse markers should be highlighted as bearing the "procedural meanings" which may mobilize the limited resources that are in the hands of interpreters and thus save their energy.

2.4. Interpreting discourse markers

In this section, we address the following questions: how do the interpreters deal with discourse markers in the second phase of communication, when interpreters act as speaker for their audience? And what are the possible explanations of their strategies of translation?

In the present study, the ways of interpreting discourse markers fall into five categories: literal translation, substitution, combination, omission and addition, shown in Table 2.5 as follows.

Table 2.5 Interpreting Discourse Markers

Discourse markers	**Interpreter 1**	**Interpreter 2**	**Interpreter 3**	**Interpreter 4**
also	literal translation	omission	(error)	omission
and	literal translation, combination, omission	literal translation, combination, omission	literal translation, combination, omission	literal translation, combination, omission
as a result	literal translation	omission	substitution	omission
as many of you know	Substitution	literal translation	addition	literal translation
At least there are some examples here.	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
but	literal translation	literal translation, omission	literal translation, omission	literal translation
else	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
em	literal translation	omission	literal translation	(error)
especially	literal translation	literal translation	substitution	literal translation
for example	substitution, omission	substitution	substitution	substitution, omission
in fact	substitution	omission, literal translation	omission, addition	literal translation

instead of	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
Let me talk a little about the history.	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
like	literal translation	omission	literal translation	literal translation
many of you know	literal translation	literal translation	substitution	omission
more than	Substitution	substitution	substitution	substitution
not only, but also	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	combination
one of the key things I shared with you earlier was that	Substitution	literal translation	omission	literal translation
or	substitution, omission, literal translation	substitution, literal translation	Substitution, literal translation	omission, literal translation
rather than	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	(error)
so	literal translation, substitution	literal translation, substitution	literal translation, substitution, omission	literal translation, omission
such as	literal translation	substitution	omission	Omission
to give you an example	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	Omission
So I want to show you this chart.	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
then	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation
well	omission	omission	omission	omission
(no discourse markers)	addition	addition	addition	addition

Relevance-based explanations for each interpreting strategy are given below with examples. Differences between interpreters, and translation errors, will be discussed later.

2.4.1 Literal Translation

Literal translation refers to a strict linguistic correspondence between the discourse markers in the original and the target language. For example, "especially" as a discourse marker stands for a deductive mental process from a general situation to a specific case, highlighting the latter half. In Chinese, this meaning is usually expressed with "特别" or "尤其". Three of the four interpreters interpret the discourse markers accordingly.

> Speaker: And what we are going to see in the future is that the growth outside of the US is going to be much more rapid, much faster, **especially** in countries like China, in Asia and in Europe.
>
> Interpreter 1: 我們在未來看到的情況將會是，美國國外的一些，市場的增長呢，將會更快。**特別是**像中國這樣的國家，還有亞洲的其他國家，歐洲的一些國家等等。
>
> Interpreter 2: 那麼在未來，我們也會看到，美國以外的互聯網發展將會更為快速，**尤其是**在像中國、亞洲，以及歐洲這樣一些地區。
>
> Interpreter 4: 我想未來，在美國外部的發展會更加快。**尤其在**中國，在中國這樣的國家，還有在歐洲的一些國家。

The discourse marker "then" could be literally translated as "然後" in Chinese, indicating the procedures of relevant things. Two interpreters choose literal translation in the following example.

> Speaker: They can talk to whoever they want to talk to, do some research and **then** conduct the transaction based on their own behavior.
>
> Interpreter 1: 他們可以做自己的功課，然後直接去找他們要購買的人，**然後**可以按照他們自己的習性呢，去選擇他們的產品。
>
> Interpreter 2: 人們可以進行一些調查研究，**然後**再基於自己的一些行為來進行一些交易，而不是非得到某個特定的地方才能購買商品。

According to Relevance Theory, understanding is such a process: a) the pursuit of minimum efforts in calculating the cognitive effect; b) the process ends as soon as the expected relevance is found. This is to say, interpreters will consider the most reachable context based on decoding in the first place and expand the scale for searching if no relevance is found. Thus in simultaneous interpreting, if the original and target language contain the same or similar logical links with similar expressions, interpreters may easily find and adopt the corresponding words. Literal translation is widely used because it calls for the least effort on the part of the interpreter, not only in understanding but also in expressing the message.

2.4.2 Substitution

Substitution refers to a situation in which interpreters find that a literal translation of the discourse markers might not facilitate the understanding of the audience, and thus they tend to choose alternative devices in the target language. Jerry Yang prefers the discourse marker "for example" and uses as many as 15 times in 15 minutes. A literal translation in Chinese of this phrase might be "比方說" ('to give you an example'). But in several places, that is not what the interpreters do. For instance:

> Speaker: The Internet is very interesting **for example** it is a platform for information, for business, for commerce and for content.

The four interpreters in this study all translate the phrase into "因為", which in Chinese means "because". This reminds us of the fact that here, Jerry Yang is actually explaining why he thinks the Internet is interesting. To put it in another way, some part of the discourse is omitted in the speech, which should be "The Internet is very interesting FOR SEVERAL REASONS, for example". Here the interpreters fill in the blank and provide a version which they think better facilitates the understanding of their listeners.

This is also consistent with Relevance Theory, which believes that as procedural devices, discourse markers will be identified as language road signs but they will not stay in the mind as concrete concepts. So the interpreters recognize the discourse markers first and anticipate the changes of the contextual assumption, thus inferring the direction of the speech. If there happen to be corresponding versions which suit the context, the interpreters will use the most convenient one; alternatively, they will look out for other expressions which fit the contextual understanding of the listeners.

Another example is given below.

Speaker: The key for Yahoo, **as many of you know**, is a directory structure and its navigational guide.

Interpreter 1: 那麼Yahoo呢，**實際上**是一個網頁索引的工具。

Here "實際上", which literally means "in fact", is not a direct rendering between English and Chinese but another active choice on the interpreter's part based on the specific context, expecting to trigger the most relevant contextual effect on the listeners' part.

2.4.3 Combination

Under the tight time pressure, interpreters sometimes adopt combination as an interpreting strategy.

Speaker: And I always try to tell them with some <u>numbers **and** statistics</u> of what is happening on the Internet.

Interpreter1:我就經常試圖用一些<u>資料</u>來支援我的一些觀點，告訴他們互聯網發生的情況。

Interpreter2:我總是告訴他們一些<u>資料</u>，告訴他們互聯網的現狀。

Interpreter3:我總是希望通過一些<u>資料</u>來向他們說明，網際網路現在正在發生些什麼事情。

Interpreter4:我就跟他們講一些<u>資料</u>，跟他們講網際網路發生的事情。

In this example, "and" as a discourse marker shows the two parts linked by it carry the same weight and are similar in terms of category, but with subtle differences. Consequently, all the four interpreters, under the time pressure, combine the meaning of "numbers" and "statistics" and use "數

據" ('data') as a summary of the two notions. If they tried to distinguish the subtle difference here, it could only be done in haste, leaving little room for processing the continuing flow of message.

Here is another similar example with the discourse marker "not only, but also":

Speaker: And this is why I would think that it is very, very important for **not only** businesses, **but also** users to get on to Internet and start using it as a way of getting their information and making their life easier.

Interpreter 4: 我覺得這對於公司，個人來說**都**是很重要的，可以讓他們獲得資訊，讓生活更加輕鬆。

A detailed analysis of how the discourse marker "not only, but also" helps the interpreter understand efficiently has already been provided in section 2.2. In the second "ostensive-inferential" stage, interpreters evaluate the cognitive context of the audience and themselves, and make quick decisions of how to interpret certain meanings and links of meaning. In the example above, Interpreter 4 chooses to combine the two parts linked by the discourse marker with a single-syllable word "都" in Chinese, which should be taken as a suitable choice here.

2.4.4 Omission

To attract the attention of the audience, the speaker often resorts to metapragmatic expressions by quoting questions from others which lead to his response afterwards. In terms of pragmatics, this is a device to clarify the discourse structure as a salient reminder of the logical clue. The quoted questions and the speaker's answers are linked by discourse markers like "well" in English. While no literal translation could be easily borrowed here without further explanation of the link per se, this does not mean that without such a device the listener would not understand. So in the following example, the four interpreters, without an easy way to translate or replace the exact discourse marker, decide to leave the link open for the listener to seek the relevance themselves. This way of translation is termed "omission" in the present study.

Speaker: Many people ask me how we come up with the name Yahoo. **Well**, Yahoo, if you look in a dictionary, it means a very rude and uncivilized people from *Gulliver's Travels*.

Interpreter 1: 很多人問我說，你怎麼會想到Yahoo這個名字呢，如果你看字典的話，Yahoo意味著是那些呃，Gulliver' Travel這個地方的一些很野蠻的人。

Interpreter 2: 許多人問我，我們怎麼突然間想到了給它Yahoo這個名字。如果大家看看字典的話，它實際上是來自《格列佛遊記》中一個非常野蠻的地區。

Interpreter 3: 有人會問我，雅虎是什麼意思呢？我，呃，雅虎實際上是一些，呃，未開化的人類的意思。

Interpreter 4: 很多人問我，我們是怎麼想起這個名字的。我們查了字典，嗯如果查字典的話，Yahoo 是意味著野人的意思。

2.4.5 Addition

Sometimes interpreters add discourse markers in the target language where in the original speech no such devices are found. This happens in two circumstances. First, in order to maintain the completeness and flow of the speech, interpreters add such language devices as "那麼" and "所以" according to the logical context. Second, modal particles such as "呢" and hesitation fillers such as "呃" are also found to be added by the interpreters.

For the first type of addition, we may cite the following example:

Speaker: Let me talk a little about the history.

Interpreter 1: **那麼**我現在簡單談一談Yahoo的歷史。

Interpreter 2: **那麼**，我想談一談我們的歷史。

Interpreter 3: **那麼**我想來談一談，呃，我們的發展歷史。

The speaker does not refer to any discourse markers in this sentence while three interpreters add "那麼" to indicate the continuity of the speech. The following is another relevant example of addition:

Speaker: And this is from a very rapid growth in 1995. There was less than 30 million people on the Internet, **and** you can see that in the last three years it has grown very, very fast and very, very rapidly.

Interpreter 1: 那麼，從95年到現在，這個數字增長非常快，呃當時呢，只有三千萬的用戶，**所以**在過去的三年，這個線民的用戶增長是非常快的。

Interpreter 2: 這是快速的發展，在95年的時候，僅僅有3000萬，**所以**我們看到，在過去的三年裡，互聯網得到了快速的發展。

Interpreter 4: 這是從95年，當時95年只有3000萬。**所以**在過去的幾年裡面，增長得非常快。

The three interpreters omit the link "and" and add "所以" ('therefore') to indicate the implied causality in the original speech, which should be taken as an ostensive approach to seek the optimal relevance to facilitate the understanding of the audience.

Hesitation fillers are another type of discourse marker added by interpreters in the current experiment, such as "呃" in the following example:

Speaker: The key for Yahoo, **as many of you know**, is a directory structure and its navigational guide.

Interpreter 1: 那麼對雅虎最重要的就是一個網路，**呃**，**呃**，索引和導航。

It is easily noticed from the recording and the transcript that Interpreter 3 is exerting herself to process the message of the whole sentence. Instead of literally translating the discourse markers into "正如大家知道的", she chooses to fill the blank with "呃", which should not only be taken as a sign of intensive mental exercise on the part of the interpreter but also as a signal to the listener that the speech is continuing. In the specific context, it could also be taken as a coping tactic which the interpreter adopts to save time for the key message and to maintain the flow of speech at the same time.

The use of hesitation fillers is frequently observed in daily conversation and is even more salient in interpreting. Although it is a coping tactic which should be acceptable from time to time, the privilege should not be abused. In the experiment, Interpreters 1, 3 and 4 use "呃" as a language filler 6, 94 and 14 times respectively. In the case of Interpreter 3, the heavy use of such hesitation fillers might easily cause a certain degree of discomfort for the listener, distracting their attention with "irrelevant" information and disrupting their capacity to seek optimal relevance in understanding.

All in all, based on the three general types of interaction of new and old information indicated by discourse markers, the interpreters have relatively extensive freedom to choose the expression suitable for the audience. The strategies they adopt are quite flexible, and include literal translation, substitution, omission, combination and addition.

The criterion for choosing the best rendering from various possible alternatives is to make the speaker's intention highly salient and relevant to the audience so that optimal relevance can be achieved with adequate contextual effect and as little processing effort as possible.

2.5. Same discourse markers in different parts of the speech

This section addresses the following research question: when some discourse markers occur repeatedly in the speech, are they translated in the same way or in different ways? Why?

While a certain way of indicating relevance could be fulfilled by different discourse markers, the same discourse markers, occurring at different parts of the speech, might indicate two or even three types of relevance, which call for different strategies of translation. Take “and” as an example. The interpreting strategies of this discourse marker include literal translation, substitution, combination and omission, which are illustrated one by one as follows.

“And”, used as a discourse marker to link parallel constructions, could be literally translated as “和”, “跟”, “同” or “以及”. For example:

> Speaker: And what we are going to see in the future is that the growth outside of the U.S. is going to be much more rapid, much faster, especially in countries like China, in Asia **and** in Europe.
>
> Interpreter1:我們在未來看到的情況將會是，美國國外的一些，市場的增長呢，將會更快。特別是像中國這樣的國家，**還有**亞洲的其他國家，歐洲的一些國家等等。
>
> Interpreter2:那麼在未來，我們也會看到，美國以外的互聯網發展將會更為快速，尤其是在像中國、亞洲，**以及**歐洲這樣一些地區。
>
> Interpreter3:那麼我們相信，之後在美國之外的地區，呃，增長會更快，比如像在中國，亞洲國家**以及**歐洲國家的發展。
>
> Interpreter4:我想未來，在美國外部的發展會更加快。尤其在中國，在中國這樣的國家，**還有**在歐洲的一些國家。

When the parallel constructions are similar in meaning and there is huge time pressure, an interpreter might combine the parallel parts as the example in section 2.4.3 shows.

It should be noted that in Chinese, such devices as “和” and “以及” only link words and phrases and are not used between sentences, while in

English, "and" not only links words and phrases, but also sentences and even paragraphs. In the current study, the speaker uses "and" 95 times in less than 15 minutes, among which half of the usages occur as links between sentences. When "and" is used to link sentences, the interpreters often replace it with "那麼" in Chinese, which could be categorized as a form of substitution. For example,

> Speaker: **And** this is from a very rapid growth in 1995. There was less than 30 million people on the Internet, and you can see that in the last three years it has grown very, very fast and very, very rapidly.
>
> Interpreter 1: **那麼**，從95年到現在，這個數字增長非常快，呃當時呢，只有三千萬的用戶，所以在過去的三年，這個線民的用戶增長是非常快的。
>
> Interpreter3: **那麼**這是一個，呃，這是一個非常迅速的變化，因為在95年的時候，不到，呃，三百萬。這個變化，這個增長是非常迅速的。

Due to the syntactic difference between Chinese and English, sometimes "and" as a link between sentences could also ignored in interpreting, in a similar way to the example of "well" in section 2.4.4. Here is an example.

> Speaker: We always talk about the Internet a lot, and people always come to me and say, "Jerry, what is the big deal about the Internet?" **And** I always try to tell them with some numbers and statistics what is happening on the Internet.
>
> Interpreter 2: 我們今天，我們總是討論互聯網。人們總是跟我說，"Jerry，互聯網到底有什麼大作用？"我總是告訴他們一些資料，告訴他們互聯網的現狀。
>
> Interpreter3:我們經常討論互聯網。人們總是問我，"Jerry，網際網路有什麼重要，有什麼好的呢？"我總是希望通過一些資料來向他們說明，網際網路現在正在發生些什麼事情。

2.6. Personal preferences in interpreting the same discourse markers

In terms of the strategies of interpreting, the personal preferences of the interpreters are observed in addition to the common choices mentioned above.

Table 2.3 reflects the individual preferences of the interpreters. For example, Interpreter 1 prefers "那麼" in order to maintain the flow of the speech and "呢" as a modal particle to maximize the communicative effect. Interpreter 4, when thinking hard, resorts to the hesitation filler "呃" as many as 94 times, as mentioned above.

Table 2.5 compares the different interpreter strategies of each individual. In dealing with discourse markers such as "for example", "instead of" and "well", the interpreters make similar decisions. But they demonstrate different choices in translating some other discourse markers. Take the example from section 2.3.4 again. While Interpreters 1, 2 and 4 interpret the word "especially" literally as "特別是" or "尤其是", Interpreter 3 adopts the method of substitution and replaces it with "比如" ('for example'), as follows.

> Speaker: And what we are going to see in the future is that the growth outside of the U.S. is going to be much more rapid, much faster, **especially** in countries like China, in Asia and in Europe.
>
> Interpreter 3: 那麼我們相信，之後在美國之外的地區，呃，增長會更快，**比如**像在中國，亞洲國家以及歐洲國家的發展。

In terms of highlighting the latter part after the link word, "比如" might not be as effective as "尤其是". However, considering the whole text, it indicates the exemplification which neatly leads to the coming message. Therefore as long as it reminds the listeners of the logical clues and reduces listeners' efforts to the minimum, the interpreted version is acceptable.

2.7. Translation errors related to discourse markers

At the same time, due to the time pressure and the fact that discourse markers are easily overlooked as they are usually short phrases, there are some discourse-marker-related interpreting failures including misinterpretation or missing the point.

2.7.1 Misinterpretation

Slips of the tongue are common in oral communication. Sometimes the speaker uses the discourse marker "em" to indicate the correction, as in the following sentence, where the speaker tries to correct the mistake without announcing it directly:

> Speaker: <u>In 1997, **em**, in 1996</u>, the number of dollars spent on the Web was around 270 million US dollars. That is the amount of money that the Web advertisers spent.
>
> Interpreter1:<u>在96年的時候呢</u>，當時網路數量投資呢，只有2億7千萬美元，那這個是網路廣告商的投入。
>
> Interpreter2:<u>在97年的時候</u>，在96年，用於互聯網的資金達到了2億7千萬美元，這就是互聯網廣告的這個支入 (出) 。
>
> Interpreter3:<u>在97年的時候</u>，呃，96年的時候，花費在網路，呃，上的，呃，費用大概在2700萬美元，那是那些網路廣告商所使用的費用。
>
> Interpreter4:<u>1997年和96年</u>，網路上的呃，流動的費用是2700萬，這是就是網路的廣告費。

The four interpreters cope with the correction differently. Interpreter 2 chooses to ignore the sign of correction, while Interpreter 3 adopts the Chinese literal equivalent "呃", and Interpreter 1, with a long ear-voice span, waits until the speaker corrects the year and delivers the correct year directly. Interpreter 4, by saying "1997和1996" ('in both 1997 and 1996'), misinterprets the message, which could be partly attributed to the neglect of the discourse marker “em” in the original speech.

2.7.2 Missing the point

Missing of messages should be distinguished from omission. The latter means deliberately eliminating something insignificant, while the former is an obvious translation error. An example of missing the point is the following:

Speaker: **And** what we are doing is **also** expanding very rapidly around the world. We have numerous Yahoo versions in Europe, in Asia, in Australia, and we are always expanding, hoping to do more.

Interpreter1:那麼我們在全球的擴張也非常快。我們在歐洲，在亞洲，澳大利亞，很多國家都有Yahoo的當地的版本，所以我們也在不斷地發展。

Interpreter2:我們的用戶在全球範圍內不斷增長。我們在歐洲，在亞洲以及澳大利亞都擁有更多的業務。

Interpreter3:我們在，呃，歐洲、亞洲、澳大利亞有，咳，有雅虎的其他一些形式。

Interpreter4:我們正在做的事情就是在全世界擴散式地發展。我們有很多歐洲的Yahoo網站，在澳大利亞也是如此。我們希望有更多的發展。

Among the four interpreters, Interpreter 3 misses the first sentence. This cannot be wholly attributed to the overlooking of discourse markers, but also to a failure to grasp the sentence as a whole. This example is cited here to illustrate the fact that discourse markers rely on the conceptual meaning of the discourse. They act as the road sign but not the road itself. That is to say, inferences of the contextual assumption could only be drawn based on the result of decoding, which is consistent with the relevant explanation of discourse understanding.

In the process of seeking optimal relevance, the ostensive clues help the interpreters to narrow down the conceptual assumption. If no link is found, and thus no sense is made out of the context, the search will end. This is particularly true for simultaneous interpreters. Any failure in either the first decoding and inferencing process as a listener, or in finding an optimal way of expressing the message ostensively with logical clues in the second phase as a speaker, could lead to the failed attempt of an interpreter.

3. Conclusion and Suggestions for Interpreter Training

3.1. Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the conclusions from the empirical study are as follows:

First, the speaker and the four interpreters all use discourse markers to highlight the link between the discourse and its context. Yet the discourse markers in the original and target speech do not always correspond to each other. This may be partly attributed to the difference between the two languages.

In terms of the first phase, in which the interpreters listen to the speech in English, there are three main types of relevance indicated by the discourse markers which could help the interpreters in understanding the speaker.

Based on their understanding, interpreters interpret the discourse markers in accordance with their different functions in the context. The methods they adopt are quite flexible and include literal translation, substitution, omission, combination and addition.

In terms of the strategies of interpreting, personal preferences are observed. As long such a rendering serves to remind listeners of the logical clues and reduces listeners' efforts to the minimum, the version is acceptable.

At the same time, due to the time pressure and the fact that discourse markers are easily overlooked as they are usually short phrases, there are some discourse-marker-related interpreting failures, including missing the point or misinterpretation.

3.2. Suggestions for interpreter training

Because discourse markers are procedural rather than notional in meaning and relatively small in structure, they are usually unstressed in pronunciation and easily escape the attention of the listener. As Setton (1999: 93) has commented, interpreting students tend to overlook procedural information. He also believes that addressing this problem involves not only language proficiency but also special training.

The purpose of the present study is not to suggest ways to translate discourse markers per se, but to draw attention to the ways which interpreters can make full use of their limited resources to save energy. In this way, focused training on discourse markers helps simultaneous interpreters enhance performance and reduce errors.

To be specific, first, it is recommended that interpreters undergo special training in regard to discourse markers and how to catch them when speeches are delivered at speed. Second, what discourse markers mark is contextual information. Context refers not only to the linguistic but also to the cognitive context (which also includes familiarity with the topic, relevant experience and attitudes), and thus the more interpreters know about the cognitive context, the easier they can grasp the logic of the speech. When it comes to discourse markers, they will be in a better position to choose the best interpreting strategies.

Notes

[1] The frequency refers to the occurrence of discourse markers rather than the number of different discourse markers.

References

Barik, Henri C. (1975). "Simultaneous Interpretation: Qualitative and Linguistic Data". *Language and Speech* 18: 272-297.

Blakemore, Diane (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance.* Oxford: Blackwell.

___ (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chaudron, C. and J.C. Richards (1986). "The Effects of Discourse Markers on the Comprehension of Lectures". *Applied Linguistics* 7: 113-127.

Gerver, David (1976). "Empirical Studies of Simultaneous Interpretation: A Review and a Model". In *Translation.* Ed. Richard W. Brislin. New York: Gardner Press,165-207.

Gile, Daniel (1985). "Le modèle d'efforts et l' équilibre en interpretation simultanée". *Meta* 30.1: 44-48.

___ (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grice, H.P. (1989). "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature". *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gutt, Ernst-August (2001). *Pragmatic Aspects of Translations: Some Relevance-theory Observations*. In *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Ed. Leo Hickey. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 41-53.

___ (1991). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Shanghai*: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

He, Ziran 何自然 and Ran Yongping 冉永平 (1999). "Huayu lianxiyu de yuyong zhiyuexing" 話語聯繫語的語用制約性. *Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu* 外語教學與研究 199.3: 1-8.

He, Ziran 何自然, Ran Yongping 冉永平, Mo Aiping 莫愛屏 and Wang Yin 王寅 (eds.) (2006). *Renzhi yuyongxue: yanyu jiaoji de renzhi yanjiu* 認知語用學：言語交際的認知研究. Shanghai: Shanghai Waiyu Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

Hickey, Leo (2001). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Jucker, A.H. and Y. Ziv (1998). *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lederer, Marianne (1981). *La traduction simultanée*. Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes.

Levinson, Stephen (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moser-Mercer, Barbara (1978). "Simultaneous Interpretation: A Hypothetical Model and Its Practical Application". In *Language Interpretation and Communication. Proceedings of the NATO Symposium on Language Interpretation and Communication.* Eds. David Gerver and Wallace H. Sinaiko. New York: Plenum Press, 353-368.

Ostman, J.O. (1981). "You Know: A Discourse-functional Approach". *Pragmatics and Beyond: An Interdisciplinary Series of Language Studies* 2: 5-8.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. and M. Shlesinger (eds.) (2002). *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Ran, Yongping 冉永平 (2000). "Huayu biaojiyu de yuyongxue yanjiu zongshu" 話語標記語的語用學研究綜述. *Waiyu yanjiu* 外語研究 66.4: 8-14.

Rouchota, Villy (1996). "Discourse Connectives: What Do They Link?" *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 199-214.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L.C. (1985). *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Seleskovitch, Danica (1975). *Language, langues et mémoire: etude de prise de notes en interpretation consecutive*. Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes.

Seleskovitch, Danica and Marianne Lederer (1986). *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris: Didier Erudition.

Setton, Robin (1999). *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

___ (2005). "So What Is So Interesting about Simultaneous Interpreting?". http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTI01/doc_pdf/06.pdf (accessed 15/01/2009).

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1986/1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Watts, Richard (1989). "Taking the Pitcher to the 'Well': Native Speakers' Perception of their Use of Discourse Markers in Conversation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 13: 203-237.

Wilson, D. (1994). "Relevance and Understanding". In *Language and Understanding*. Eds.

G. Brown, K. Malmkjaer and A. Pollitt. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yan, Tao 閆濤 (2007). "Lun renzhi guanlianxing dui huayu biaojiyu de jieshili" 論認知關聯性對話語標記語的解釋力. *Xueshu jiaoliu* 學術交流 163.10: 131-133.

Zhang, Faxiang 張發祥 (2006). "Ying-Han huayu biaojiyu yuyong gongneng duibi" 英漢話語標記語語用功能對比. *Luoyang shifan xueyuan xuebao* 洛陽師範學院學報 1: 136-138.

About the Author

Zheng Wenbo is a lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tsinghua University, Beijing. She lectures on interpretation and English reading and conducts research in translation and interpretation at the Center for Translation and Interdisciplinary Studies. A native speaker of Chinese, she holds an MA in simultaneous interpretation and a BA in English language and literature, both from Beijing Foreign Studies University. She has served as simultaneous interpreter for more than 50 major international events such as the Beijing Olympic Games and the annual Beijing Forum, and has translated John Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* into Chinese.

Book Review

Asian-centrism and the Japanese Translation of China

Leo Tak-hung Chan

Emanuel Pastreich: *The Observable Mundane: Vernacular Chinese and the Emergence of a Literary Discourse on Popular Narrative in Edo Japan*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 2011, pp. 366. ISBN: 978-89-521-1177-7

Recently, there has been a widespread call for translation theorists to move beyond a Eurocentric emphasis through incorporating the diverse conceptualizations in non-Western contexts. Maria Tymoczko, as one of the most vocal proponents of this non-Eurocentric turn, has argued for such an "enlargement" of thinking about translation. In the context of East Asia, other than a series of conferences on Asian Translation Traditions and a number of articles by Judy Wakabayashi, in-depth research on translation in the region has been minimal, especially when compared with intra-European studies (on, say, England and Germany). Considering the rising importance of China and Japan on the international scene, the paucity of research in East Asian translation, especially as communicated in English, is perhaps appalling. Pastreich's monograph, though not billed as translation history, is nevertheless an invaluable contribution well worth the attention of Western-trained translation scholars. On the face of it, *The Observable Mundane* is a piece of reception research, focusing on the Japanese response to the importation of Chinese vernacular fiction in the eighteenth century. But there is a translation twist.

This rather voluminous book is divided into eight chapters, preceded by an introduction (while Chapter Eight serves as a kind of conclusion). It covers prototypical translations (verbal transfer from one language to another) in two forms: Japanese translators rendered both Chinese fiction into their mother tongue and indigenous materials into Chinese. Yet in addition to that, it surveys an astonishing array of quasi-translational genres, including adaptations, parodies, imitations, transpositions and bilingual writing. The translational relationship between the two countries some three centuries ago proves, quite surprisingly, to be a minefield for ruminations on what translation is about, from an East Asian and then a Western perspective.

Chapter One of the book begins by examining the Japanese fascination with things Chinese against the background of the Ming-Qing interregnum and the flourishing of an urban culture in Edo, Osaka and Kyoto in the mid-seventeenth century. It then describes briefly the earliest translated vernacular novels, like that of the *Sanguo zhi* (Romance of the three kingdoms), and early translators like Nishita Isoku (?-1765). Chapter Two discusses the work of the leading translator of the time, Okajima Kanzan (1674-1728), who not only "translated" (i.e. kundoku-annotated) the *Shuihu zhuan* (The water margin), but also rendered the Japanese classic *Taiheiki* (Chronicle of Grand Pacification) into vernacular Chinese at a time when classical Chinese was the norm of writing for the educated. The latter act was nothing less than revolutionary.

Ogyū Sorai (1666-1728), the translator-theorist who averred that Chinese should be viewed "as a foreign language and not an elevated domestic discourse" (146), is the subject of Chapter Three. This is clearly a counter-reaction to the dominance of Chinese in Japanese intellectual life prior to that time. Pastreich details the background to Ogyū's founding of the Translation Society and translates into English the influential treatise *Yakubunsentei* (A tool for translation) (see Appendix, 299-330). Ogyū's most important contribution, as Pastreich observes, lies in his valorization of vernacular Japanese as the language of translation, which "more accurately reflected the content of the Chinese classics." He juxtaposes this more "explicit" form of translation against *kundoku* translation, which "is but an imperfect [form of] translation" (144). The subtle shift in the Japanese perception of China/Chinese is indeed revealed in the diversity of translations produced at the time.

Chapter Four of *The Observable Mundane* moves to the Kansai area, where the Kogidō School members—Itō Jinsai (1627-1705), Itō Tōgai (1670-1736) and Hozumi Ikan (1692-1769)—were most active. Pastreich highlights yet other uses of translation that are perhaps not so "Western," especially the deployment of back translations (Chinese to Japanese, then back to Chinese) (164) to support close hermeneutic readings of the Chinese classics, and the compilation of translingual glossaries and dictionaries to help readers deal with the original. The full translational significance of these efforts is seen in the degree to which they generated Japanese vocabulary used later to translate Western terms in the nineteenth century (179). One of the ironies of history is that some of the translated terms (we know) made their way back into China in the twentieth century and became standard ones in use till today. The circle was thus complete.

In spite of the burgeoning of modern forms of translation and the gradual distancing from China, *kundoku* translations continued apace, as described in Chapter Five. Examples are Oka Hakku's (1692-1767) and Sawada Issai's (dates uncertain) anthologies of *huaben* (prompt-book) stories, most notably *Shōsetsu seigen* (Novels in Fine Words; 1743) and *Shōsetsu suigen* (Novels in Refined Words; 1758). They include stories mostly from Feng Menglong's (1574-1645) famed collection *Sanyan* (Three words).

Beginning with the last section of Chapter Five, which is already two-thirds through the book, Pastreich focuses on the quasi-translations triggered by the Chinese vernacular novels, in particular imitations and adaptations. Tsuga Teishō's (1718-1794) "translation" of the Chinese tale "Du Shiniang Sinking Her Jewel Box in Resentment" (1766) is thus an adaptation (*hon-an*) where the setting is completely localized. One wishes, though, that more analysis had been given to Ueda Akinari's (1734-1809) famous adaptations of stories of the strange from China, *Ugetsu monogatari* (Stories of rain and moon) (1776). Pastreich also discusses at length Sawada Issai's imitative piece *Engi Kyōgiden* (The vernacular tale of the righteous courtesan) (1749), based on a real-life event but clearly borrowing from Chinese *huaben* conventions. The mixture of narrative text, interlinear glosses and running commentary gives rise to a hybrid text is one of the most interesting features of the "translations" of the period.

Even more fascinating tales that exemplify how the linguistic and literary influences of China were superimposed on indigenous Japanese modes of writing are surveyed in Chapter Seven. Reading the plethora of examples cited of cross-linguistic punning, multiple glossing in Chinese and Japanese, and so on, one might even think of the literature of eighteenth-century Japan in post-modernist terms. When one scrutinizes the bewildering list of unconventional "influenced" texts, a question arises: How do we integrate these anomalies into a history of translation in Japan, or for that matter, a history of translation anywhere in the world?

From a translation studies perspective, the following comments may be offered about *The Observable Mundane*. First, as Pastreich has noted, his book is not intended to be about the actual "traces" of Chinese novels in Japanese literature, but the intellectual discourse on vernacular literature prompted by the arrival of the Chinese texts (22). Judging from the bibliography, he has not referenced recent translation research, which would have thrown into high relief other aspects of the materials he uncovered. Generally considered, in contrast to the rich contextual discussion, textual analysis is rather scanty (see 64-65, 118, 178-179, 199-200). One would like to see more of the internal dynamics at work when texts were translated from Chinese into Japanese and vice versa. As it is, neither the adaptive strategies nor the abridgement methods, for instance, are fully demonstrated. Given that Pastreich's concern is primarily with context, perhaps such a lacuna can be filled in by interested translation scholars in the future. Furthermore, *The Observable Mundane* interprets the Japanese translation of China as an attempt at domestication: "appropriation" is the term Pastreich uses from quite early on. This actually is a departure from the common assumption that translation in Japan is by nature foreignizing, due to its readiness to absorb things from abroad, firstly from China then from the West.

The conclusion (in Chapter Eight) about the "layers" of external cultural influence on Japan places history in contemporary perspective, especially in that of globalization in the East Asian context. Pastreich's argument is that it is wrong to see Japan's receptivity to Chinese culture during the past two millennia as totally separate from her Westernization in the last two centuries. The link between the two is addressed indirectly in the question: "Why was it that Meiji Japan so readily imported Western literature and its theories in the nineteenth century in contrast to the marked resistance in Korea and China?" (286). To him, the eighteenth-century experience of yoking together vernacular Chinese with Japanese vocabulary had prepared Japan well when confronted with the (later) importation of Western literature. Historians have been misguided in thinking that "the Western literary tradition was directly imprinted on the Japanese tradition" (284-285), ignoring the intermediary, catalytic effect played by Chinese vernacular literature. Pastreich's discussion refocuses attention on how Japan has been more actively "translating" the foreign, or appropriating things alien, than at least her two East Asian neighbors. In his Asian-centric analysis, he also queries the viability of the globalization thesis, according to which the impact of Europe and the United States has caused Japan to break completely with her pre-modern past, in which China figured prominently.

All in all, *The Observable Mundane* is a much-needed investigation into a crucial moment in the translation history of Japan, making it available to Western theorists of translation. Pastreich has documented the seismic shift from *kundoku*—a "translation" method used for centuries to make classical Chinese readable by rendering it into Japanese pronunciations and making explicit the syntactical and grammatical structures—to translation in the modern, Western sense, involving meaning transfer from one language to another. It must be noted that in the so-called "Chinese character sphere," translation has had, for centuries, an eccentric character. The gap between translation and non-translation was vague and indeterminate. The vernacular narratives that form the object of Pastreich's study were not always read in translation; they were also read in the original language (through reprints), with assistance provided by interlinear *kaeriten* and *furigana*, which aided comprehension. Viewed textually, the original exists alongside the "translation" (*kundoku* annotation). Considering that such a practice has lasted till the present, and wielded by contemporary Japanese Sinologists in particular, might it not be considered an alternative but unique form of translation? And isn't it the ideal translation that Walter Benjamin has envisaged, an extremely literalist rendition which gives the translator little room for interpreting freely, but offers great laxity to the readers, each of whom is allowed to interpret in his/her own way? This may point the way to resolving the debate on the nature of *kundoku* translations.

Although much research on the subject by Japanese scholars (like Nakamura Yukihiko) has appeared in print, practically nothing substantial has been published in English, while in Chinese scholarship the field is relatively unploughed, except for limited contributions from Wang Xiaoping and others. Most importantly, in engaging so extensively with the critical issues on the Early Modern Japanese translation scene, Pastreich's monograph challenges translation scholars trained in Western theories to rethink what translation is all about. Unfortunately, however, it is marred by quite a few textual errors, with book titles and Chinese and Japanese terms often un-italicized, words left carelessly in the wrong places, random oversights, and so on. These are, of course, more the fault of the editors and do not detract from the book's many merits.

About the Author

Leo Tak-hung Chan is Professor and Head of the Department of Translation, Lingnan University, and President of the Hong Kong Translation Society.

稿約凡例

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

一、稿件格式

1. 請以電郵傳送來稿之電腦檔案。
2. 來稿請附200-300字英文論文摘要一則，並請注明：（1）作者姓名；（2）任職機構；（3）通訊地址／電話／傳真／電子郵件地址。
3. 來稿均交學者審評，作者應盡量避免在正文、注釋、頁眉等處提及個人身份，鳴謝等資料亦宜於刊登時方附上。
4. 來稿每篇以不少於八千字（約16頁）為宜。

二、標點符號

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

三、子　目

各段落之大小標題，請依各級子目標明，次序如下：

一、／A.／1.／a.／(1)／(a)

四、專有名詞及引文

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

一段原引文為整段引錄，首行需入四格。

五、注　釋

1. 請用尾注。凡屬出版資料者，請移放文末參考資料部份。號碼一律用阿拉伯數目字，並用( )號括上；正文中之注釋號置於標點符號之後。

2. 參考資料
文末所附之參考資料應包括：(1)作者／編者／譯者；(2)書名、文章題目；(3)出版地；(4)出版社；(5)卷期／出版年月；(6)頁碼等資料，務求詳盡。正文中用括號直接列出作者、年份及頁碼，不另作注。

六、版　權

來稿刊登後，版權歸出版者所有，任何轉載，均須出版者同意。

七、贈閱本

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

八、評　審

來稿經本學報編輯委員會審閱後，再以匿名方式送交專家評審，方決定是否採用。

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

Guidelines for Contributors

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. All contributions will be first reviewed by the Editorial Board members and then anonymously by referees for its suitability for publication in *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves. Submissions written in a language which is not the author's mother-tongue should perferably be checked by native speaker before submission.

8. Electronic files of contributions should be submitted to Professor Leo Tak-hung Chan, c/o Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong. Email address: chanleo@LN.edu.hk

9. Given the accessibility, from summer 2009, of the journal via the EBSCO database, authors will no longer receive complimentary copies unless special requests are made to the Chief Editor.

《翻譯季刊》徵求訂戶啓事

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

中文大學出版社

地　址：香港　新界　沙田
香港中文大學
中文大學出版社

電　話：+852 2946 5300

傳　真：+852 2603 7355／+852 2603 6692

電　郵：cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk

網　址：www.chineseupress.com

Subscribing to *Translation Quarterly*

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

The Chinese University Press

Address:	The Chinese University Press The Chinese University of Hong Kong Sha Tin, New Territories, Hong Kong
Tel:	+852 2946 5300
Fax:	+852 2630 7355 / +852 2603 6692
Email:	cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk
Website:	www.chineseupress.com

Translation Quarterly 翻譯季刊

Subscription Information

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

- **Orders and requests for information should be directed to:**
  The Chinese University Press
  The Chinese University of Hong Kong
  Sha Tin, New Territories, Hong Kong
  Tel: +852 2946 5300
  Fax: +852 2603 7355
  E-mail: cup-bus@cuhk.edu.hk
  Web-site: www.chineseupress.com

TO: The Chinese University Press **Fax: +852 2603 7355** **Order Form**

Please enter my subscription to
Translation Quarterly, beginning with *No.67 to 70(2013).*

Subscription and order	**Rates**
1 year	☐ HK$624 / US$80
2 years*	☐ HK$1,123 / US$144
3 years**	☐ HK$1,498 / US$192
Back issues (No.1 – No.66)	☐ HK$180 / US$23 each (Please list issue no. _______ , total _______ issues.)

Please circle your choice.
Prices are at discount rate, delivery charge by surface post included.
* 10% discount.
** 20% discount.

☐ Attached is a check in HK$ / US$* ________________________ made payable to "**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**". (*circle where appropriate)

☐ Please debit my credit card account HK$____________________ . (Please convert at US$1 = HK$7.8)

I would like to pay my order(s) by: ☐ AMEX ☐ VISA ☐ MASTER CARD

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

Expiry Date: ________________________________

Cardholder's Name: ________________________________

Cardholder's Signature: ________________________________

Please send my journal to:

Name: ________________________________

Address: ________________________________

Telephone: ______________ Fax: ______________ E-mail: ______________

Ref: 20130316

中文大學出版社
THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY PRESS
www.chineseupress.com
HONG KONG, CHINA

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