

In the next issue:

Guest Editor: Fan Wenmei

范文美

Articles

On the Art of Translation

Goran Malmqvist

小說翻譯略論

范文美

從政治的需求到文學的追求——略論 20 世紀中國

文化語境中的小說翻譯

謝天振 查明建

Reaffirming "Chineseness" in the Translations of
Asian American Literature: Maxine Hong Kingston's
Fictions in Taiwan and Mainland China

Kwai-cheung Lo

On the Translation of Eileen Chang's Fiction

Hoyan Hang Fung

譯《尤利西斯》札記六則（第 14 章部份）

劉象愚

混雜的狂城·變幻的亂馬——試論《紅玫瑰與雜種馬》

英譯困難與策略

楊昱昇

美國小說中譯輯錄(1980-1999)

查明建

Translation Quarterly

Nos. 16 & 17 2000

Special Issue

Translation and Ideology

香港翻譯學會出版

翻譯季刊

二〇〇〇年
第十六、十七期
翻譯與意識形態
專號

ISSN 10278559



9 771027 855003

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

Translation Quarterly

Nos. 16 & 17 October 2000

Social Issue

on Translation and Ideology

香港翻譯學會出版

Published by
The Hong Kong Translation Society

翻譯季刊

二〇〇〇年十月
第十六、十七期
翻譯與意識形態
專號

《翻譯季刊》

Translation Quarterly

二〇〇〇年十月 第十六、十七期 Nos. 16 & 17, October 2000

版權所有，未經許可，不得轉載。 All Rights Reserved

Copyright ©2000 THE HONG KONG TRANSLATION SOCIETY

ISSN 1027-8559

Printed by WORLD FAIR DESIGN LTD. 緯輝設計有限公司承印

翻譯季刊

Translation Quarterly

香港翻譯學會

The Hong Kong Translation Society

編輯委員會 **Editorial Board**

劉靖之 (主席) Liu Ching-chih (Chairman)

黎翠珍 Jane Lai 吳兆朋 E. S-P. Almberg

陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan 羅志雄 Lo Chi-hong

金聖華 Serena Jin 孫藝風 Sun Yifeng

黃國彬 Laurence Wong

主編 **Chief Editor**

劉靖之 Liu Ching-chih

執行編輯 **Editors-in-Charge**

陳德鴻 Leo Tak-hung Chan

孫藝風 Sun Yifeng

本期特約編輯 **Guest Editor of This Issue**

張南峰 Chang Nam-fung

顧問委員會 **Advisory Board** (按音序 in alphabetical order)

鄭仰平 Cheng Yang-ping 羅新璋 Lo Xinzhang

高克毅 George Kao 馬悅然 Göran Malmqvist

何丙郁 Ho Ping-yuk 紐馬克 Peter Newmark

葛浩文 Howard Goldblatt 奈達 Eugene Nida

賴恬昌 Lai Tim-cheong 王健 Jan W. Walls

劉紹銘 Joseph S. M. Lau 楊憲益 Yang Xianyi

林太乙 Lin Tai-yi 余國藩 Anthony Yu

林文月 Lin Wen-yueh 余光中 Yu Kwang-chung

目錄 CONTENTS

vii	Introduction: Ideology, Translation and Translation Theory	<i>CHANG Nam-fung</i>
論文 Articles		
1	西方傳教士與中國近代之 外國文學翻譯	劉樹森
24	文學翻譯中的刪改	王曉元
40	Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts	<i>Nitsa BEN-ARI</i>
53	Subversion, Sex and the State: The Censorship of Translations in Modern Japan	<i>Judy WAKABAYASHI</i>
79	A Cry for Identity: A Case Study of Maori-English Cultural Translation	<i>Akiko UCHIYAMA</i>
92	Cultures Translated and Appropriated: Rethinking Ethnicity, Nationscape and Cultural Identity	<i>MAO Sihui</i>
108	翻譯理論對譯者有用嗎?	羅倫斯·文努提著 區劍龍譯
122	用多元系統理論研究翻譯的 意識形態的局限	莊柔玉

書評 Book Review

137	Re-reading Yang Mu in Translation	<i>Göran MALMQVIST</i>
140	論文摘要 Abstracts	
147	作者簡介 Notes on Contributors	
151	稿約凡例 Guidelines for Contributors	
155	First Call for Papers	
159	訂閱表格 Subscription Order Form	

Introduction: Ideology, Translation and Translation Theory

CHANG Nam-fung

In a Chinese translation of “A Gathering of Bald Men”, a short story by a South African writer, Mandla Langa, who served the African National Congress for fifteen years (1980-94) as an editor, speech-writer, and Cultural Attaché to the United Kingdom and Ireland, the following passage is deleted in the published version although it is there in the translator’s manuscript:

(As he drove along Empire Road, he cast around in his mind for famous men who were bald. There was Winston Churchill: *It will be long, it will be hard, and there will be no withdrawal*. That was a classic piece, and Churchill was regarded as a sex symbol. Gandhi? Well, Gandhi was famous for other things, his glasses and the dhoti, he couldn’t go that far; nor could he imagine South Africans following a leader who wore nappies. [...]) Was Hitler bald, or did he wear a hairpiece? [...] If President Mandela were bald, maybe that would even the equation, lots of men like Caleb would walk with their heads held high. That De Klerk was no longer the top dog merely made matters worse. It made his baldness seem like a weakness. (Langa 1996: 122; translation: Langa 1997: 129)

希特勒也是禿頭？他戴假髮？[...] 假如曼德拉總統是禿頭的話，也許能使事情保持一種平衡，許多和凱萊布一樣的男子走起路來或許會昂首挺胸。德克勒克不再是總統了，這使事情變得更加糟糕。這使凱萊布的禿頭似乎變成了一種缺陷。(manuscript: 9-10)

It seems safe to assume that the censorship is done for political reasons. As Mandela is a national leader who is regarded as a comrade in the fight against imperialism, he is not to be joked about, not even in a manner that is likely to be considered good-humoured in the source culture, and that Mandela himself would hardly mind. This is probably for fear of setting an undesirable example in the target culture where, as Hu Fanzhu observes, the Confucian code of conduct forbids laughing at the sovereign, and at one's parents, superiors, teachers and seniors (1987: 32). And Hitler, a "negative figure", is not to be mentioned in the same breath with Churchill and Gandhi, who are "positive figures", according to the "revolutionary" literary tradition of China.

Three other passages have been deleted in the published version probably out of ideological considerations, without telling the reader. These passages are:

Millions of rand were being squandered in buying military toys of destruction, in a country that claimed to have no external enemies; (123; translation: 131) 在這個自稱沒有外來敵人的國家裡，數百萬蘭特被用於購買具有毀滅性的軍事武器。(manuscript: 19)

Nothando remembered a story she had heard from one friend who was a returned exile. The secretarial staff at the ANC headquarters in Lusaka was sent on a course where people learnt, among other things, telephone manners. The then-President Oliver Tambo called his office. "ANC headquarters," a smooth voice said, "Dudu speaking, good morning, can I help you?" Tambo had to ask twice whether this was the ANC office, possibly wondering if his organisation hadn't been taken over by the Swedish Embassy, before he was convinced that he was phoning the right place. (126; translation: 133)

諾桑多想起了一個流放歸來的朋友給她講過的一個故事。盧薩卡非洲人國民大會總部秘書處的工作人員被送去培訓。除了其他內容外，他們還學會了接電話的舉止態度。當時的總統奧利弗·坦博打電話到他辦公

室。“這裡是非洲人國民大會總部，”一個悅耳的聲音答道，“我是杜都，早上好，能為您效勞嗎？”坦博也許不知道他的組織是否沒有被瑞典大使館接管，因此他不得不問了兩遍接電話的是不是非洲人國民大會總部，然後才確信他沒有打錯地方。(manuscript: 34-35)

In her line of work, she was duty bound to counsel the staffers on the hazards of casual sex. Even though she had been thoroughly grounded in the workings of the dread disease [AIDS], and how it could be contracted, she couldn't quite see herself telling a man to wear a condom. She had once tried one on herself and quickly discarded it. It had felt as if she were walking with a Checker's rusty carrier bag between her legs. So, no extra-marital *fickie-fickie*, as one of TransStar's more brazen Arabic customers would say. (126; translation 134) 她在工作中有責任告誡工作人員淫亂的危險性。儘管她完全了解這種可怕疾病的發病原因及傳染過程，她還是無法想像自己會叫男人戴上避孕套。她曾經試着戴過一個，但很快就摒棄了。戴上那玩意後走路的感覺就像是兩腿間夾着一個切克商店的購物袋，窸窣作響。因此，正如星際運輸公司一位更加厚顏無恥的阿拉伯客戶所說的那樣，不要搞婚外交。(manuscript 36)

All these passages are apparently deemed problematic in terms of either politics or ethics, although the first two do not seem to be very offensive even to the South African Government. It is also worth noting that the translator has already "sanitized" the last passage to a certain degree by rendering 'casual sex' into '淫亂' (promiscuity) and 'more brazen' into '更加厚顏無恥' (even more impudent and shameless), thus superimposing a tone of moral indignation on the narration, but the censor still finds the passage unacceptable in spite of the fact that it is much less "spicy" than some indigenous original works.

In mainland China today, politically incorrect sentiments, especially those regarded as "anti-communist" or "anti-China", are still a highly sensitive or even forbidden zone in literary works, whether translated or original,

and explicit sex is another. In fact, censorship on such ideological grounds has always been and still is a common phenomenon in the People's Republic. It provides ample proof that translation is "a rewriting of an original", and that "rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power" (Bassnett and Lefevere 1992: vii), although traditional translation theory chooses to ignore it and keeps harping on the string of faithfulness.

The issue of manipulation in literary translation is taken up in four articles in this collection. Liu Shusen probes into the earliest phase of Chinese literary translation from the West, starting from the early seventeenth century, an area still unexplored by academia. Done by Western missionaries, the translations aimed at converting people into Christians, targeting mainly the intelligentsia. This skopos determined the ways texts were selected, interpreted, translated and presented. Since Confucianism was the dominant ideology, which was antipathetic to Christianity, these missionary translators favoured the fable, a genre traditionally looked down upon by the literati, although some works with a stronger religious flavour were also selected. Prefaces and footnotes were generously supplied to ensure "correct" reading: *Aesop's Fables* was said to point to the Confucian path of "cultivating one's person, regulating one's family, governing the state rightly, and making the whole kingdom tranquil and happy",² and John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* was packaged as fact rather than fiction. Source texts were handled rather freely: Alexander Pope, the author of *An Essay on Man*, was made to say that he composed the poem to enlighten rather than to entertain; and in a Chinese translation of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward, 2000-1887*, the hero told Edith, "I have sworn to Heaven that from now on I will change my heart completely and put myself at the service of the people", and Edith put his heart at ease with these words: "As our Lord is the most merciful, He will forgive you now that you have repented your sins."³ These missionary translators were successful in that they played a part in the formation of a reformist ideology, and that their concept and strategies of translation were accepted and became the vogue

later.

Wang Xiaoyuan discusses what he sees as the three major causes of omissions and alterations in literary translations: ideology, reading habits and literary traditions, all originating from the receiving culture. Most of the translations cited were produced at the turn of the twentieth century, from which one can see how the missionary translators' heritage as mentioned in Liu's article was carried on well into the first half of the last century: quite a number of these works have been changed beyond recognition, and "translation" was just a name to cover their new identity; Yan Fu, when translating Thomas Henry Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*, used a method that Wang Kefei, a Yan Fu expert, likens to "borrowing a hen to lay [his] eggs". Echoing Wang Kefei, Wang Xiaoyuan opines that while "under normal circumstances the translator cannot, should not and has no right to make omissions or alterations in the translation process", Yan was translating in a special socio-cultural context for a special purpose.

This brings out a series of interesting questions: where should we draw the line between what is normal and what is special? If Yan's socio-cultural context was special, what is a normal socio-cultural context? Is there not a tendency for people to regard their immediate socio-cultural context as normal, and those remote to them in space or time as special, because they, including academic researchers, do not observe from nowhere in particular but necessarily do so from a certain space time (cf. Hermans 1999: 36)? And is it really that special for translators, or anyone involved in the translation process, for that matter, to make deliberate changes in the text for any reasons?

Wang also reports a contemporary case of manipulation: a Chinese translation of John Fowles' *French Lieutenant's Woman* published in 1985. The "Editor's Afterword" states: "Out of consideration for length and impact, we have, with the consent of the translator, slightly abridged some paragraphs that are either wordy or incompatible with

the customs of our country.” Such manoeuvres are of course dictated by poetics and ideology, in Lefevere’s terms (1992). Wang observes that the first kind of abridgement has resulted in loss of the post-modernity of the work, and he attributes such abridgement to the influence of the old literary tradition on the producer in spite of the fact that post-modernism is in fashion in indigenous works.

In order to see how special or normal a socio-cultural context is, we need to compare it with as many others as possible. We are very fortunate, therefore, to have half of the contributions in this issue coming from non-Chinese cultures. Nitsa Ben-Ari studies the ideological manipulation of literary texts translated into Hebrew in different contexts. The phrase “manipulation of literary texts” seems to have a double meaning here: the texts are manipulated in the first place, and then these texts become tools for ideological manipulation of the reader. She concludes that the point of her findings is “in the realization that translation is a powerful tool, which can and has been used for ideological manipulation”.

Ben-Ari identifies four main factors involved in manipulation in translation: the agent, the method, the target public and the message. With regard to the first factor, she finds that “generally speaking, [...] the one to be held directly responsible for the manipulation is the translator”. The case in contemporary China seems to be different. We have seen that the abridgements in the Chinese translation of *French Lieutenant’s Woman* were done by the editor. According to my sources, the same happened to the translation of *A Gathering of Bald Men*.

Editors in mainland China usually assume the duty of revising translated texts on poetological and ideological grounds, sometimes without checking the originals, and sometimes without the prior consent or even knowledge of the translator, depending on the power relations between the two parties. That the translator has no right to make omissions or alterations can therefore be understood quite literally: the norm applies only to the

translator, but not to the editor, who, acting on behalf of the publisher, mediates between the translator and the patron. The problem -- or the beauty of it, depending on your institutional position -- is that faithfulness is also the expectancy norm of the reader, who is not always able to identify such manipulation as Ben-Ari points out. An important lesson to be learnt is that, however well-meant it may be, a translation theory that prioritizes faithfulness while turning a blind eye to the phenomenon of censorship is complicitous with the patron in creating the illusion of accuracy in translations, for the effective manipulation of the reader.

In contrast to the system of self-censorship in the People’s Republic of China, both the pre- and post-publication types of censorship have been imposed in modern Japan, where some translated works have been banned and their translators and publishers prosecuted. From Judy Wakabayashi’s article one can see how censorship is “often a reaction to crisis or social change”, and how changeable standards can be. During the Occupation even translations of works by American writers were prohibited while their originals would not have met the same fate in America, and the ban on criticism of the Soviet Union was lifted as the Cold War developed. A possible cause of censorship is, as Ben-Ari puts it, “a perceived weakness in the regime or the culture”.

Wakabayashi notices that women translators “are often complicit in the censorship of works that present an ‘unacceptable’ view of women and their sexuality”, thus taking a more conservative position than women writers. But she refrains from drawing the conclusion that “there are different standards of acceptability for foreign and domestic works on this topic” because the sample may be too small to be representative.

Akiko Uchiyama examines a collection of short stories by Maori writer Patricia Grace as “cultural translation”. She finds that Maori words and word order (including a whole song) are interspersed throughout the texts, creating the impression of a translation from Maori into English, and con-

cludes that such a strategy indicates a way to assert a minority culture in a dominant culture. This is similar to the foreignization approach that Lawrence Venuti has been calling for.

An interesting point is that while Grace has a mixed reception, a translator would have hardly dared to foreignize the translated text to such an extent, and such a translation would have most likely been condemned as a poor one. After Wang and Wakabayashi, Uchiyama presents another case which proves that there may indeed be different standards of acceptability for translated and indigenous original works.

Another lesson to be drawn from the writing of Grace is that foreignization may not be the only way to express and assert a minority culture: as she became a more confident and established writer, she tended to use less Maori elements over the years, shifting “from overt demonstration to more subtle means of expressing herself as a Maori”.

Going even further beyond the translation of texts, Mao Sihui explores the realm of cultural translation proper. His object of study is the Shenzhen Cultural Village, which seems to me to have rich implications for translation studies. Take for example the “China Folk Culture Villages”, which is a part of the complex. The cultures, customs and practices of some of the ethnic minorities in China are “faithfully” reproduced in scenic and exotic surroundings, and, to ensure “authenticity”, artists and workers have been recruited from these nationalities for performances and services. However, only a few highly selected aspects of these minority groups are displayed in the protected environment of the Villages, which is made to symbolise a ‘privileged’ rather than ‘marginalized’ position. In consequence, “ethnic differences are made to disappear into surfaces”, and the visitor is enabled to forget “the racial, political, social, cultural, economic and psychological conflicts between them and the Han people”, and, one may add, the history of suffering caused by these conflicts. The translation strategy is apparently “faithful”, but the product is “the absolute fake”, used not to assert minority cultures in the dominant culture, but to maintain the illusion of national

unity and to confirm the superiority of the Han. This proves once more that translations, be they “cultural” or linguistic,

are never produced in an airlock where they, and their originals, can be checked against the *tertium comparationis* in the purest possible lexical chamber, untainted by power, time, or even the vagaries of culture. (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 7)

Given the overdetermination of translation, what should be the roles of translation theory, and what kinds of theory can best fill these roles? Venuti holds that “the most important role is to critique the ideologies in translation, the values, beliefs and representations that inform every cultural practice and ultimately serve the interests of some social groups over others”, and by this standard he assesses the value of various theories to (beginning) translators. He finds linguistic theories of translation, functionalist theories and Polysystem theory all inadequate in some ways. While “translation decisions are also made on the basis of textual effects, cultural values, and social functions, not simply equivalence”, “linguistics-informed textual analysis will stop short of the cultural and social factors that shape decisions, and that therefore can powerfully explain them”. “Sociolinguistics will go some way toward recovering these factors, but in the absence of cultural and social theories it will not go very far.” The theory of “translatorial action” and the Skopos theory promote hardly “anything more than good business practices”, informed as they are “by an ideology of commercialism that ultimately limits the translator’s ethical reflection”, whereas translators must decide “whether, for instance, they want to translate for an institution that exploits and endangers the welfare of its workers, causes environmental threats, collaborates with oppressive governments”. Polysystem theorists, taking the target orientation, have developed cultural and historical explanations. Nevertheless, concerning themselves mainly with the

search for probabilistic laws of translation, their theories “invite the beginning translator to see a law as a pat answer to questions of strategy and effect, a ready way to choose a foreign text or even to decide to translate”. Moreover, these “formalist-inspired theorists” do not have “principles of historiography and sociology”, which are required for the formulation of laws that “apply to cultural patterns and social relations”.

Taking a morally committed position, Venuti is of the view that Antoine Berman’s theory represents “the most sophisticated developments of the target orientation” by joining it with “a concern for the impact of the translation process on the foreign text”. With an underlying belief that the main objective of translation is “to receive the Foreign as Foreign,” Berman’s interest lies in “establishing an ethical relation to the foreign text and culture in the translated text”. His theory exemplifies the importance of not only linguistic, but also cultural and historical knowledge, because a translator without a historical consciousness will remain “a prisoner to his representation of translation and to those representations that convey the ‘social discourses’ of the moment”. Berman’s approach, Venuti concludes, “permits the translator to evaluate his or her own translation practices and expand the range of available discursive strategies”, and “will lead to a critique of the ideologies in translation theories, revealing how even a seemingly innocent approach like text linguistics might privilege a particular social or political value [...] by limiting the analysis of translations to language”.

While Venuti is concerned with the kind of theories that can be of use to translators, Chong Yau-yuk examines the advantages and limitations of Polysystem theory as a framework for researchers who wish to describe and explain (rather than critique) ideology in translation. She observes that the framework enables the inclusion for analysis of various factors that directly or indirectly shape ideology in translation, extending the objects of translation studies from individual works to the whole socio-cultural system as the

ultimate shaping force. Polysystemic study of translation therefore offers the prospects of not only a comprehensive and objective description and explanation of translational phenomena, but even a revelation of the ideologies of the cultural community by the kinds of translations that it has produced.

At the same time, synthesizing and elaborating on the criticisms made by Edwin Gentzler, Lawrence Venuti, Theo Hermans and so on, Chong finds severe limitations in Even-Zohar’s theory as a guide for such research. First, there are contradictions in the theory itself. The tendency to overgeneralize and establish universal laws in the study of ever-changing, open systems constitutes an attempt to absolutize diachronic phenomena with synchronic patterns. Judgements are unavoidable and absolute objectivity is impossible in the humanities because interpretation will be laden with the values of its cultural situation, and the insistence on value-free translation studies prevents the discipline from being self-critical and shuts its eyes to the radical changes in cultural studies. Secondly, there are difficulties in the application of the theory, which has not provided enough guidance. The interrelations of co-systems in a polysystem of culture are so complicated that the very selection of some as relevant for a research project and the exclusion of others from it may already reflect the values of the researcher. The lack of tools for the analysis of extra-textual factors such as actual power relations and concrete social entities has made the theory abstract, depersonalized and ultimately deterministic. And the interdisciplinarity of the Polysystem approach may entail an incompatibility with the sometimes conflicting methodologies, goals and demands of those individual disciplines involved.

Chong also quotes José Lambert’s remarks on some practical problems in polysystemic research that are not caused by any fault in the theory itself. Of particular relevance to our present discussion is the observation that “research focusing on norms and power without trying to support them

will always be perceived as a threat". This is more so in a culture where the political and the ideological polysystems are particularly dominating, one may add. So it is understandable that scholars in mainland China who have studied ideology in translation and yet find it hard "to use research as a way of celebrating heroes, stars and morality" (Lambert 1995: 135) tend to avoid focusing on sensitive contemporary issues, Mao's article being an exception. And this is why I have felt it appropriate to include a case study in this introductory article.

Another practical problem may be added to Chong's list, which is the usually uncooperative attitude of translators, editors and publishers when approached for information about the translation process (see Bassnett 1998: 115), especially if ideology and/or politics have played an important part. As researchers seldom know very much about "how many different persons were actually involved in the establishment of a translation", and "whether the same attitudes were shared by all [...] or whether a (direct or indirect) normative negotiation, maybe so much as a struggle took place, and if so -- whose norms had the upper hand and on what grounds", "the common practice has been to collapse all of them into one persona and have that conjoined entity regarded as 'the translator' (Toury 1995: 183-184). While conceding that this problem is "relatively inconsequential" "as long as comparisons are only executed for *descriptive* purposes", Gideon Toury argues that "once *explanations* are sought, especially in terms of decisions and what may have governed them", "this kind of information becomes very helpful" (Ibid.).

Returning to the limitations of Polysystem theory, it seems to me that although the criticisms of Venuti and Chong are largely valid, they do not point to any fatal deficiency in the polysystem concept itself.⁴ Take for example Even-Zohar's quest for laws. If Chong is concerned about absolutism, then Toury has made it clear that he is after probabilistic laws that should ultimately take the form that:

If X_1 and Z_1 , then the likelihood that Y is greater than if X_1 and Z_2 , and even greater than if X_1 and Z_3 . (1995: 266)

And one cannot deny the explanatory power of some of the laws that they have formulated with regard to certain known translational phenomena. Let us look at the following two:

The more peripheral this status [of translation], the more translation will accommodate itself to established models and repertoires. (Toury 1995: 271)

Translation tends to assume a *peripheral* position in the target system, generally employing secondary models and serving as a major factor of conservatism. (Toury 1995: 272)⁵

It seems that these laws, while they may not be universal or eternal, can explain the conservative behaviour of the publisher of the Chinese translation of *French Lieutenant's Woman* reported by Wang, and that of the women translators reported by Wakabayashi. If not for the empirical and theoretical work of Even-Zohar and Toury, one may still find such behaviour perplexing or see it as the exception rather than the rule.

Meanwhile, the writing of Patricia Grace may be regarded as proof of the reverse of the second law: (more or less) central positions tend to be occupied by certain types of original literature that generally employ primary models and serve as a major factor of innovation.

Anyway, the quest for laws is not an integral part of the Polysystem approach. If one does not like this part, one may simply discard it without dismissing the whole thing, as Hermans observes:

No one else in the descriptive camp has followed Toury in the quest. For them the aim remains that of gaining insight into the theoretical intricacies and the historical relevance and impact of translation. (1999: 36)

Another controversial aspect of the Polysystem approach is its descriptivism, as serious doubts have been cast on the possibility of absolute detachment and objectivity or of pure description in the human sciences. There are three dimensions in this problem. One is that, as Venuti remarks, the very act of engaging oneself in translation studies signifies opposition to its marginal position (1995: 312-313), and the argument for a particular approach constitutes an attempt to “control the behaviour of translation scholars” (1998: 28). That is to say, the description of the struggle in a certain polysystem - that of translation in our case - is involved in the struggle in another polysystem - that of academia. There is of course no escape from this dilemma. The only thing the descriptive scholar can do is to leave it to someone else to be descriptive about the struggle in the academic polysystem.

Another dimension is that description, even if it can be (more or less) detached, objective or neutral, alters the perception or the status of the things described (cf. Hermans 1999: 150). It may expose certain aspects of a system that the system wishes to hide (such as the censorship reported above in the case study), playing the role of the *enfant terrible*. While traditional, pro-establishment approaches take central systems such as canonized literature, standard language and orthodox ideology as the only legitimate objects of academic research in order to protect their interests, the descriptive Polysystem approach regards the integration into research of objects previously unnoticed or bluntly rejected as a precondition for an adequate understanding of any polysystem (see Even-Zohar 1990a: 13). This means that it refuses to take for granted the assumed inherent superiority of central systems, and sees the standards they uphold as norms rather than as the only truth, thus demythicizing its very centrality. And the mere recognition of the existence of a peripheral system (such as a set of translation strategies that will produce what are called “bad translations” or “non-translations” by mainstream critics) may contribute to its legitimation. On the other hand, acknowledging the dominant position of central norms may be construed as

endorsement. In other words, the act of “detached” description of the struggle between rival systems may be involuntarily involved in that struggle.

The third dimension is that absolute objectivity in observation is impossible as Venuti (1998: 28-29) and Hermans (1999: 36, 146-150) point out, because one always has a cultural context or an institutional position.

However, the question remains whether one should still try one’s best to be objective and descriptive vis-à-vis one’s object of study. This is what divides the descriptive approach and the morally/politically committed approaches, but, as I see it, there is more common ground between the Polysystem approach (or some newer versions of it) and committed approaches than have been recognized. Both take a cultural perspective in that they see translation as a cultural phenomenon more than a purely linguistic one, and that they put emphasis on the “external politics” of translation, exploring the relation between translation and socio-cultural factors such as ideology, power, economics, etc.⁶ Their descriptions and explanations may be different, but their projects will both have the effect of upsetting the existing power relations. While Polysystem theory “involves a rejection of value judgments as criteria for an *a priori* selection of the objects of study” (Even-Zohar 1990a: 13) - in disregard of the interests of central systems, the committed approaches tend to bring the study of peripheral systems into the lime-light (cf. Hermans 1999: 155).

Moreover, there is no necessary relation between the polysystem concept and descriptivism. It is only accidental, at least for some theorists, that the two happen to go together (see Hermans 1999: 41). And the polysystem concept is not inherently incompatible with the committed approach. On the contrary, they can be complementary and mutually enriching. Postcolonial, cultural-materialist and gender-based approaches to translation may not only provide new perspectives and theoretical input (or, in Venuti’s terms, “principles of historiography and sociology”) for polysystem studies, but also enable Polysystem theory to be “more self-reflexive and

self-critical, aware of its own historicity and institutional position, of its presuppositions and blind spots, of the pitfalls of representation by means of language and translation” (Hermans 1999: 149-150). Thus enriched and improved, Polysystem theory in turn may provide a more comprehensive and substantial framework for the study of translation, enabling researchers, whether they are politically/morally detached or committed, to take a step back and enjoy a panoramic view.

It is a sincere hope of mine and, I trust, of all the contributors’, that this special issue may contribute in a small way to the globalization and the cultural turn of translation studies by bringing into our view translational phenomena of various cultures, by presenting to us some common features shared by linguistic translation and other forms of cultural transfer, and by the interaction between theory and practice (by which I mean the practice of research as well as translating).

Acknowledgement

This research has benefited from financial and logistical support from the Research Committee and Arts Programme of Lingnan University, Hong Kong.

Notes

- ¹ All translations and back-translations from Chinese are mine, unless indicated otherwise.
- ² Translation adapted from James Legge 1960: 7.
- ³ Compare the source text provided in Note 26 of Liu’s article.
- ⁴ Actually, these criticisms can be used to improve on the theory. More discussion below.

- ⁵ Cf. Even-Zohar 1990b: 48-49: “While the contemporary original literature might go on developing new norms and models, translated literature adheres to norms which have been rejected [...] by the (newly) established center.”
- ⁶ It is for this reason that Susan Bassnett finds a “curious mixture of formalist and Marxist methods” in the Polysystem approach, which she regards as its “beauty” (1998: 106).

References

- Bassnett, Susan. 1998. “Researching Translation Studies: The Case for Doctoral Research”. Peter Bush and Kirsten Malmkjar (eds). *Rimbaud’s Rainbow: Literary Translation in Higher Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 105-118.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1992. “General Editors’ Preface”. André Lefevere. *Translation, Rewriting, & the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge. vii-viii.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990a. “Polysystem Theory”. *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11: 1. 9-26.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990b. “The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem”. *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11: 1. 45-51.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hu Fanzhu (胡範鑄), 1987. *Youmo yuyanxue (Linguistics of Humour)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences Press.
- Lambert, José. 1995. “Translation, Systems and Research: The Contribution of Polysystem Studies to Translation Studies”. *TTR* 8:1, 105-152.
- Langa, Mandla. 1996. “A Gathering of Bald Men”. *World Literature Today* 1. 121-128.
- Langa, Mandla (曼德拉·蘭加) (translated by Wen Wei (聞焯)), 1997.

- “*Tu le ding de nanren*” (Bald Men). *Yilin* (譯林) 4. 127-136.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, & the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André and Susan Bassnett. 1990. “Introduction: Proust’s Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The ‘Cultural Turn’ in Translation Studies”. In Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds). *Translation, History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter (reprinted London and New York: Cassell 1995). 1-13.
- Legge, James (trans.), 1960. *The Four Books*. Taipei: Culture Book Co.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

西方傳教士與中國近代之外國文學翻譯

劉樹森

生發於晚清而隆盛於民初的外國文學中譯，可謂在中國歷史上開風氣之先，對於中國近現代的本土文化轉型乃至於整個社會的變革都產生了重要影響。這一時期的外國文學中譯與西方來華傳教士之間，具有不可割捨的聯繫。傳教士之於外國文學中譯，固然無一人擁有足以與林紓等翻譯大家相匹敵的成就，但是作為在當時社會中擁有特殊地位的一個群體，他們不僅做出了萌動階段的開拓性建樹，而且後來又長期釋放出推波助瀾的勢能。然而後世對此卻似乎始終疏於關注，迄今未見較為系統性的研究。本文擬探討西方傳教士與近代外國文學中譯之間的關係，主要包括梳理傳教士在翻譯理論與實踐兩個方面的建樹，分析其翻譯活動的特徵，兼及它們在特定歷史文化語境中的作用。

西方傳教士涉足外國文學中譯的歷史，實際上可以上溯到17世紀初葉。利瑪竇 (Matthieu Ricci, 1552~1610)、龐迪我 (Jacques de Pantoja, 1571~1618) 與金尼閣 (Nicolas Trigault, 1577~1628) 等三位分別來自意大利、西班牙和法國的傳教士，在各自的著作中順帶譯介了伊索的寓言。1608年，利瑪竇與名士徐光啟搭檔在《畸人十篇》中介紹伊索，並援引了《獅子和狐狸》等數篇寓言。1614年，

龐迪我在其著作《七克》中也徵引了《大鴉和狐狸》等伊索寓言的片斷。1625年，金尼閣與舉人張騫採用正統的文言合譯了伊索的20餘篇寓言，並結集以《況義》為書名出版，由此成為中國翻譯史上迄今所知最早的文學譯作集。

應當說，這三位傳教士是中譯外國寓言的先驅。然而由於所謂程朱理學主流意識形態以及印刷技術等因素的制約，他們譯介的寓言刊行數量很少，即使偶有再版，也因為大多流傳於教徒之間，影響輻射範圍狹小，逐漸為後人淡忘。17世紀之後，來華傳教士雖然人數成倍遞增，但青睞寓言者甚寡，所以譯介外國寓言的文字長期闕如。此後，中譯外國寓言出現了兩百餘年的斷裂帶。

鴉片戰爭之後，西方傳教士再次着手中譯外國文學。他們譯介外國文學的緣由，無一不出於其背負的宗教使命。這一翻譯動機一方面制約着他們選譯作家及其作品，另一方面也基本上左右了他們對於作家與作品的解讀方式。1853年，英國來華的長老會教士賓威廉(William Chalmers Burns, 1815~1868)與一位佚名的“中國士子”合作，採用較為淺顯的文言將17世紀英國小說家約翰·班揚(John Bunyan)的《天路歷程》(*The Pilgrim's Progress*)譯為中文。與利瑪竇、金尼閣與明本土文人合作譯介伊索寓言一樣，賓威廉也是採用中西譯者協力合作的方式，形成了一種獨特的翻譯模式，在清末民初西學東漸的文化背景下具有典型的意義。該譯作的序言陳述了譯者青睞該作品的原因：

《天路歷程》……將《聖經》之理，輯成一書，始終設以譬詞，一理貫串至底。其曲折處，足令人觀之而神悅；其精嚴處，尤足令人讀之而魂驚，且教人如何信真神道，如何賴耶穌功，當如何着力，如何謹慎，是誠天路歷程之捷徑也。¹

這一譯作在問世後的10餘年間，“屢次刷印，各處分送。凡我教同人，或教外朋友，閱此書者，咸謂是書有益於人。”²就目前掌握的資料而言，這一譯作是譯為中文的第一部外國小說，並由此開啟了近代中譯外國文學的帷幕。由上述序言來推測，該譯作大概以單行冊的形式刊行，但迄今未見有關其原始資料的記載，恐已失傳。其譯序則因收入《天路歷程》(官話)而留存於世。

《天路歷程》(官話)為該小說的中文重譯本，也是迄今所見中國翻譯史上外國文學作品的第一部重譯本，1865年作為宗教著作刊行行世，但譯者佚名。譯者重譯該小說的動機，在於賓威廉的初譯本以文言為譯語，因而將本來有限的讀者局限在更為狹小的範圍之內，有違於廣泛傳授“天路歷程之捷徑”的目的。譯者“緣此重按原文，譯為官話，使有志於行天路者，無論士民，咸能通曉……誠以是書為人人當讀之書，是路為人人當由之路。”³譯者及其“自序”均未署名，有待於進一步考證。“自序”在名稱、內容、敘議的視點和行文風格等諸多方面，與“原序”迥然相異，而且重譯本是“重按原文”而翻譯，所以推測此次重譯可能與賓威廉無涉。

初譯無注，誠恐閱者不解，今於白文旁，加增小注，並註明見聖書某卷、幾章、幾節，以便考究。凡閱是書，務於案頭置新、舊約，以備兩相印證。依次而行，則《聖經》之義，自能融洽於胸中。⁴

如“自序”中的上述文字所示，譯者如此詳細地為譯語文本提供輔助性的參考資料以及閱讀方法，似乎並非19世紀60年代中國的宗教人士可為。此外，譯作在內容、敘事特徵和風格等方面頗為忠實於原作，⁵並非粗識英文、略知西方文化者可以勝任。大概這一重譯本仍是由隱匿姓名的中西譯者合譯而成。顯然，上述兩篇

譯序的契合之處，是均將《天路歷程》視為基督徒依據親身經歷撰寫的宗教著作，而並未將其視為虛構性的文學作品。

晚清，西方傳教士翻譯與傳播外國文學作家及其作品，主要依賴他們創辦與出版的各類中文期刊，至清末民初才逐漸開始大規模地借助於書籍的形式。當時，中國大陸、香港、澳門以及新加坡等週邊國家出版的中文報刊，絕大多數由西方傳教士興辦與發行。他們辦刊的動機和宗旨，在西學東漸的大背景下並沒有局限於宗教宣傳的範疇。李提摩太 (Timothy Richard, 1845~1919) 將辦報歸納為七種“養民新法”之一。

……報館，國家固藉之，以壯聲威，以覘嚮背。下至士、工、農、商並各種托業者，皆別類分門，各有日報，不但知本國之事，兼博通萬國之事，於以集思廣益，出人頭地。⁶

在相當長的一段時期內，出版與發行刊物始終是西方傳教士擁有優勢的一種文化傳播途徑。因此，無論是從翻譯數量還是質量來看，西方傳教士對於外國文學的譯介是與中文報刊的發展並駕齊驅，呈現出正相關曲線。稍晚一些時候，中國譯者譯介外國文學的情況，也大體如此。有學者指出，英國傳教士偉列亞力 (Alexander Wylie, 1815~1887) 創辦的短命月刊《六合叢談》(1857~1858) 曾刊文，“對荷馬史詩、希臘幾大悲劇家和亞里士多芬的戲劇作過片斷介紹。”⁷ 筆者未見原始資料，但據此考證，這大概是西方傳教士在中文刊物上紹介與翻譯外國文學的開端。

美國北長老會教士丁韋良 (William Alexander Parsons Martin, 1827~1916) 中文造詣深厚，以中文著有多部宗教書籍，其中尤以《天道溯源》(Evidences of Christianity) 聞名。因此，他與利瑪竇

和賓威廉等傳教士不同，無需中國的文人協助，可以獨自從事英中翻譯。自 1872 年開始，丁韋良在他陸續創辦的《中西聞見錄》和《新學月報》等刊物上譯介外國寓言，成為最早開始較為集中地譯介外國寓言的譯者。在他看來，《伊索寓言》的思想價值與藝術魅力，在於“凡修身、齊家、治國、平天下之道，皆以隱語發明之，言簡意賅……博雅者每引為典故，樸俗者亦借為箴諺，蓋雅俗莫不共賞。”⁸ 《中西聞見錄》1872 年 8 月的創刊號上便刊出他翻譯的《俄人寓言》和《法人寓言》兩則寓言，此後幾乎每一期都刊出一則乃至數則寓言，諸如第 32 號上刊載的《寓言四則》。與此同時，這一刊物也刊載其他西方來華人士譯介的寓言，第 22 號刊載了當時任法國駐華公使館首席翻譯的德微理亞 (Jean Gabriel Deveria, 1844~1899) 自《伊索寓言》中選譯的《柔勝剛寓言》。《新學月報》也是定期刊載丁韋良翻譯的寓言，如第 4 期至第 6 期連續發表了《珠椽寓言》、《防漁寓言》和《牧畜寓言》。丁韋良提供的外國寓言的中文譯本，融譯介與評論為一身，時常以註釋、序跋、或附加評論的方式介紹與寓言內容相關的文化背景知識，闡發事理，為讀者導讀。

值得提及的是，在西方文化語境中，寓言似乎始終處於倍受歧視的邊緣地帶。從柏拉圖到歌德，再延及布萊克和柯爾律治等人，這些在人類思想發展進程中具有持久震撼性影響的人物都公開鄙夷寓言，視其為品位低下的文化產品，尤其厭惡其明顯的說教特徵。然而近代來華傳教士則似乎反其道而行之，看重寓言，並借助於新興的報刊雜誌將其中譯文本在中國讀者中傳播，大概主要還在於傳教士對於寓言本質的認識。作為一種特殊的文學體裁，寓言以文學的敘事性和多元的能指性見長，言此而意彼，意蘊是複義的。對於

寓言潛在的多元寓意，傳教士大多在翻譯過程中通過增刪內容以及綴加評語等手法，將其進行過濾處理，或者說賦予其單一的闡釋，凸現宗教道德的價值觀。另外，在文化素質相差懸殊的中國民眾中傳播基督教，加之中國本土文化傳統對於基督教的拒斥，傳教士意識到有必要啟用某種溫和且具有廣泛適應性的中介文本。在這種背景下，寓言進入了他們的視野。

作為《萬國公報》的主編，林樂知和李提摩太，以及知名傳教士艾約瑟 (Joseph Edkins, 1823~1905) 與慕維廉 (William Muirhead, 1822~1900) 等人，也時常在該刊的“西國近事”等欄目中刊登有關西方文學及作家的報導，包括新近出版的作品以及獲得的各類榮譽等。經由他們介紹的作家，包括英國詩人“忒業生” (Alfred Tennyson)、“皇族”、“德伯”。“蒲老寧” (Robert Browning)，蘇格蘭詩人“哀恩” (Robert Burns)，英國女小說家“華爾得”，古希臘詩人“和美耳” (Homer)，古羅馬詩人“韋而吉利” (Virgil)，還包括古希臘佚名詩人的詩歌。他們譯介的資料均摘引自西方報刊，大多為新聞性質的消息，一般並不詳細論及作品的內容或者藝術特色，但畢竟有益於晚清的讀者了解外國文學作家與作品及其在社會中的存在的意義。下則關於英國詩人“忒業生”的文字，可體現上述基本特徵。

西廷向例，國家必擇一善於吟詠之人養之以祿，蓋道揚盛烈，鼓吹休明，亦不可少之事也。茲有英議院大臣忒業生者，素工詞翰，生平作詩篇甚多，英之詩人舉無駕乎其上。故知英之語言文字者，即知有此人，英廷與之歲俸，亦一著作才也。⁹

直接譯介外國文學作品與作家，是西方傳教士慣常使用的方

式。此外，在自己的中文著述或其它學科的譯著中論及和翻譯西方文學作品，也是西方傳教士經常採用的方式。在這種情況下，一般不提供作家的姓名和作品的名稱。譬如在 1896 年發表的《重哀私議以廣見公論》(五)一文的開篇，林榮章(樂知)便以一句譯詩導引議論。

倫敦《特報》云：西國古詩曰：“除舊不容甘我後，布新未要佔人先。”具有新意。然“除舊”固宜從速，而“布新”則盡學老子之不為人先。蓋謂新事未必可恃，將俟人之先試其利弊，而已則從速而取舍之也。¹⁰

文中並未提及該詩句出自何人之手，也未提及詩篇的名稱。依照西方行文的慣例來推測，林榮章大概刪汰了《特報》中原本提及的英國詩人蒲柏 (Alexander Pope) 的姓名，以為一個陌生的異國詩人的名字對於晚清的讀者無關緊要。上述譯詩源自蒲柏的名詩《人論》(An Essay on Man)，為迄今所見英國詩歌最早的中譯文。¹¹

在涉及西方文學的著述中，西方傳教士往往選取經典中的範例，以西方的審美思想、文學理論及其作品來闡釋或印證他們傳播的宗教意識形態，以促使晚清的讀者相信並接受他們宣傳的思想。慕維廉的《續四週論》一方面論證了上帝至上的信念，另一方面也較為具體地評介古希臘的詩歌，並且使二者相輔相成，有機地結合在一起。

蓋非為異事，為靈魂得其生命。在上帝，此為其本地之氣。上帝為靈魂之四週乃自至苦之時為至深所思者於教中之事。希伯來作詩，深浸以此，高念可見。當我試思，此念不在也，真詩惟為。格致有

他形，聖教早已不能依格致論。其至大道理，有知識之人言於詩篇，即不可更相合。天地之理若近，時之光所管，其默示曰：我一心仰慕上帝，猶鹿渴慕溪水兮。有至美相似於天生及感神者，在其言下哉，如鹿追其四週，人亦然也。如溪水合宜所意，以知足。天生必需者，上帝亦合宜，供給人感神之需也。可見希伯來作詩者，其仰慕上帝，非染病之色，或不循理於所言之人，即循理於彼，以仰慕上帝。如燕求其巢，經其諸像，無疑生我心中。彼言太重，我有彼果讀已至深之意，無偽聲見於其嘆氣，無疲倦在其無止嘆息除外所愛者疲倦為不在之人若欲飛去惟可得安息也。有人無精神，獨奇在此；有人得靈，而小言德，能忌之。希伯來人求上帝，為大福樂哉。¹²

除開譯介文學作品與作家，西方傳教士還將一些西方經典的文藝理論家介紹到中國。1875年4月，艾約瑟發表《亞里斯多德里傳》一文，最早將“亞里斯多德里”(Aristotle)譯介到中國。這篇文章洋洋近四千言，為迄今所見最早專門介紹外國文藝理論家的重要論文。在評述“亞里斯多德里”顯赫生平的基礎之上，艾約瑟着重論述了這位西方文明泰斗的學術建樹，將其著作劃分為“論詳審之理”，“辯駁之理”以及“詩學”等門類，共計10種，並大致描述了它們在西方文明演進過程中的價值與意義。

亞斯學之論既立，凡後學之，因此悟彼，舉一反三，皆不外亞斯學之理。舍此，別無可師者焉……其說清淨，純潔無塵，俗論復有外論諸說。蓋亞博聞多識，筆大才雄，思慮周詳，議論宏遍。是以所論之語，干珠一線，詞句圓融……其所傳之書，系希臘文字，計四十四萬五千二百七十七行，流行甚廣，於亞後千百餘年。¹³

艾約瑟客觀地指出，工業革命以後，“西人務於新學格致之

功，循亞之學者鮮”。但他也注意到：19世紀後半葉，“西人”又開始重新認識“亞里斯多德里”，復而“喜讀之”，“謂其書與性論之學，均大有裨益於人也。”¹⁴西方社會對於“亞里斯多德里”的再認識，正是艾約瑟譯介這位先哲的起因。

大體而言，19世紀50年代至90年代初期，是近代西方傳教士譯介外國文學的第一個階段。就對於文學的認識而言，西方傳教士身處西學東漸的前期歷史語境之中，竭力全盤輸入“西學”，還未能將西方文學從廣義的“西學”中區分出來。實際上，在19世紀下半葉，“文學”至少在東方語境中仍然是一個內涵極為寬泛的概念。按照《文學興國策》的作者森有禮的界定，“文學乃統賅文法學，地理志，史記，算學，格致學，動物學，保身學，地殼學，化學，萬國公法，富國策，心才學，詩賦，古人著作等。”¹⁵“文學”這一概念包容的內涵之廣，幾乎覆蓋了當時人類所有的學問。至於其翻譯動機，西方傳教士要麼視文學作品為純粹的宗教作品，虔誠地將其譯為宗教話語，要麼認為文學作品是從屬於整個西方文明的一個次要部分，通過譯介它們曉示教理或“凡修身、齊家、治國、平天下之道”。¹⁶從譯介的對象來看，它們大多為西方文學作品和作家，另有為數不多的俄國文學作品。總之，西方傳教士首開中譯外國文學的先河，使中國的讀者開始有機會了解和認識外國文學。

二

時至19世紀90年代，西學在中國的傳播已經長達半個多世紀，西方傳教士始終是譯介西學的主體。1892年，李提摩太在追

溯西學東漸的歷史時寫道：

……蓋講西國之事，大半系教士所著，如上海翻譯局、北京同文館所譯之算學、格致、萬國公法、富國策等書，均十有八九系教士所為。又將中國《十三經》及史鑒子書等皆翻譯成西文，亦十有八九系教士所譯也。¹⁷

伴隨着西學在晚清社會的灌輸與滲透，林樂知、李提摩太、艾約瑟、慕維廉等大名鼎鼎的傳教士的著作和譯作相繼出現了盜版，以致他們不得不在各種刊物上刊登啟事，聲明：“凡翻人著作，掠買得資者，視同盜賊之竊奪財產，是以有犯必懲。”¹⁸這一現象或許可以從一個側面說明有關西學的著作與譯作傳播範圍之廣泛，影響之大。此時，西學仍舊是一個籠統的整體概念，自然也包括外國文學譯作以及相關的著述。

19世紀臨近尾聲時，晚清社會在政治、經濟、文化等方面發生了諸多顯見的變化，因此西方傳教士逐漸開始調整譯介西學的策略。李提摩太、林樂知、艾約瑟、慕維廉等代表人物在這一時期的主要論點，大致勾勒出重新擬定的策略。他們對於譯介西學的重新認識，凸顯兩個核心內容。首先，強調譯介西學的宗旨應當定位於造就新人，試圖以此來規劃西學的傳入。上述頗有影響的傳教士頻數撰文，強調譯介西學、改造中國社會需要以人為本，認為中外各國當今所面臨的四件“大事”，不外乎“養民”，“安民”，“新民”，“教民”，而其中的“新民”尤為關鍵，即“去其舊染之污，使之成一新人，而復其初也。此乃教門所宜為之事。”¹⁹但是他們所指涉的“民”，既是泛指普通民眾，又具有特定的含義。他們寄予希望的“民”，是具有相當文化教養的“士”。如果說李提

摩太的《以士保國》一文的中文標題還不足以說明“士”的確切含義，那麼其英文標題“Defence of the Country through Enlightened Scholars”，²⁰則清楚地昭示“士”應當是“經過啟蒙的學者”。不言而喻，“啟蒙”的含義是指心悅誠服地接受西學。西方傳教士對於“民”的內涵的界定，在很大程度上決定了此後他們對於所譯外國文學作品的選擇以及具體翻譯策略的運用。

其次，西方傳教士從理論與實踐兩個方面入手，試圖將作為藝術形式之一的文學從包羅萬象的“西學”中分離出來，同時強調文學在社會變革中具有不可替代的作用。1900年，林樂知的長文《俄國文學考略》（“Russian Education: Language and Literature”），有相當部分的內容介紹俄國的“文學”（literature），對寓言作家“格利老夫”（Ivan Andreyevich Krylov）推崇備至，讚揚他善於“撰喻言以諷世”，並以附加評論的方式翻譯了《狗友篇》、《魚猴魚篇》和《狐鼠篇》等三篇寓言。1895年，傅蘭雅（John Fryer, 1839~1928）在《萬國公報》等刊物刊登告示，個人斥資數百元懸賞，“求著時新小說”。

竊以感動人心，變易風俗，莫如小說推行廣速。傳之不久，輒能家喻戶曉，氣習不難為之一變。今中華積弊最重大者，計有三端：一鴉片，一時文，一纏足，若不設法更改，終非富強之兆。茲欲請華人願本國興盛者，撰著新趣小說，合顯此三事之大害並祛各弊之妙法。立案演說，結構成編，貫穿為部，使人閱之感動，力為革除。辭句以淺明為要，語意以趣雅為宗，雖婦人幼子皆能得而明之。述事務取近今易有，切莫抄襲舊套，立意毋尚希古怪，免使駭目驚心。²¹

傅蘭雅的倡議，與歷來視說部為小道的中國文化傳統背道而

馳，率先在清末強調小說“感動人心，變易風俗”的獨特作用。以發表的時間而論，傅蘭雅的告示，先於幾道、別士的《本館附印說部緣起》(1897)和梁啟超的《譯印政治小說序》(1898)。傅蘭雅雖然並未提及西方的小說及其社會作用，但無論有關“時新小說”的社會功用的觀點，還是對於此類小說創作的籌劃，顯然均以西方的先例為參照。為了幫助清末的民眾了解西方社會文化的結構，李提摩太習慣於統計每年英國出版的書籍的種類和數量。以1892年為例，共計出版各類圖書6254種，其中“小說”、“記傳”、以及“詩賦歌曲類”的著作高達2132種。²²

早在傅蘭雅之前，李提摩太已於1891年嘗試通過譯介西方小說來實現“新民”的願望。是年，他翻譯了19世紀美國小說家畢拉宓(Edward Bellamy)的烏托邦小說《回頭看》(*Looking Backward, 2000-1887*)，因為是節譯本，故稱《回頭看記略》。這部小說以虛構的筆法描寫2000年美國的社會制度發生徹底的變革，社會主義意識形態以及相應的社會制度，取代了原有的資本主義制度，人們無一不安居樂業。小說的原作1888年問世後，旋即風靡美國，隨後又在歐洲各國引起轟動。在小說出版僅3年之後，李提摩太便將這樣一部暢銷書譯介給中國的讀者，促使晚清社會參照書中先例、除舊圖新的迫切願望，由此可見一斑。他為自己的譯作撰寫了一則短篇序言：

美國出現一書《回頭看》，名儒畢拉宓君所著也，所論皆美國百年後變化諸事。西國諸儒因其書多敘養民新法，一如傳體，故喜閱而讀之，業已刊數十萬部行世。今譯是書，不能全敘，聊譯大略於左。²³

李提摩太對於這部暢銷作品的解讀，類似於傅蘭雅對於小說的認識，承認其核心內容為描寫“養民新法”，即展示了社會變革的一種理想模式，而其藝術魅力則在於能夠使人“喜閱而讀之”。至於《回頭看》的體裁，李提摩太將其稱為“一如傳體”，而迴避了小說抑或說部的稱謂，並且將原作的第一人稱敘事視角改為譯作中的第三人稱。這種處理手法與西方傳教士普遍奉行的翻譯策略有關，主要着眼於譯作能夠在讀者中產生預期的影響。按照中國傳統的文化概念，“傳”的內容是真實的，而說部則不然。對此，深諳晚清社會背景的西方傳教士並不陌生。最初，《回頭看記略》未署譯者姓名，自1891年起連載於《萬國公報》，成為譯介到中國的第一部美國小說。譯作的篇幅為八千餘言，相當於原作的二十分之一。

《回頭看記略》刊行後，並沒有在讀者引起譯者期待的反響。1894年，李提摩太將其易名為《百年一覺》，自己也以譯者的身分署名。以單行冊的形式出版發行，首次印刷時的印數就多達2000冊，其中絕大部分贈送各級官吏、翰林及普通知識分子。此後，這部譯作開始對於構建晚清謀求變法的意識形態產生了顯著的影響。²⁴

《百年一覺》所產生的社會影響，促使李提摩太與任延旭合作於1898年將18世紀英國詩人蒲柏的詩作《天倫詩》譯為中文。如果說，李提摩太翻譯《百年一覺》的意圖主要是側重再現作品的內容，因此淡化作品的敘事形式並加以本土化的處理，以免因其體裁而為讀者所怠慢。那麼，他在翻譯《天倫詩》時則不再迴避作品自身的文學藝術價值，一併強調作品內在與外在的價值。

此詩乃英國詩人蒲柏所作……專詠天人相關之妙。詩分四章，章各數節，條目詳明，詞旨深遠，刊行之後，膾炙人口。余藏是編，數年於茲，屢欲翻成華文，藉質中國當世諸大吟壇，俾知泰西亦有詩學，不乏名流。惜乎南轅北轍，仆仆告勞，以致擱筆者久矣。延至今春，始於暇時，略一翻之，並囑吳江任申甫點綴潤色，仿照中國詩體，撰成四言韻文，五閱月而畢。²⁵

對於李提摩太而言，《百年一覺》敘寫了一種理想的社會制度，預期影響的讀者為思想較為開明、激進的中上層官吏和知識分子，而《天倫詩》則表現“天人相關之妙理”，其針對的對象則擴大到更為廣泛的知識階層以及信仰基督教的民眾。雖然兩部譯作的內容及藝術形式大不相同，但它們所負載的譯者的意圖則並無出入，即以西方文學“新民”。在《百年一覺》的譯作文本和序言中，李提摩太沒有直白地陳述其翻譯宗旨，而是通過刪汰原作的內容與增加基督教的思想內容、情節使其自然流露。

偉斯德……見儀狄採花而來，遂告之曰：“我前既未曾為救世操心，今世原不稱在此世界住，但我已對天矢願，自此以後，要全改變此心，亦欲利濟眾人也。”儀狄曰：“上帝是最慈悲者，既已悔過前罪，諒必赦也。”於是偉斯德心始安。²⁶

但在《天倫詩》的譯作文本中，李提摩太則假詩中的“我”之口，和盤托出其翻譯意旨：“我詠天倫，作此詩歌……非講詩學，乃講實學，非悅人心，乃化人心。”²⁷

與李提摩太一樣，英國循道會傳教士高葆真 (William Arthur Cornaby, 1860~1921) 似乎對詩歌比較感興趣。由他譯介的作家和作品，除了古羅馬的詩體悲劇作家和演說家“森伊喀”(Seneca) 的

《恩賜篇》之外，還包括古希臘詩人“革利安替司”(Clanthes)。他還翻譯了一首“革氏詩篇”，讚美上帝並祈禱：“天父開我心之無知兮，賜我以智慧。我報上帝恩兮，一如世人之所宜。”²⁸ 此外，他還撰文介紹並節譯了印度最古老的“頌神詩”——《吠大》(Veda)，稱“是詩第闡發古印人之思想，而其思想若童蒙未發，至理名言，並不多見。”²⁹

西方傳教士撰寫或翻譯的各類文章，時常提及英國 17 世紀哲學家 and 作家培根的名字和學說。但是他們長期忽視了培根在文學方面的著述，只看重他在自然科學與哲學等領域的建樹。1911 年第 6 期的《書圖新報》，將培根的肖像置於首頁，稱其為“英國大格致學家”。在如此顯要的位置介紹一位西方學者，在近代傳教士主辦的刊物上大概是罕見的。1897 年，林樂知在一篇論文中，稱培根為“英國格致名家”，同時在該文中穿插翻譯了他一篇論述“格致之效”的數百字的小品文。³⁰ 這是目前所見培根的文學作品最早的中譯文。

清末民初，小說方面較為重要的譯作，包括德國傳教士播呂氏亞譯意、徐顯榮潤詞的長篇“警世小說”《死裡還生》。譯作自 1911 年 3 月起連載於《中西教會報》，譯序稱：該作品“非憑空結撰者”，1861 年在德國出版後，

一時流行四方，洛陽紙貴。凡讀之者，均為所感。及後又有英吉利、法蘭西、俄羅斯、以大利、與夫、瑞士、瑞顛、義斯蘭、西班牙、奧大利亞各國學者將本國文字翻譯此書，為社會所歡迎……可見此等小說實有益於社會人心，非只悅人耳目。³¹

此外，還應當包括一些外國文學作品的中文重譯本。《昕夕閑

談》原為蠡勺居士 1874 年的譯本，英國傳教士約納約翰與李約翰的重譯本 1904 年由上海文寶書局出版。1923 年，該小說由傅蘭雅口譯、顏惠廉筆述的另一個中文重譯本在上海梓行。如上文所言，傅蘭雅於 1895 年刊登告示，“求著時新小說”；次年，他離華赴美，出任加利福尼亞大學東語系教授。推測他的《昕夕閑談》重譯本大概在赴美之前譯就。

至於傳記作品的翻譯，除去具有濃厚宗教內容的聖徒傳記之外，傳教士也翻譯了一些文學性見長的傳記，尤其是有關歷史名人的作品。英國傳教士斐有文譯、柴蓮馥演話的《泰西偉人真跡》(*Romance in Real Life*)，以白話為譯文。1912 年起由《書圖新報》定期刊載。他們合譯的另一部譯作《克林威爾傳》(*The Story of Cromwell*)，1915 年起連載於《開風報》。

清末還出現了一些西方女傳教士翻譯的文學作品。1903 年，美國女傳教士亮樂月 (Laura N. White) 出版了她的第一部譯作《貧子奇錄》，收入三篇短篇小說。同年，她與陳春生聯袂翻譯了法國作家散顛小說《獄中花》(*Picciola, or the Prison Flower*)，以及美國女小說家步奈特夫人 (Frances Eliza Hodgson Burnett) 的小說《小英雄》(*Little Lord Fauntleroy*)，1914 年與周澈朗合譯了步奈特夫人的小說《小公主》(*Sara Crewe*)。此後，她又出版了《天堂幸福歌》、《靜妙園琴歌》以及《婦女四愛歌》等十餘首譯自《聖經》的詩歌。1906 年，武師母 (Mrs. Franklin Ohlinger) 與張遵道合譯了“小說”《月光嬉記》(*An Indian Priestess: the Life of Chundra Lela*)，自該年 4 月起連載於《華美教保》。德國禮賢會傳教士葉道勝 (Immanuel Genahr) 與其夫人潘道勝合譯的小說《叢中美花》(*Flowers of the Forest*)，採用淺顯的文言，有關天主教的內容均附

有註釋。1906 年，該譯作由《華美月報》自第 25 冊開始連載。1908 年，季師母翻譯的小說《幼女遇難得救記》(*The Wide, Wide World*) 由《中西教會報》連載。1913 年，一未署姓名的女傳教士翻譯的當代英國小說家、詩人吉卜林 (Rudyard Kipling) 一首短詩，題為《若克辭》，發表於《尚賢堂紀事》。

見於西方傳教士主辦的各種刊物上的文學作品以及以單行冊的形式出版的作品，從內容上看應當為譯作，但並未註明原作者和譯者的姓名，無法確認它們是否由傳教士翻譯。《興華報》1911 年刊載的白話“宗教小說”《風塵淚》、《小基督徒》(*The Little Christian*) 和《再生人》(*Twice-Born Men: A Tight Handful*)；同年，《書圖新報》發表的中篇小說《童子警探》(“Scouting for Boys”)；1912 年，《聖教雜誌》刊出的短篇小說《弗勞萊斯》與《羅勞之談主智安排》，凡此種種，都屬於上述情況。另外，大約還有 20 餘部作品由傳教士單獨完成，但是內容與敘事風格介於翻譯與創作之間，也難以確定是否應當將其劃歸為譯作。因此，客觀而全面地認識傳教士的有關翻譯活動，仍然需要進一步的研究。

三

本文選取的資料，限定在 19 世紀 60 年代至 1919 年之間，大體上代表了近代西方來華傳教士中譯外國文學的主要成就。在將近 70 年的時間之內，西方傳教士在中譯外國文學方面持續不斷地作出了重要的努力，但其譯作的數量卻始終比較單薄，遠不及林紓等一批中國譯者在清末掀起的譯介外國文學的旋風中那樣多產。

形成上述現象的原因較為複雜。對於西方傳教士而言，文學之

於他們肩負的宗教使命，畢竟是一種輔助性的文化文本，不如純粹的宗教著作更能精確而嚴肅地宣敘思想與感情。這在很大程度上束縛了傳教士，不可能以翻譯宗教著作那樣的熱情和精力譯介外國文學。其次，清末民初的中國譯者翻譯外國文學，呈現出多元化的翻譯動機，對於作品的內容也沒有嚴格的限制，既有表現治國安邦的“政治小說”和“歷史小說”，也有以“新民”為目的的“教育小說”，而尤以描摹一般市井生活的“言情小說”與“偵探小說”居多。而傳教士則不然，他們對於譯介的對象具有嚴格的選擇，其翻譯宗旨正如李提摩太在《天倫詩》中的表述：譯作必須是一種“非悅人心，乃化人心”的宗教話語。再者，傳教士中的部分傑出人物固然通曉漢語，但是就中譯外國文學而言，語言障礙畢竟是制約絕大多數傳教士的另一個重要因素。

在晚清至民初特定的歷史文化背景中，西方傳教士對於外國文學作品的譯介以其在時間上的超前性和獨特的翻譯特徵，對外國文學翻譯領域的中國本土譯者產生了顯而易見的影響。簡而言之，其影響主要分別見於翻譯觀念、翻譯策略、翻譯技巧等三個方面。在翻譯觀念上，傳教士尤其青睞啟蒙與教化功用，上文也已經談及。一般認為，梁啟超的《譯印政治小說序》標誌着晚清知識分子開始有意識地利用外國文學翻譯來促進社會變革。不難看出，梁啟超倡議的主張，與傳教士的翻譯觀念具有一定的淵源關係。

傳教士有關文學翻譯理論和實踐的論述，見諸於世的不外乎隻言片語，但他們的譯作自身卻可以再現其翻譯過程中採用的各種文化策略。以小說翻譯為例，李提摩太在《百年一覺》中採用的一些翻譯手法，諸如增刪內容，敘議結合，改變敘事視角等等，構成了以譯作文本的讀者為中心的翻譯特徵。譯者以讀者熟悉的敘事方式

鋪陳故事，通過增刪內容來導讀，或者將讀者的視野限定在一定的範圍之內，其終極目的則是以譯作文本所負載的特定內涵啟蒙與教化讀者。有關這種文化策略，李佳白解釋得頗為清楚：

夫以西人辦中國之事，必須隨中國人之性情……今天下談者，動言：西法若用之中國，則富強可立致。此非通論也。蓋法雖善，必與其人心、風俗相宜，而不相戾，乃可採用之。故善用法者，必相宜而後動，漸摩而後入。³²

李提摩太在《百年一覺》中大刀闊斧地刪節的內容很多，但是下面一段被割除的文字，或許在大量刪汰的內容中具有典型的意義。

“……不久前的一天，我問巴特利特先生，若是社會主義者們威脅人們的諸多禍事果真發生了，我們應當移居何處。他說除了格陵蘭島，巴塔哥尼亞和中華帝國之外，目前還不知道哪裡是可以稱作社會安定的地方。”有人補充道：“那些中國佬拒絕接納我們西方文明的時候，深知並非盲目行事。對於西方文明的前途，他們比我們了解得更清楚。在他們看來，西方文明無非是偽裝起來的炸藥。”³³

對於晚清的讀者而言，譯者刪節的手法猶如一道堅實的屏障，阻隔了他們的耳目，無法聽到非議西方文明的聲音。10年之後，林紓翻譯美國小說家斯托夫人的小說《黑奴籲天錄》之時，坦白地告訴讀者，他的譯作刪節了與中國國情不合的“教門”內容。這一現象既表明瞭中國本土譯者對於李提摩太的翻譯手法的沿用，也反映了晚清譯語文化與原語文化之間的衝突。無獨有偶，林紓翻譯的《義黑》1913年載商務印書館編輯出版的《小說月報》，次

年《聖教雜誌》因該譯作“足以激發教友熱心”而轉載，但將小說改名為《義奴》，並對其中的部分譯文予以修改。編者在譯序中特別說明：“惟畏廬先生非天主教徒，對於吾教中事不甚熟悉，故於名詞間往往有隔膜之處……酌加改正。閱者幸勿作為尋常小說讀也。”³⁴由此可見，晚清文化語境中的不同譯者，都試圖通過外國文學中譯提供能夠傳達不同意識形態和文化觀念的文本。因此，全面而深入地探討西方傳教士在譯介外國文學方面對於中國本土譯者的影響，也應當是一個有意義的課題。

註釋

- ¹ 參見《〈天路歷程〉原序》，《天路歷程》（官話），上海美華書館，1906年，卷首序一，第1頁。
- ² 《〈天路歷程〉（官話）自序》，卷首序二，第1頁。
- ³ 同上。
- ⁴ 同上。
- ⁵ 參見劉樹森：《論中國近代外國小說翻譯的敘事語態特徵》，《外國語》，1997年，第55~65頁。
- ⁶ 李提摩太：《養民新法》，《萬國公報》，第45次，1893年7月，第11頁。
- ⁷ 方漢奇編著：《中國近代報刊史》，太原：山西教育出版社，1991年版，第56頁。
- ⁸ 丁韞良譯：《鐵鍋寓言》，《新學月報》，第3本，1897年，第4頁。
- ⁹ 林樂知譯：《各國近事》，《萬國公報》，第10期，1898年11月，第26頁。
- ¹⁰ 林榮章譯著、蔡芝絨著：《重哀私議以廣見公論》（五），《萬國公報》，第95卷，1896年12月，第18頁。

- ¹¹ 蒲柏的原詩，見 Alexander Pope: *The Complete Poetical Works of Pope*. Edited by Henry W. Boyton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931, p.139。筆者認為，嚴復在《天演論》中節譯的蒲柏的《人道篇》（即《人論》）中的十幾行詩以及李提摩太1898年翻譯出版的《天倫詩》（即《人論》），表明蒲柏為最早譯介到中國的英國詩人，見劉樹森《〈天倫詩〉與中譯英國詩歌的發軔》，載《翻譯學報》1998年第1期。本文涉及到的新近發現的史料，再次印證了上述論點，並將初次譯介的時間提前至1896年。
- ¹² 慕維廉：《續四週論》，《萬國公報》，第48次，1893年1月，第19~20頁。
- ¹³ 艾約瑟：《亞里斯多德里傳》，《中西聞見錄》，第32號，1875年4月，第11~13頁。
- ¹⁴ 同上。
- ¹⁵ 參見顏永保：《〈日使文學彙集〉譯序》，《萬國公報》，第50次，1893年3月，第5頁。
- ¹⁶ 丁韞良譯：《鐵鍋寓言》，《新學月報》，第3本，1897年，第4頁。
- ¹⁷ 李提摩太：《救世教益》，《萬國公報》，第37次，1892年2月，第10,7頁。
- ¹⁸ 參見《嚴禁翻刻新著書籍告示》，《萬國公報》，第97次，1897年2月，第31頁。
- ¹⁹ 李提摩太：《救世教益》，《萬國公報》，第37次，1892年2月，第10,7頁。
- ²⁰ 李提摩太：《以士保國》，《萬國公報》，第45次，1892年10月，第1頁。
- ²¹ 傅蘭雅：《求著時新小說啟》，《萬國公報》，第77次，1895年6月，第31頁。
- ²² 李提摩太：“新書出單”，《萬國公報》，第45次，1893年7月，第21~22頁。
- ²³ 李提摩太：《〈回頭看記略〉序言》，《萬國公報》，第35次，1891年12月，第15頁。
- ²⁴ 參見劉樹森：《李提摩太與〈回頭看記略〉：中譯美國小說的開端》，

《美國研究》，1999年，第1期。以往認為，林紓與魏易1901年合譯的《黑奴籲天錄》是第一部分譯為中文的美國小說。根據晚近發現的資料表明，英國浸禮會來華傳教士李提摩太1891便將19世紀美國小說家愛德華·貝拉米的烏托邦小說《回顧：2000~1887》譯為中文，當時取名為《回頭看記略》，連載於《萬國公報》，開創了中譯美國小說的先河。該文探討了李提摩太翻譯這一小說的社會歷史文化背景，與其譯事相關的文化策略，譯作的特徵，以及譯作在中國近代語境中的影響。

²⁵ 李提摩太、任延旭譯：《天倫詩》，上海：上海美華書館，1898年，第1頁。

²⁶ 引文出自《回頭看記略》，為小說中的男女主人公在故事結尾的對話，李提摩太譯，載《萬國公報》，1892年3~4月，第3卷，第37期，第17頁。下附原作文本中的結尾部分，兩者對比，可以發現李提摩太增加的內容。

When at length I raised my bowed head and looked forth from the window, Edith, fresh as the morning, had come into the garden and was gathering flowers. I hastened to descend to her. Kneeling before her, with my face in the dust, I confessed with tears how little was my worth to breathe the air of this golden century, and how infinitely less to wear upon my breast its consummate flower. Fortunate is he who, with a case so desperate as mine, finds a judge so merciful. (Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward, 2000~1887*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917, p. 332.)

最後，我抬起低垂的頭，從窗戶向外望去，宛如清晨一般清新的儀狄已經來到花園，正在摘花。我急忙下樓朝她走去。我跪在她面前，臉扎進土裡，流着淚懺悔道：我是多麼不配呼吸這個黃金世紀的空氣啊，更是多麼不配在胸前佩戴這個世紀盡善盡美的花朵啊。像我這樣一個窮途末路的人，卻找到了這樣一位仁慈的審判者，這是何等的幸運啊！（此為作者譯文。）

²⁷ 李提摩太、任延旭譯：《天倫詩》，上海：上海美華書館，1898年，第42頁。

²⁸ 高葆真：《述古道今錄》，《中西教會報》，第191卷，1908年7月，第30~31頁。

²⁹ 高葆真：《印度古教之變遷》，《中西教會報》，第197卷，1909年1月，第36頁。

³⁰ 林樂知、任延旭：《格致源流說》，《萬國公報》，第106卷，1897年11月，第5頁。

³¹ 播呂氏亞譯意、徐顯榮潤詞：《死裡還生》，《中西教會報》，第223卷，1911年3月，第66頁。

³² 李佳白：《新命論》，《萬國公報》，第95卷，1896年12月，第5~6頁。

³³ 英文原文附錄如下。

I asked Mr. Bartlett the other day where he should emigrate to if all the terrible things took place which those socialists threaten. He said he did not know any place now where society could be called stable except Greenland, Patagonia, and the Chinese Empire. "Those Chinamen knew what they were about," somebody added, "when they refused to let in our western civilization. They knew what it would lead to better than we did. They saw it was nothing but dynamite in disguise." (Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward, 2000 ~ 1887*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917, p.21.)

³⁴ 參見“《義奴》編者按”，《聖教雜誌》，第4卷，1914年，第329頁。

文學翻譯中的刪改

王曉元

引論

翻譯不是在真空中進行的。譯者總是處在某一時期的某一文化中進行翻譯操作的。因此，譯者的翻譯行為便不可避免地會帶有時代的、社會—文化的痕跡。換言之，譯者對其自身及其文化理解的方式便有可能成為影響他們翻譯的一個因素。刪改——刪節與改動——的原因是多方面的，諸如譯者因理解與表達存在困難，便有可能“跳過”原文，略而不譯，或者想當然地添加以此代替原文內容；或者因粗心大意產生“跳讀”現象而導致漏譯，如此等等，但這些情形都不在本文所要討論的範圍之內。本文要討論的是那種“故意的”刪改行為，有着非水平限制之外的原因。大致可分為以下幾個方面的原因——可能是其中之一，也可能是兩種或多種原因的綜合：1. 意識形態，或者說，社會—文化；2. 文學閱讀習慣；3. 文學傳統。下面我們試分別加以論述。

一、意識形態，或社會—文化

什麼是意識形態呢？根據阿爾都塞（L. Althusser）以來的現代意識形態理論，意識形態已不是認識論意義上的信念、思想、意識，而是本體論意義上的與人們的存在、在世攸切相關的東西。阿

爾都塞（Althusser, 1977: 152）指出：“意識形態是個體與其現實存在境遇的想像性關係的‘再現’。”伊格爾頓（Terry Eagleton）（1987: 17）認為意識形態意味着“我們所說的和所信的東西與我們居於其中的社會的權力結構（power-structure）和權力關係（power-relations）相聯繫的那些方面”。人們身不由己地處於意識形態所結成的這張無形的“網”中，其行為、在世活動不得不要受到它的合理化的規範。法國作家雨果（Hugo, 1865; Lefevere, 1992: 18）對於翻譯與意識形態的關係，描述了一種極端的情形：“當你向一個國家提供一個譯本，那個國家幾乎總是會將其視為對自身的一種暴力行為。”譯文之所以具有潛在的威脅，恰巧在於譯文使目標文化（receiving culture）面對另一種不同的看待人生與社會的方法或觀點，這種方法可能具有潛在的顛覆性（potentially subversive），因而必須排除在外。Lefevere（1992: 14）也指出：“意識形態經常受到贊助人，即委託翻譯或出版翻譯作品的人或機構的加強與實施。”例如，1899年普羅（梁啟超）譯的《佳人奇遇》敘述歐美各滅亡國家志士及中國逸民光復故土的故事，原是分期刊載在《清議報》上的，但其中關於中國志士反抗滿清一節，為康有為強令刪去（馬祖毅，1984）。鄭振鐸（1936）在《清末翻譯小說對新文學的影響》中談到清末翻譯在內容方面的妥協時指出：“在翻譯的工作中，無論如何要顧及中國的讀者的口味及倫理觀，要不相違背的才翻譯。甚至於將原作修改，來和中國舊勢力妥協。”我們知道，就一般情形而言，在翻譯過程中，譯者不能、不應也無權對原作進行刪改，但嚴復¹在他所處的特殊社會—文化語境中，為了達到他對進化論的特殊攝取目的，以近似借雞下蛋的方式給《天演論》塞入了許多他自己的見解和發揮，刪改了他認為不必要的內容（王克非，

1996: 54)。從嚴復的減譯也可以窺視他的攝取心態。首先《天演論》這一書名就是一個經過刪減的產物，是從原書名《進化與倫理》中刪去後者而來的。進化論在當時的西方是已經公認的，問題在於有些人（如斯賓塞等）要將進化論普遍化，解釋萬事萬物的發展變化，有些人（如赫胥黎等）認為它不能簡單地用之於人類社會，人類不同於自然界，在宇宙過程中還有個倫理過程，所以赫胥黎要將進化論和倫理結合起來探討人類社會問題。嚴復則沒有這樣的目的，他關心的是眼前已在進化過程中落伍的中國現實，而且他從來接受的是斯賓塞的普遍進化觀，即用進化論可以解釋一切，包括倫理問題。如赫胥黎在書中說，進化原理很難應用到人類社會的實際政治領域，因為單憑人類智力不能選擇最適的生存者。生物進化原理不適於作社會發展原理這一觀點，可以說是赫胥黎此書的主旨所在。嚴復要徹底地運用進化論，自然不同意赫胥黎這種觀點，於是便有了嚴復大刪“導言十五·最旨”一節原文的結果。而這樣的後果，乃是使譯文文本的意義迥然不同於原文文本，我們甚至可以說，與原文文本的意圖是背道而馳的，其直接的結果便是違反了嚴復本人在《天演論·譯例言》中所謂的“意義則不倍本文”或者說“達旨”。當然，從某種意義上說，嚴復的這種刪節，乃是一種極端的情形：嚴復的譯文文本，乃是嚴復在特定的意識形態氛圍之中，對原文文本作了一次嚴重的實用主義性質的變形之後的產物。

戊戌變法失敗後，當時的資產階級啟蒙家們開始把注意力從上層轉移到國民身上；梁啟超提出文學具有宣教的獨特魅力，文學之所以有生命力就在於它能使“全國議論為之一變”。中國文學“綜其大較，不出誹盜淫兩端”，它只能使國民墮落，外國文學卻能使國民“開化”。他們以一種思想家、政治家的眼光看待外國文

學，而不是以文學家的眼光判斷外國文學的是非高低，看重的是文學的宣傳性而不是文學的文學性。在這樣一種觀念的指導下，很多的外國文學作品已經失去了本來面目，只剩下一個遮面的名稱代號，甚至在某種意義上，我們可以說存在着所謂的“偽翻譯”的成分或因素。包笑天當時以翻譯教育小說為讀者所重，但他的譯作幾乎都是借“譯”的名稱的自我創作。最能說明問題的還是蘇曼殊，他把雨果的 *Les Misérables*（今譯《悲慘世界》）譯成了僅僅數十回的故事，其中竟出現了雨果借其人物在法國罵孔子、罵菩薩、罵小腳！毫無疑問，這是譯者通過對原作實施刪節，而將自己的思想添加進了原作，插入譯者對現實的諷刺與嘲弄。同時，蘇曼殊還偏離原文，自行杜撰故事，如譯者塑造了一個叫“滿周苟”的村官，因詐騙錢財被男德刺死，而“滿周苟”其實是“滿洲狗”的諧音，譯者藉此表達了對清朝貴族的強烈痛恨（陳玉剛，1989: 78-79）。譯者還一反雨果原意，把書中很高尚的主教改寫成一個很壞的貪和尚。柳亞子在《慘社會與慘世界》一文中認為，這是由於蘇曼殊和雨果對待基督教有着截然相反的看法（柳亞子，1987）。這裡，我們可以明顯地感覺到意識形態對譯文文本的生產所起的作用。

英國作家哈葛德的小說 *Joan Haste* 的譯者蟠溪子（筆名，楊紫麟節譯，包笑天潤飾）在譯述過程中，刻意隱去了迦茵與亨利相遇登塔取雛的浪漫故事，刪削了迦茵與亨利相愛私孕的情節，把亨利為了愛情，不顧父母之命而與迦茵自由戀愛的內容也刪而不述（鄒振環，1996），譯者之所以會這麼做，乃是受到當時尚佔主導地位的意識形態氛圍——譬如中國的傳統禮教，尤其是“男女授受不親”之類——的制約；換言之，這種刪節是為了“順應”當時的意識形態氛圍，同時也滿足了當時讀者群 (target readership) 的期待

視界；這一點，我們從如下這樣一個事實便可以看出：1904年，林琴南與魏易對此小說進行了重譯，並且是全譯，結果卻引起了一場風波：道學家大聲質問：“未嫁之女兒？有私孕，其人為足重乎？不足重乎！”有的則憂慮，如果把這類“女子懷春”的故事一併譯入，“貞操可以立破矣！”“西人臨文不諱，然為中國社會計，”正宜刪去為是（鄒振環，1996: 187）。這就表明，林琴南與魏易的全譯本由於所保留的部分在當時遠遠超出當時讀者群的期待視界，同時，也因為它所傳達的意識形態上的信息與當時佔主導地位的意識形態氛圍相對抗，甚至我們可以說，對當時的主導意識形態可能形成某種顛覆性的威脅，迦茵這一形象並不是人們所希望譯本加以傳播的，相反正是在主導意識形態中所加以排斥與反對的，因而難以為讀者接受。

昆德拉曾發現他的小說《玩笑》的法譯者“沒有翻譯小說，而是把它改寫了”，指責譯者從三個方面作了“再創造”（參見施康強，1997）：一、引進上百個隱喻以增飾詞藻；二、小說三分之二部分的敘述者盧德維克在原文中使用一種簡潔、明晰的語言，在譯文中他變得裝腔作勢，混用俚語切口、文縷縷的詞和古語古詞以譁眾取寵；三、原文裡，一切想法的表述極為精確，譯文過事彫琢，變得難以理解。如果說《玩笑》法譯本的改動尚屬於“技術性”操作的話，那麼《玩笑》的英譯本的情況就不一樣：“章節的數目改變了；章節的順序也改變了；許多段落都被刪掉。”（昆德拉；轉引自段蘇紅，1996）而英譯本之所以改動原作，昆德拉認為，乃是因為“在那個時代，意識形態的獨裁（在東方國家）和新聞界的過於簡化（在西方），這二者的共同愚妄都能妨礙一部藝術作品用自己的話語講出自己的真實。布拉格的理論家們把《玩笑》看作是反

社會主義的小冊子，因而禁止它；外國出版商把它視為在出版幾周後就變成了現實的政治幻想作品，因而改寫它。”（同上）施康強（1997: 108-109）指出，昆德拉的小說《不朽》中譯本因為政治（亦即意識形態）上的原因作了刪節從而導致了譯文的銜接出現問題，同時因為性方面的緣故作了整節的刪節。

二、文學閱讀習慣

正如每個人都有自己的閱讀模式一樣，在長期的歷史過程中，每一個民族，基於自己的文化——尤其是文學——傳統，形成了具有自身特色的（文學）閱讀模式。譯者在翻譯的過程之中，出於種種目的，為了使譯文文本符合譯語讀者群體的閱讀習慣或模式，會或多或少地對原文文本進行刪改。

為了適應譯語讀者的欣賞習慣與審美情趣，譯者將原文文本中固有的大段的有關自然環境描寫、人物心理描寫刪去，所譯的只是原文文本的故事情節。傅東華在翻譯 *Gone with the Wind* 時，為了獲得閱讀的效果，為了使讀者讀起來不致“沉悶”，為了“替讀者省一點力氣”，對於“一些冗長的描寫和心理的分析，覺得它跟情節的發展沒有多大關係，並且要使讀者厭倦的，那我就老實不客氣地將它整段刪節了。但是這樣的地方並不多。總之，我的目的是在求忠實於全書的趣味精神，不在求忠實於一枝一節。”（傅東華，1940；載羅新璋，1984: 442）意大利作家 Umberto Eco 的小說 *The Name of the Rose* 寶文堂版的中譯本在“譯後記”中聲明，“為免受篇幅冗長之嫌”，“對全書略加刪削”。

西方文學或原文文本中，作者有時往往花較大的篇幅做細膩的

人物心理刻劃或風景描寫，而譯語讀者（在這裡，是指中國讀者）由於對此感到不習慣，且在閱讀翻譯作品（尤其是小說）時，習慣於只注重或了解作品的故事情節，對其它與故事情節關係不大的內容，則無甚興趣；甚至還會認為那些心理刻劃與風景描寫是“文字冗複”、“不精煉”。基於這樣一種情形，翻譯中介（譯者和/或出版機構）出於某種目的——比如說，發行量的考慮——而對原文文本中的內容進行刪改，以此迎合譯語讀者的閱讀習慣。這裡，我們可以《繡像小說》為例。有論者統計（郭延禮，1998），該刊在1895-1906年間所刊長篇小說11種，幾乎無一例外地將作品開頭的背景、自然環境描寫刪去，直接進入故事情節的描寫。再如，Charles Dickens 在其小說 *David Copperfield* 第一章用了整整一段，誇張地刻劃來接生的醫生的溫和性格，林紓在翻譯（《塊肉餘生述》，1908）的過程中，覺得“原文過於繁冗”，且其主要意欲傳達的是小說的情節，對他認為“無關宏旨的枝枝葉葉”（馬祖毅，1984: 308），便不惜刪除，結果將其譯為11字：“醫生平惋不忤人，亦不叱狗。”伍光建在翻譯小說《三個火槍手》（《俠隱記》）時，原作表現人物性格之處採用直譯的方法，而對於景物描寫和心理描寫則壓縮或節略，與故事情節及人物性格無關的議論，乃至西洋典故，則加以刪削。茅盾（1937；羅新璋，1984: 364）認為，這類刪改的效果是，“原作的主要人物的面目依然能夠保存；甚至有時比原作還要簡潔明快，便於一般的讀者。”

在被問到翻譯原則的時候，羅新璋的回答是“文字要精練。刪繁就簡，把可有可無的字全刪掉。”即便是“這些可有可無的字是原文中就有的”，羅新璋認為，“為了符合中文習慣，也刪。中文的句子一定要精練，要 *sobre*。如果說我譯的《紅與黑》還算成功

的話，也就在這一點上。93年2月交稿之後，我花了將近三個月的功夫，把全文從頭至尾通篇再看一遍，把原譯稿中那些可有可無的字全刪去了，譯本的質量可以說就靠這一遍，當然從稿費上來說是有所損失的，但是原來那些臃腫、累贅、笨拙的地方沒有了。”當問到如何譯陀斯妥也夫斯基那些錯綜複雜的句子時，羅新璋覺得，“為了適合現在讀者的閱讀習慣，應該簡化。”（許鈞等，1998: 208-209）我們且不論羅新璋心目中的“現在讀者”究竟為何，但很顯然，他在翻譯的過程中，已經有意或無意地在頭腦中預設了他的譯本的“現在讀者”了。

羅新璋的作法使我想起了道安有關“巧”的論述。所謂“巧”，道安所指主要是兩個方面：一是指翻譯時的刪重去複，二是指改舊適今。道安在這方面的認識是有一個過程的。在他到關中以前，道安常用異譯本（即“合本”）來作對照工作，在對照中，他對刪略這一點是贊同的。如他用《放光》與《道行》對照，他認為《道光》經過刪略以後，文字更流暢達意了。他說：“斥重省刪，務令婉便。如其悉文，將過三倍，善出無生，論空特巧，傳譯如是，難為繼矣。”但到關中以後，在其他譯人如趙政、慧常等的影響下，他改變了看法。如在譯《比丘大戒》時，道安覺得過去的戒本翻譯“其言煩直，意常恨之”，而現在的新譯本依然如此，便叫筆受者慧常“斥重去複”，慧常卻加以反對，認為戒就像禮，是不能刪的，又說這是一師一師相傳的，萬一有一言與原本違背就會被老師趕走，所以“與其巧便，寧守雅正”。道安便贊同了這一意見，並且認為譯煩為約者“皆蒲陶酒之被水者也”。對改舊適今的“巧”，道安也是反對的。他說：“前人出經，之識、世高，審得胡本難系者也；又羅、之越，斫鑿之巧者也。巧則巧也，懼窳成

而混沌終矣。若夫以《詩》為煩重，以《尚書》為質樸，而刪令合今，則馬、鄭所深恨者也。”他認為胡言的質樸和煩重都是時代的產物，在翻譯中不能為了順應今天愛好文飾的風氣而去隨便修改它，正如不能把《詩經》、《尚書》改為今天的文體一樣。如果那樣做，“巧”是顯得“巧”了，但竅成以後混沌則死了。（蔣述卓，1990）

三、文學傳統

毫無疑問，不同的文化系統中，不但有着不同的文學閱讀習慣，更有着不同的文學（寫作）傳統：從歷時的角度看，不但有題材、體裁、文體的不同，而且從共時的視角看，即便是同一文體，比如小說，也會存在很大的差異。在翻譯的過程中，譯者帶着自身文化的“成見”，自然就會遭遇到不同的東西——一種“異”。在對待這種異的問題上，基本上存在兩種作法：或保存或刪改。鄭振鐸(1936)在談到清末翻譯在文學形式方面存在的妥協時，指出：“一邊把它譯成文言，一邊改造成中國的章回體，不肯超脫舊的圈套，與舊勢力妥協。”再如，在本世紀之初，一些文學翻譯作品的文字“大抵模倣傳奇體文言或章回體白話，……使之更接近於中國舊小說的文體”。

美國詩人 Henry Longfellow 的詩“A Psalm of Life”，可能是我國最早翻譯的英語詩歌了，董恂於 1860 年代將其譯為七絕（錢鍾書，1982）。埃及著名詩人蒲綏里(1212-1296)所創作的優美詩篇“Qasida al-Burda”，是世界聞名的文學作品。1890 年，馬安禮用詩經的體裁翻譯成漢語（馬祖毅，1984: 321）。

法國 Jules Verne (1828-1905) 的小說《兩年的假日》，英國譯者將其譯為英語時，“用英人體裁”，日本譯者由英語轉譯為日語時又“易以日本格調”，到了梁啟超再由日語譯為中文（《十五小豪傑》）時，“又純以中國說部體段代之”（郭延禮，1998: 33）。在中國，章回小說曾經是文學傳統中的一個主流，二十世紀初期的譯者大多採用章回體來翻譯外國小說，而完全置原文文本的敘述結構於不顧。譯本往往分章標回，且不少有對仗的回目，採用“話說”、“且說”、“下回分解”等陳舊老套，如 1905 年刊於《繡像小說》的美國畢拉宓的政治小說 *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* 譯本《回頭看》，第一回云：“列位高興聽我的話，且不要忙，容在下慢慢說來。”梁啟超譯《十五小豪傑》、徐念慈譯《海外天》，都認為經過他們的改造，不但不負於作者或原作，而且“似更優於原文也”（參見陳平原，1997: 625）。

譯者由於受到本國文學傳統或詩學的影響，即便是在諸如敘事視角這樣一些“技巧性”——嚴格說來，這既屬於敘事學也屬於文體學的研究範圍——層面上，也會體現出來：嚴復在翻譯英國 Thomas Huxley 的 *Evolution and Ethics* 的時候，便將原文文本中的第一人稱改換為更加符合中國文學（如史記或春秋筆法）傳統的第三人稱。在這裡，原文文本中固有的那種敘述者（最終亦體現為作者）與讀者之間因第一人稱敘述視角而產生的“close relationship”，在譯語文本中則體現為一種因第三人稱敘述視角而產生的一種權威感 (authority)。

如果說，在本世紀之初，這種體裁及/或文體上刪改的作法從歷時的角度尚可理解的話，那麼到了 80 年代，依然存在這種情況，就不能不令人深思了。這裡，我們以中譯本《法國中尉的女

人》（阿良，劉坤尊，1985）作為討論的個案。該中譯本的編後話稱：“基於對篇幅和影響的考慮，我們徵得譯者同意，將某些冗長的或不合乎我國風尚的段落作了些刪節。”看來，被刪去的主要是兩方面的內容。關於後一方面的內容，其實就是意識形態方面的原因：至少在當時的語境中，某些描寫不符合接受文化的常規，前面已有論及，這裡不予討論。而前一類所謂的“冗長的”篇幅，除小說每一章篇首的題記引文（主要是維多利亞時代的詩文摘引）以外，就是一部分作者本人介入小說敘述所發表創作意圖和手法的插話。這種刪節表面上看來屬於出版者為了迎合讀者的閱讀習慣一類，甚至當時的情況真的如此，但如果作更深一層的探究，則不難發現問題遠不止此：這一刪節行為其實隱含着文學傳統上的差異，或者說，這一行為受某種文學傳統的引導——至少在今天看來是這樣。

首先，我們不妨考查一下這一小說所產生的語境以及該小說在西方文學語境中的位置。Fowles 的 *French Lieutenant's Woman* 發表於 20 世紀 60 年代，但在敘述形式上卻與 18、19 世紀的傳統小說認同，即 Fowles 所謂的按“故事發生時人們普遍接受的慣例進行寫作”。這種傳統寫作手法的回歸，並不僅僅是一種 parody，雖然作者並不否認這一點；從某種意義上言，這部小說是一種“後現代”文本；或者說，在各種現代或後現代主義盛行的語境所形成的背景中，原文文本在西方——至少是在英語——文學場 (literary field) 中，反而獲致了一種凸現 (foregrounded) 的位置或坐標。也正是在這種意義上，我們認為，小說中譯本的刪節便遠非一般意義上的“技術處理”，誠如盛寧 (1997: 4) 所言，“從原作所處的英美小說傳統的角度看，在中譯本中被刪節的部分，對於原作來說，

非但不是可有可無的‘閑筆’，相反，正是這些間雜於故事敘述之中的議論和插話，賦予了這部小說以某種‘舊瓶裝新酒’的特色。”²

盛寧 (1997: 22) 認為，中譯本的編者將福爾斯的議論和插話視為“冗長”的累贅，至少表明目下中西文學觀念有兩點不同：我們更關心一個完整的故事情節，而西方的當代小說家恐怕對如何講故事更有興趣；我們的讀者在閱讀小說時往往希望它同時還是點別的什麼，而西方當代的讀者則覺得小說只不過是小說。究其原因，不同的文化傳統使然。回到翻譯上，問題是，在我們的文學場中並不缺乏現代主義甚至後現代主義作品——甚至曾一度到了氾濫的地步——的今天，這種刪改依然存在。因此，我們想補充的一句，也恐怕是唯一可以解釋這一現象的理由，就是古老的“文學傳統”在譯者（就這一個案而言，乃是指出版者和/或譯者）身上作祟。

為了迎合中國讀者的口味，一些譯者不僅在內容上刪節很多，而且在體裁上也作了改變。林紓將莎士比亞的幾個劇本和易卜生的《梅孽》（即《群鬼》）譯成小說的模樣，主要的原因便是為了迎合中國人喜歡聽故事的習慣而變的，儘管與他的特殊翻譯方式亦不無關係。但是，這同時與當時依然佔據主流地位的小說傳統也有着很大的關係。此外，林紓的任意刪改，還隱含着以老大自居的古老民族在眼界乍開、面對外國文學時的妄自尊大與輕蔑態度。在他眼中，外國文學的描述和情景，畢竟是異域的蠻夷之風。通過改譯使其符合中國人的口味和趣味，點石成金，似乎是天經地義、義不容辭的責任。按中國人的傳統觀念，經、史為學問之冠，要“述而不作”，而文學，尤其是小說，乃文章小道，即使改譯得面目全非，也無關宏旨。當然，還有一個客觀原因。林紓（1908；羅新璋，

1984: 180) 曾將自己對原作的刪改歸咎於“鄙人不審西文，但能筆述；即有訛錯，均出不知”。可他後來便毫無掩飾地承擔此中責任，說：紓本不能西文，均取朋友所口述者而譯，此海內所知。至於謬誤之處，咸紓粗心浮意，信筆行之，咎均在己，與朋友無涉也。”

結語

由以上尚不全面而又粗略的論述，我們已不難看出，翻譯中的刪改遠非只是一個“技術”問題：簡言之，從相對宏觀的角度而言，翻譯中的刪改可能受到這樣幾個方面的影響或制約，即(1)譯者或翻譯中介所處的社會—文化語境或意識形態氛圍；(2)譯語社會的閱讀習慣或習性；(3)譯語社會的文學傳統或詩學傳統。但需要指出的是，即便是對翻譯中的刪改這一現象，我們在對其進行研究的時候，也有必要加以全面而綜合的考慮。此外，我們從中似乎可以得出兩點啟示：(1)譯者在翻譯過程中所作出的某種程度的刪改，也許是無意之中所為，但其影響卻可能遠遠超出譯者所能想像的範圍，因此，翻譯時當慎而又慎；(2)從譯本的歷時研究角度而言，我們似乎可以從譯本中的某些刪改追溯譯者在當時的社會文化語境中，作出這種刪改的目的與動機，以及推測當時的社會—文化語境因素。

註釋

- ¹ 嚴復的翻譯雖然不屬於文學翻譯，但如果考慮到當時的文學界定尚不十分明確，同時嚴復正是利用了文學語言這一“包裝”或者說“糖衣”的話，我們這裡將其放在文學翻譯中討論恐怕也並不為過。譬如，胡適就曾在《五十年來中國之文學》一文中這樣說過：“嚴復的譯書，有幾種……在原文本有文學價值，他的譯本，在古文學史也應該佔一個很高的地位。”
- ² 在這裡，我們需要指出的是，由於譯語文化語境所構成的背景不同於甚或可以說迥異於原文文本所處的背景，即便是譯文文本客觀如實地再現了原文文本的這一寫作手法，譯文文本在譯語文化語境中也不可能取得原文文本在原語文化語境之中的凸現位置或坐標；換言之，譯文文本是根本無法實現“等效”這一所謂的翻譯目標的，這一點，如果考慮到中文文化語境中的文學傳統，就顯得更為明顯了。

參考書目

- Althusser, L., 1977, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, London: NLB.
- Chang, Nam Fung (張南峰), 1998, *Politics and Poetics in Translation: Accounting for a Chinese Version of 'Yes Prime Minister'*. *The Translator* 2 (4) 249-272.
- Hugo, Victor. 1865. The preface to *The New Shakespeare Translation*. In Lefevere 1992: 18.
- Lefevere, André, ed. 1992. *Translation/History/Culture: A Source Book*. London: Routledge.
- 陳平原, 1997。《陳平原小說史論集》(上、中、下冊), 石家

- 莊：河北人民出版社。
- 陳玉剛，1989。《中國翻譯文學史稿》，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司。
- 程麻，1990。《溝通與更新——魯迅與日本文學關係發微》，北京：中國社會科學出版社。
- 段蘇紅，1996。從被改寫的昆德拉談起，《中華讀書報》1996年11月6日，另載許鈞（主編）《翻譯思考錄》（武漢：湖北教育出版社，1998）98-100。
- 福爾斯，約翰（J. Fowles），1985，《法國中尉的女人》，阿良，劉坤尊譯，廣州：花城出版社。
- 傅東華，1940。《飄》譯序，載羅新璋（編）《翻譯論集》（北京：商務印書館，1984）442。
- 郭延禮，1998。《中國近代翻譯文學概論》，武漢：湖北教育出版社。
- 蔣述卓，1990。《佛經傳譯與中古文學思潮》，南昌：江西人民出版社。
- 林紓，1908。《西利亞郡主別傳》序，載羅新璋（編）《翻譯論集》（北京：商務印書館，1984）179-180。
- 柳亞子，1987。《柳亞子文集》，上海：上海人民出版社。
- 羅新璋（編），1984。《翻譯論集》，北京：商務印書館。
- 馬祖毅，1984。《中國翻譯簡史——五四以前部分》，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司。
- 茅盾，1937。《簡愛》的兩個譯本，《譯文》新2卷第5期，另載羅新璋（1984）354-365。
- 錢鍾書，1982。漢譯第一首英語詩《人生頌》，《新華文摘》1982

- 年第四期，另載羅新璋，1984: 233-250。
- 盛寧，1997。《文學：鑒賞與思考》，北京：三聯書店。
- 施康強，1997。《第二壺茶——施康強書話》，杭州：浙江人民出版社。
- 湯哲聲，1995。《中國文學現代化的轉型》，南京：南京大學出版社。
- 王克非，1996。《中日近代對西方哲學思想的攝取——嚴復與日本啟蒙學者》，北京：中國社會科學出版社。
- 王克非，1997。《翻譯文化史論》，上海：外語教育出版社。
- 許鈞，1998。翻譯釋意理論辨——與 D. Seleskovitch 教授談翻譯，《中國翻譯》1: 9-13。
- 許鈞等，1998。談文學翻譯中的再創造，《譯林》1: 201-209。
- 伊格爾頓，特雷。1987。《二十世紀西方文學理論》，第2版，伍曉明譯，西安：陝西師範大學出版社。
- 應錦襄，林鐵民，朱水涌，1997。《世界文學格局中的中國小說》，北京：北京大學出版社。
- 鄭振鐸，1936。清末翻譯小說對新文學的影響，《今代文藝》1936年7月20日第1期，另載王克非《翻譯文化史論》（上海：上海外語教育出版社，1997）157-162。
- 鄒振環，1996。《影響中國近代社會的一百種譯作》，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司。

Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts

Nitsa BEN-ARI

Introduction

A couple of years ago I was invited to lecture in Cairo, to a group of translators who specialize in translating Israeli literature. I spoke about adequacy and acceptability and the role of norms in determining the translator's policy. After the formal talk, several translators surprised me by admitting that their translations were dictated by ideological considerations. Thus, for example, in literary texts translated from Hebrew to Arabic, the name of the country, Israel, must be converted to Palestine. The name of the capital, Jerusalem, must be converted into its Moslem name "Al Kuds", etc. I wondered whether they were aware of the absurdities this was bound to create in an Israeli novel. They were fully aware of it, yet they insisted that these alterations were necessary to make the translation acceptable.

This brought me back to the years, not long after the establishment of the state of Israel, where occurrences similar to this took place in translations into Hebrew. Not very frequently, and mainly in children's literature, but it was part of a larger tissue of "liberties" taken with translation for the sake of a bigger "Truth" called Ideology.

In fact, the interference of Israeli-Arab political relations with literary translation is but a small example of the many cases where ideology and politics play a conscious, manipulative role in translation, a kind of self imposed censorship dictated by the regime. In this case, if translators want to translate Israeli literature, due to the growing interest and demand for it, ever since peace was established between Egypt and Israel, they have to obey the ideological dictates imposed on them.

The problem is probably as ancient as translation itself, presenting the age-old distinction between translator as "melitz", or interpreter (Genesis, 42, 23) or as "ma'atik", one who copies. The awareness of the potential manipulative power of translation is probably the reason for the precautions taken when translating "sacred" texts. Such is the well-known case of the holy Bible, the Old Testament, translated into Greek, in the second and third century B.C., when seventy translators undertook the work. Since the words were considered the words of God, the policy was to translate the text literally, word for word, even if this attempt at what might seem extreme adequacy impaired its adequacy.

This paper is an attempt to study the complex issue of ideological manipulation of translation, first by formulating a series of relevant questions, and then by offering a classification of various cases of manipulation and finally by analyzing one specific case which I have looked into rather closely. The examples will not concern one person, or one text, but a trend which started in Jewish literature in the late eighteenth century and developed into a norm in various periods of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

* * *

On the basis of modern theories of translation some elementary questions ought to be formulated. The questions pertain to the four main factors involved:

- (a) The Agent (the translator/editor/publisher): Who manipulates the translation? Is it done consciously or without awareness?
- (b) The Method: Is it done directly or in a subtler manner?
- (c) The Target Public: When is such manipulation made possible and what does it reveal about the target public? Can the readers of translated texts "defend" themselves against this manipulation, in other words develop a different kind of "reading"?
- (d) The Message: What type of "ideology" is prone to interfere with

texts?

Generally speaking, of course, the one to be held directly responsible for the manipulation is the translator. Yet we must bear in mind that the translator does not operate as a private capricious person. As such he is of no interest to research. The translator obeys either a rule or a norm. The rule may be specific and direct, as in the case of censorship, and it may be general and indirect, yet as effective as the first type, in cases of what could be termed self-imposed censorship.

In both cases it is done consciously. My Egyptian colleagues were quite aware of the inadequacy of translating 'Israel' into 'Palestine' in Israeli literature, and of the ideological twist or shift in political outlook involved. I assume the alternative could entail sanctions, varying from corrections by a supervising editor to losing their jobs.

However, there are cases where the ideological manipulation is dictated by a norm or a set of norms. The norm, although not formulated, either officially or unofficially, has, as we know, its own means of imposing itself and of "punishing" disobedience. The line between the rule and the norm is rather thin, but it seems that there are three criteria that can help us distinguish between them: the norm is applied without full "awareness" (in fact people who abide by it are often surprised and indignant when confronted with the "accusation"), it does not exclude the existence of other, parallel norms, and the manipulation it involves is, perhaps, more subtle. Yet the norm is as powerful as the rule, if not more so, and the result is the same.

Ideological manipulation imposed by regimes or cultures as rules (censorship, imposed or self-imposed) may indicate a perceived weakness in the regime or the culture, which explains why they may feel obliged to fight the "danger" of cultural contacts. Assuming that the indigenous literature, or the local writers, have been "dealt with", it is translated literature which presents a potential danger. In fact, the most extreme case of manipulation in totalitarian regimes would be not to allow translations at all, or to apply censorship in the preliminary decision of which texts to translate. (If you

have read Tabucci's famous novel, "Sostiene Perreira", you will have noticed that the hero, a translator, fights against ideological indoctrination of the Fascist regime, by the very choice of the "innocent" classical French stories that he chooses to translate for the literary page of the newspaper). Such "weakness" can also be detected in a "young" or "reviving" culture, where the new ideology is embraced so fully and so enthusiastically, that it willingly assumes a dictatorial role and defies any opposition. Examples will follow.

When the ideological manipulation of texts functions as a rule, it is easier for the public to develop a defence mechanism. The reading public then learns how to identify the manipulation and how to read "through" the texts. We might say that readers develop means of "re-translating" the texts. This does not apply in one case - that of children's literature, at least not at such ages when children read on their own. And this may be one of the reasons why children and youth are such an obvious target for ideological indoctrination.

In the case of a norm, however, the process of identifying the manipulation and "re-translating" it is more complicated, primarily because it is more difficult to put your finger on normative manipulation, but also because the readers, who have absorbed and internalized the norm until it is an integral part of their world picture, will not **want** to acknowledge the manipulation, let alone read through it.

The question to tackle last is what the term ideological manipulation includes. I suggest the following: any interference with the text, be it cultural, religious, political or otherwise, imposing modifications that are not due to textual constraints, for the purpose of indoctrination. The interference may consist of additions, omissions or alterations of the original information. The motive is not text induced, but it is dictated by extra-textual extra-literary calculations.

Let us briefly consider some examples.

Cultural/religious manipulation

In the late eighteenth century, the Jewish Enlightenment marked the rebirth of Hebrew literature. Translation took an active part in supplying new models to this "young" or "new" literature. However, in that period the norm took a very clear ideological form: translated texts had to undergo a conversion to the Jewish culture. This norm has had its ups and downs in the nineteenth century, remaining in the twentieth century mainly in children's literature.

Consider this in view of the previous formulations: the manipulation was undertaken by educators, publishers and last but not least translators. It was done consciously on a large scale and almost automatically on a more subtle scale. It used omissions of items representing "other" religions (usually Christianity). It sometimes replaced the omitted items with Jewish parallels. The omissions could be done on a small scale, i.e., words or phrases, or on a large scale, i.e., passages and chapters.

Clear-cut omissions were relatively easy to perform. Here are three cases taken from children's books translated in the last forty years, varying in the degree of manipulation involved: in the first, a girl complains that her gold necklace with the little cross has disappeared. The translation retained the gold necklace, omitting the cross. In the second, the heroes eat bacon or pork chops. The translation either replaces them by a more general term (meat) or by a more concrete Kosher kind of dish. In the third, the heroines come into the room with faces shining like Christmas trees. This is considered an unacceptable metaphor ("children will not understand") and is replaced by a more convenient Jewish one: their faces shine like Chanuka candles.

On a larger scale the omission could encompass whole chapters: *Ben-Hur* is a well-known historical novel about a Jewish hero who rebels against the Roman Empire. In the second part of the novel he meets a group of early Christians and converts to Christianity. In its Hebrew version, half of the book was cut off, retaining only the Jewish heroic rebellion against the Ro-

mans. This procedure also involves additions, for such large-scale omissions naturally require some "filling material" for the narrative gaps created by the missing parts.

Behind the manipulations lies an obvious weakness of the cultural system. In this case it is the very concrete historical fear of assimilation, which could lead to religious conversion.

Can the reading public apply means of defence against such manipulation, for instance by the mental process of "re-translating"? Only if the reader is mature enough, physically and mentally. Only when the fear, the initial "weakness" in the system is overcome and cultural normalization takes place. Then the reader will be able to detect the manipulation, either by comparing with the original or by showing mature discrimination between manipulated and non-manipulated texts.

Cultural/political manipulation. The policy of translation of German literature into Hebrew during and after World War II.

During the Nazi regime and afterwards, when the scope of the Holocaust was revealed, there was a general, overpowering norm that dictated what could or could not be translated from German literature. Understandably enough, priority was given to German-Jewish writers, then to German anti-Fascist writers, like those who were exiled (or exiled themselves) from Germany. A shift in this attitude began to take shape in the 1970s only. Even in those works that were translated, some norm-dictated interference took place. In my essay about translation of German children's literature into Hebrew (1992), I analyzed many examples taken from translations of Erich Kaestner's novels, where German elements were modified. For instance, in *Lottie and Lisa*¹ the very German names were replaced with Hebrew names, and the hometown of one of the twins, Munich, was changed into Zurich. This was done directly after World War II, in a period when Kaestner would be translated, because he did not hide his anti-fascist opinions and his books were burned by the Nazi regime, but German names and

German towns such as Munich could arouse hard feelings.

The readers, children, could only be partly aware of the interference, especially when the rather artificial device of Hebrew names was concerned. They could not tell where more subtle changes took place (Zurich instead of Munich came as a surprise to me as a grown-up, when I began to explore translations from German). Neither could they know about the overall policy of translation.

* * *

Ideological manipulation: the case of the nineteenth century Jewish historical novel.

For Jewish literature, the nineteenth century was in many aspects a beginning. It was the revival of various genres, but a completely new beginning for the novel. For nearly half a century, the popular novel was rejected as “cheap” “improper” literature. Towards 1830, however, the demand for the genre was greater than any criticism of its value.

The revival took place in Germany, where the Jews were fighting for, and gradually gaining emancipation. Jewish children, out of the Ghetto, could read German, and their parents and educators, afraid that they would turn to the German popular novel, decided to adopt the genre as well. There was one particular sort that appealed to them - the historical novel, at its peak in Europe in the first two decades of the century. While adopting the historical novel reluctantly, so to speak, as a lesser evil, they discovered its didactic value, especially for young readers; and very soon they realized what a perfect vehicle it was for introducing new ideological notions. By a method of selection and manipulation of the historical data, that is, choosing convenient periods in Jewish history and rewriting them according to their needs, they could introduce new notions even more effectively than by means of pamphlets. The historical novel introduced innovations through “the back door”, so to speak. It could get to a much larger audience, includ-

ing women and children, and “work” directly through the emotions. For what can be more persuasive than identifying with the “good guys” and hating the “bad guys”?

I did some very intensive research about the subtle ideological indoctrination achieved through the tool of the popular novel, which uses far away periods in history to introduce modern Jewish thought, and strive for gradual modernization of the Jewish tradition, even a certain modernization of religious rites and customs. One of the more basic, profound changes was in the attitude to the dichotomy - Diaspora versus Return to Zion. Facing continuous attacks of being “a state within a state”, the German Jews wished to break away with the vow that bound them to the Holy Land and prove everlasting loyalty to their new homeland. Yet, abolishing the sacred vow never to forget Jerusalem was not an easy notion to introduce blatantly. The German Jewish historical novel of the nineteenth century joined forces with more serious forms of debate in breaking away with the traditional notion of the Diaspora as a temporary stage, and of the Messiah as the redeemer who will put an end to this stage and lead the people of Israel back to their homeland.²

Hundreds of historical stories and novels were published in Jewish newspapers and in books, some in serials that left the young readers with thumping hearts and glowing cheeks, eager to know what befell of their beloved heroes. And since the genre was gaining popularity, and Jewish historical novels met with great demand in Eastern Europe as well, the stories were soon translated into Hebrew and swept through Jewish communities there. This is done, however, with one modification: the ideology seeping through the stories could no longer be the same.

The situation of the Jews in Eastern Europe was in no way similar to that of the German Jews. Wave after wave of pogroms hit them throughout the century, and emancipation was nowhere in sight. The only hope was escape, and the old dream of returning to the homeland of the Forefathers revived in all its glory. For Russian or Polish Jews, the second half of the

nineteenth century was the era of national as well as cultural revival, the seeds of early Zionism were germinating, young people left their families and fled their old country homes, to settle in the land of Israel.

And, sure enough, the popular historical novels which they read with such enthusiasm (often secretly) were part of the emotional force that nurtured that national revival.

The transition is amazing: How was it possible for novels that had attempted to smother any national ideology in German Jews to become such an effective tool in the national revival of East European Jewry?

The answer is - mostly by translation. Mostly, because ideas do not spread just by reading, they tend to "seep through", with the help of "agents" such as reviews, literary salons and discussions. But most of the transformation was done by the translations.

The translations (today we would call them 'adaptations') of the popular German Jewish historical novels undertook the mission of replacing the ideology which was right for German Jews with one that would suit the needs of East European Jews. Some of them did so rather consciously, stating quite bluntly in their letters or in Translator's Notes that they considered it their duty to omit, add or alter certain components of the original. Other worked more subtly, with perhaps less awareness of their manipulation of the original texts. The result in the two cases was the same.

The modifications covered a wide scope of ideological themes: first and foremost, as mentioned above, the enhancement of the return to Zion and the condemnation of the Diaspora as a "temporary" period of exile. But other issues were tampered with as well. The New Jew, according to Eastern European standards, was to develop muscles, not only to deal with survival. Enlightenment and assimilation were no longer considered as the promise of a new era, but as deleterious, leading, in fact, to conversion and destruction of whole communities. The concept of a "national" Messiah, which would lead the Jews back to the Promised Land, was revived, in contrast with the German Jewish attempt to replace it with the concept of a "univer-

sal Messianism". Different periods in the Jewish history were highlighted, different heroes picked from the historical inventory. Biblical times, avoided by the authors of German Jewish historical novels so as not to emphasize the bond between the Jewish people and the land of their forefathers, was for that same reason a favourite background for their translations/adaptations, as well as for new historical novels written in Eastern Europe in Hebrew. And since these historical novels were later a basis for a new literature written in Israel up to the establishment of the state, adapted in countless school readers and magazines, their translations into Hebrew done in Israel are in a way their third ideological metamorphosis.

From the many examples of the process, let me just illustrate the point with examples of modifications of book titles. Bearing in mind what the function of the title is, and how it serves as the first and immediate advertisement of the novel, it is significant to study its alterations when no linguistic constraint is involved. Here are two typical examples of "translation" of titles:

The original, published in German in Leipzig, 1856-7, by Hermann Reckendorf: *Geheimnisse der Juden* [Mysteries, Secrets of the Jews].

The translation, in Hebrew, published in Warsaw, 1893, by Avraham Shalom Friedberg: *Zichronot le Beit David* [Memories of the House of David].

The book is a saga that covers twenty generations of the survivors of the House of King David in the Diaspora. The original ends with the promise of the Enlightenment and a hope for a new home for the Abarbanel family in Holland, where the hope of religious tolerance and civil rights is promised them. The "translation" ends with the failure of the Enlightenment and the promise of a new life in the land of Israel. The new title emphasizes the continuation of the seed of David, which, according to Jewish tradition, is where the Messiah will stem from.

The original, published in Berlin, in German, by Ludwig Philippson, 1866: *Sepphoris und Rom*.

The translation, by A.L.Yakobowic, in two volumes, published in Tel Aviv, 1950: *Ha Mered ha Acharon* [The Last Rebellion]; *Ha Gibor ha Shavui be Roma* [The Hero Captive in Rome].

The original creates an obvious dichotomy between the old world and the new one. Sepphoris, a northern town in the land of Israel, was the last to fall in the hands of the Roman Empire after the rebellion in the fourth century A.D. thus marking the end of the existence of a Jewish land. From then on, the novel advocates a new existence in the Diaspora. The translation rejected this reading and switched the emphasis to a new dichotomy: Rebellion and Captivity. The hero, the leader of the last rebellion, will eventually become a free man again and reject anything that Rome stands for.

* * *

Conclusion

One must of course beware of an over-simplification of a rather more complicated case. At the very moment the German Jews turned to Jewish history for themes, motives, symbols and, perhaps more than anything else, a repertoire of heroes, they could not but have ambivalent feelings about their national bond. In fact, the very denial of the feeling of pride in national myth and symbols, the denial of the strong emotional bond with the lost homeland paradoxically brought national feeling to the surface. And when Philippson describes the holy Land lying in ruins, he is too carried away by the tragic moment to persuade the reader with his new-world ideology, so that a "different reading" of the novels was possible without the alterations made by the translators.

But the point is not there. The point is in the realization that translation

is a powerful tool, which can and has been used for ideological manipulation.

Let me conclude by going back to the [so called verbatim] translations of the "word of God". In an Internet debate about the validity of the translation of the New Testament I found titles like "The Conspiracy Behind the New Bible Translations" (29.12.98) or "Should the Church Be Concerned About Bible Translations?" (29.12.98) I would like to quote a few lines from the latter, written by Marc A. Graham, D. Min.

"[...] If we cannot know that the Bible we read from is the completely accurate and divinely-preserved English translation of the original God-inspired manuscripts (1st Tim. 3-16), then no pastor or individual Christian may say that he knows what GOD HAS SAID with ANY DEGREE OF CERTAINTY! Thus, the work of the church degenerates into a chaotic conglomeration of conflicting human opinions on what man THINKS GOD HAS SAID!

It would be easy to see that Satan would have a vested interest in causing the above to happen. His chief program is attempting to deceive the church so that it will have little impact on a lost world (II Cor. 11:13-15). His first step in this diabolical strategy has, from the very beginning, been to cast doubt upon the Word of God [...] Clearly a clever link in the chain of Satan's strategy has been the flooding of the Christian landscape with a MULTITUDE OF BIBLE TRANSLATIONS."

This passage obviously brings the imagery of the (Satanic) power of translation 'ad absurdum'. Yet, not disregarding for a moment the belligerent demagogical rhetoric, it amplifies the awareness of the potential and the danger existing in translation manipulation.

Notes

¹ Kaestner, Erich 1985[1949]. *Das doppelte Lottchen* (Hamburg: Cecilie Dressler Verlag, Zuerich: Atrium). Hebrew translation - Kaestner 1962. *Ora Ha-kfula*,

translated by A. Kaplan (Jerusalem: Achiasaf). English translation - Kaestner 1980.
Lottie and Lisa, translated by Cyrus Brooks (London: Puffin).

² For a more detailed discussion of this topic see for example Ben-Ari, 1997.

References

- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1988. "Norms Underlying Translation of German Literature into English, French and Italian". Thesis submitted for an M.A. degree (Tel-Aviv University).
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1992. "Didactic and Pedagogic Tendencies in the Norms Dictating the Translation of Children's Literature". *Poetics Today* 13:1, 198-221.
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1993. "Historical Images and the Emergence of a New National Literary System". Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (Tel-Aviv University).
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1994. "The Historical Novel for Youth. In Search of National Identity Via the Adaptation of a New Genre." In: *Kinderliteratur im interkulturellen Prozess*, H.H.Ewers, G. Lenhert, E. O'Sullivan Hrsg. (Stuttgart: Metzler), 72-77.
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1997. "The Jewish Historical Novel Helps to Reshape the Historical Consciousness of German Jews." In: *Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought*. Sander L. Gilman & Jack Zipes eds (New Haven: Yale University Press), 143-151.
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa 1998. "The Ambivalent Case of Repetitions in Literary Translations". *Meta* 43:1, 68-78.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar 1990. *Polysystem Theory*. *Poetics Today* 11:1.
- Shavit, Zohar 1992. "Literary Interference Between German and Jewish-Hebrew Children's Literature During the Enlightenment: The Case of Campe". *Poetics Today* 13:1, 41-63.
- Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins).

Subversion, Sex and the State: The Censorship of Translations in Modern Japan

Judy WAKABAYASHI

Introduction

Despite the common perception amongst readers that a translation is a reflection of the original work, in reality a certain amount of distortion is introduced during this process. Often this occurs unconsciously and is an almost inevitable by-product of the differences between the two languages and cultures. Occasionally, however, the changes are the outcome of a deliberate process of manipulation at the ideological level in the form of additions, omissions (suppressions) and distortions aimed at controlling the message. Not only are translations affected by ideological considerations but they are also sometimes consciously used in an effort to shape the ideas and behaviour of readers, and hence they are far from innocent or transparent 'windows'. Censorship is an extreme example of the influence of ideology on translations. Translations sometimes act as a vehicle for introducing ideas regarded as subversive,¹ and so particularly in more authoritarian regimes they have at times been regarded with considerable suspicion.

Censorship of translations is difficult to delineate, verging as it does on various other practices such as editing, bowdlerization, abridgements for non-ideological reasons; and political correctness in relation to what is perceived to be discriminatory language. Here I will adopt the definition of ideological manipulation proposed in Ben-Ari's article elsewhere in this issue (43) - i.e. "any interference with the text, be it cultural, religious, political or otherwise, imposing modifications that are not due to textual con-

straints, for the purpose of indoctrination.” The phrase “for the purpose of indoctrination” is what distinguishes censorship from other forms of textual manipulation.

Typically, the censorship of translations is merely one aspect of a larger ideological project, and many of the reasons for policing translations - such as perceived unacceptability on moral, religious, military or political grounds - apply equally to original works.² Hence any discussion of the censorship of translations in Japan must be set against the broader background of Japanese censorship, which has generally been instigated in response to - and justified on the grounds of - particular crises or periods of change. In terms of the historical circumstances that enable or facilitate the censorship of translations, one possible explanation is that a perceived weakness in the target culture gives rise to the need to resist cultural assimilation and protect against foreign ‘incursions’ in the form of new ideologies (Ben-Ari 2000). War also frequently leads to the censorship of translations.

Nevertheless, translations may in fact be *less* likely than original works to be singled out for censorship in that “translation awards some kind of limited immunity to those who write it (after all, they are not responsible for what others wrote)” (Lefevere 1995, 23). Chang (1998, 251) suggests also that “as their context generally belongs to a foreign culture, the social impact of translated literary works is thought to be weaker.” What makes the censorship of translations of particular interest, however, is the fact that by definition the works being filtered in this way are of foreign origin, and hence their censorship might act as an indicator of foreign elements regarded as inadmissible or undesirable in the target culture, or as a pointer to unacceptable foreign views of the target culture. This may include features peculiar to the relationship between the source and target cultures, such as accounts of war between the two nations.

Censorship takes various forms, from the expurgation or rewriting of certain passages or the outright banning of an entire work after publication to more subtle forms such as the question of what is *not* selected for transla-

tion in the first place and even deliberate manipulation on the part of translators themselves. Intervention may occur in the form of a prohibition prior to publication (pre-censorship) or suspension after publication (post-censorship). It is typically based on the actual content of the source text (including illustrations), but may also be based on the language used in the translation or even on the translational approach adopted - i.e. the accuracy and acceptability of the translation itself.³

Post-publication censorship is only one form of censorship, albeit the most easily catalogued. It is almost impossible to identify works that have undergone ‘censorship’ in the form of rejection for publication, unless this takes the form of explicit pre-censorship. Nevertheless, the silent corpus of never-published translations should not be overlooked. Pym (1998, 70) describes the rejection of ‘undesirable’ translations prior to publication as one aspect of “negated translation”, and argues that such cases “imply a situation where the desired translation/performance was so important that someone didn’t want it to take place.” It would be mistaken, however, to assign sinister motives to all cases of rejected translations, as the reasons usually have nothing at all to do with censorship in the commonly accepted sense of the term.

Typical vehicles of controlling social expression include the government, courts and religious or military authorities, but censorship can also be exercised by publishers (who have the power to reject a work or require a rewriting) or the translation initiator, and even by minority groups. Sometimes the authority imposing censorship is simply reflecting the mores, taboos and beliefs of the community, but at other times the restraints run counter to general community standards. Translators themselves sometimes act as self-censors, and this may be acknowledged in translator’s notes that indicate the changes made, but their manipulation might be more subtle and less overt. Hall (1998, 152) observes that in Japan censorship is often voluntary when it comes to matters of national interest or issues affecting national sensitivities. Translators may also censor their own work as a pre-

emptive measure - Chang (1998, 250) has commented that "post-publication censorship in the form of criticism and punishment" ensures "pre-publication self-censorship through the manipulation of fear." Thus translators sometimes voluntarily initiate partial censorship for fear of an outright ban if the work is not watered down in some way - i.e. as part of a necessary and pragmatic strategy to secure publication.

Religious censorship

Violation of the target culture's sacred values occasionally gives rise to censorship of 'heretical' translations by religious or secular authorities. Such censorship was a feature of early modern Japan, with works that contained even passing references to Christianity being banned. The reasons were more political than religious, however, and censorship on religious grounds has played little role in modern Japan, perhaps because the Japanese are generally tolerant of other religions. There has, however, been one noteworthy case in recent years of an extreme form of translation 'censorship' motivated by the religious beliefs of people outside Japan. This was the 1991 murder of the translator of Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*, the Japanese version of which was published in 1990. Islamic studies specialist Professor Igarashi Hitoshi was stabbed to death by an unknown assailant, and although there is no definite proof of a connection between this controversial work and his death it is widely believed that he was murdered by Islamic opponents of Rushdie's book, as one part of the *fatwa* against Rushdie. Igarashi's murder did not, however, lead to the withdrawal of the translation, and so in this sense it failed as 'censorship' within Japan. No doubt, however, it gave pause to potential translators into other languages, and in fact some publishers elsewhere did refuse to produce a translation of this work.

Another recent case of religious-based censorship pertains to the Aum Supreme Truth cult that was responsible for the sarin gas attack on a Tokyo subway in 1995. Illustrations from comics that had previously been pub-

lished in Japan by Aum were censored by the publisher of a translation of a foreign work (Frederick Schodt's *Dreamland Japan: Writings on Modern Manga*, 1996) in which they were reproduced. This might indicate the publisher's desire to distance itself from these controversial excerpts, or it could suggest sensitiveness about how Japan is perceived and portrayed by foreigners.

Political censorship

In times of political repression translations deemed objectionable in the context of Japanese politics have sometimes been expurgated or banned. Kornicki (1998, 320) argues that "Both in terms of legislation and of enforcement, censorship was haphazard and unsystematic until after the Meiji Restoration" (1868), but the social upheaval ushered in by the Restoration led to much stricter regulations, although primarily the focus was on the media. Mitchell (1976, 22) comments that "in spite of the new Meiji government's promise to lay great emphasis upon public discussion (as embodied in the Charter Oath, April 6, 1868) the government ... passed ordinances to censor the press and to control other literature. In 1876, more systematic legislation was promulgated which located the seat of censorship in the Police Bureau of the Home Ministry. Any book regarded as harmful to public peace might be seized, and its printing press might be destroyed." Although the Meiji Constitution of 1889 guaranteed freedom of speech, writing and publication, this freedom could be restricted by Diet laws, and the constitution did not enshrine the rights of the individual.

In modern Japan a series of crises have prompted censorship of both original and translated works. The first was the 1877 Satsuma rebellion in southern Japan, and Rubin (1984, 4) argues that the ordinances issued at that time limiting free speech have constituted the core of all later censorship legislation. The next crisis triggering a round of censorship was the anti-government Freedom and People's Rights Movement of 1874-1890 that demanded a Diet and a democratic constitution. Around 1887 transla-

tions about the anti-tsarist, popularist Narodniki Movement in Russia were banned, no doubt because they might have incited anti-imperialist sentiment in Japan. Ishizaka (1983, 262) writes that under the repressive Publication Law of April 1893 "all published materials were to be registered with the government and a copy submitted to the Home Ministry for official inspection. The law decreed that any materials that were found to obstruct peace and order or to be morally corrupt would incur severe restraints on operations and harsh penalties for those publishers or individuals involved. As a means of protest and to avoid conflict with the censor, publishers often issued books and magazines with potentially offensive passages deleted (usually indicated by a row of circles or X's printed down the page) or replaced by blank spaces, a practice referred to as *fuseji*, in order to avoid prosecution." *Fuseji* were an indication of the overtness of censorship at this time - Rubin (1984, 31) notes that the Japanese believed "it was natural that a higher authority should exist, arrogantly expecting compliance." Conversely, *fuseji* were also an open but 'safe' way of objecting to censorship, and had the effect of forcing the omissions on readers' attention.⁴

Rubin (ibid., 4-5) observes that "The code empowered the police censors to strike without the inconvenience of having to set judicial machinery in motion and provided no route of appeal. Not only were the courts unavailable for the redress of unjust administrative action but they too were empowered by law to prosecute offenders, punishing convicts with fines and prison sentences when suppression alone was considered insufficient. In practical terms, a financial threat stood at the heart of the system, for it stressed the prohibition of sale and distribution of already-printed publications rather than prior assessment of manuscript." Rubin (ibid., 5) also comments on the cooperative aspect of censorship in Japan, which was manifest in "a self-policing mentality among publishers, who increasingly sought - and were granted - the privilege of informal "consultations" with censors before committing themselves to a press run".

In the early 1900s it was political writing that was the main target of

government censors, rather than literature. Rubin (ibid., 15) argues that "The Meiji government became seriously interested in controlling the content of literature only when the literature itself had become a serious art form after some four decades of experimentation." Nevertheless, these early years did witness the censorship of some literary translations. In 1901 *La Dame aux Camélias* by Dumas was banned, and in 1908 Molière's *Collected Works* and the second volume of Zola's *Paris* were proscribed. The year 1909 was particularly problematic, with Maupassant's *Collected Short Stories* being suppressed by the Home Ministry, along with Sienkiewicz's *Bez Dogmatu* and works by Tolstoy, Gorky and Andreev. Rubin (ibid., 149) comments that "The *Asahi* had contributed to the uproar in September [1910] with an article entitled "Dangerous Western Books" ..., which drew a storm of criticism by arguing for a ban on the import of all modern European literature as morally corrupting." Prohibited translations in 1913 included Zola's *Nana*, Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* and works of Tolstoy; in 1914 they included *Madame Bovary*, Maupassant's *Bel-Ami* and *Une Vie* (twice each), and Tolstoy's play *The Power of Darkness*. *Madame Bovary* was banned yet again in 1916, as was Boccaccio's *The Decameron*.

The main focus at this time, however, was on political works. In 1904 the socialists Kôtoku Shûsui and Sakai Toshihiko were the first to translate Marx's *Communist Manifesto* into Japanese, publishing their abridged version in the *Heimin Shimbun* (People's Newspaper). Publication was immediately suspended, however, and Kôtoku was imprisoned for five months for violating the 1875 Press Ordinance. Tamai (1983, 252) comments that "After 1910 the government intensified the repression of the socialist movement, and all socialist-related material was banned retroactively to 1899."⁵ Nevertheless, this was followed by the relatively liberal 1920s and a boom in the translation of proletarian works. Rubin (1984, 231) argues that in the Taisho period (1912-1926) "the censors relaxed somewhat, and informal consultations between publishers and censors played a major role." He notes (ibid., 27) that such protests against censorship as did occur at this time took

the form not of appeals on the grounds of the rights of the individual but pragmatic requests from publishers that censorship take place prior to (not after) publication so as to minimize the financial risk. Nevertheless, after the introduction of the Peace Preservation Law of 1925 works by Lenin, the communist editor and politician Bukharin, and the anarchist communist Kropotkin were banned, along with works by the American novelist Sinclair Lewis and the *Kama Sutra* (Tamai 1983, 253).

Economic woes, political corruption and the apparent failure of democracy around the end of the Taishō period led to growing influence on the part of right-wing military patriots. This coincided with a boom in publishing, and the sheer volume of publications led to an end of the informal consultations with the Police Bureau in 1927. As Rubin (*ibid.*, 231-2) points out, however, “In 1930 a good deal of Marxist theory was still appearing in print, and an occasional arrest was considered, if anything, good advertising. [...] The crucial turning point was the Manchurian Incident of 1931, after which the exigencies of war became the rationale for a tightened grip on the minds of the people. The crackdown on communism expanded to the suppression of left-leaning cultural and literary groups that had heretofore been considered legal.” With the rise of militarism during the 1930s, translations of leftist literature were strictly censored, and with the Greater East Asia War the importation of Western works came to a virtual halt. Yan (1999, 22) comments that “the steadily building crescendo of nationalism strengthened xenophobia in Japan to the point where ... if you wanted to read European or American literature, you had to do it behind closed doors.” Fictional status was no protection, and the censored translations included works by H.G. Wells and James Joyce as well as by many Russians. Mitchell (1976, 229 and 270) provides the following statistics on foreign publications whose entry, sale or distribution was prohibited:

	Prohibited entry	Books and other general publications prohibited sale and distribution	Periodicals prohibited sale and distribution	Total
1921	4	17	29	50
1922	9	39	40	88
1923	4	31	11	46
1924	1	4	13	18
1925	1	19	6	26
1926	0	8	3	11
1927	2	13	5	20
1928	1	2	5	8
1929	1	34	29	64
1930	5	74	53	132
1931	1	64	52	117
1932	2	102	274	378
1933	7	260	945	1,212
1934	No figure	186	723	909
1935	No figure	332	1,330	1,662

This seems to indicate a relaxation of censorship in the democratic years of the mid-1920s, followed by an upsurge from 1929. Mitchell cautions, however, against relying too much on statistics, and notes (*ibid.*, 339) that “measurement of repression inflicted by the censorship system is difficult. There are no statistics for books, articles, and plays that prudent writers did not produce ...” - and the same goes for translations.

War-related censorship

Wars, martial law and totalitarian regimes often lead to the outright suppression of information deemed a threat to national security, and World

War II (Japan's involvement spanned the years between 1937 and 1945, including the war with China) was regarded by the Japanese authorities as justification for censoring 'undesirable' translations. No longer was the English language taught at Japanese schools, and foreign literature - including Anatole France, Charles Baudelaire, André Gide, Somerset Maugham and Pearl Buck - was banned by the militarists. Some 628 foreign books and 1,492 foreign periodicals were prohibited, many of which reported on Chinese resistance to the Japanese (Tamai 1983, 254). One means of self-regulation was the prior approval system that commenced in 1942, whereby the Japan Publishing Culture Association's permission for publication was required before receiving printing paper, which was in short supply (Rubin 1984, 271). When the war ended there was an outpouring of previously suppressed literature, despite certain ongoing restrictions during the Occupation. The Japanese were starved of reading matter, and in particular they wanted to read foreign works, especially those from nations that had defeated Japan.

After the lifting of wartime censorship one might have expected a shift from the idealized portrayal of Japan's activities during the war to a more realistic portrayal. Yet even today the Japanese remain sensitive as to how their wartime activities are described, and translations of works discussing Japan's wartime atrocities sometimes face various forms of censorship. For instance, a recent controversial American bestseller about the 1937 Nanking Massacre in China, *The Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II* by Iris Chang (1997), chronicles various atrocities and rapes by Japanese soldiers and alleges that there is a conspiracy of silence in Japan to cover up these events. Right-wing Japanese groups who claim that the massacre never took place threatened Kashiwa Shobo Publishing Co. when it tried to release a translation, even though Kashiwa also intended to release a supplement criticizing the book's claims. These threats were in all likelihood at least partially instrumental in Kashiwa's decision to cancel its translation contract with the American publisher, Basic Books, although the edi-

tor-in-chief maintains they decided against publishing the translation because the book was biased. The original contract had stated that no changes were to be made without the author's consent, but Chang refused to agree to Kashiwa's request to make 'corrections', add notes and disclaimers and eliminate certain illustrations. The Japanese publisher insists publicly that the decision to withdraw was not in response to pressure from groups opposed to the book and that "his company was pressing forward with plans to publish other titles that examine Japanese war crimes", but he had earlier admitted in an e-mail to the author that publishing the book put his firm "in a life-threatening situation" (Carvajal 1999). Basic Books is now seeking another Japanese publisher, and Kashiwa is to publish a separate book listing the errors in Chang's work, whose reliability and accuracy has been questioned even within the United States. Some believe that Chang's refusal to allow any changes is simply a political and publicity stunt. Moreover, other foreign publications about the Nanking Massacre have appeared in Japan, so this may not be a clear-cut case of censorship, yet it seems likely that pressure from right-wing groups contributed to the cancellation of this contract.

Externally-imposed censorship during the Occupation

The end of World War II witnessed a shift in the seat of authority for censorship, with this role now moving to the Allied Occupation authorities. Yet the initial indications during the Occupation (1945-1952) were positive. For instance, the Freedom of Speech and Press Directive that was published on 10 September 1945 by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) stated that "there shall be an absolute minimum of restrictions upon freedom of speech. Freedom of discussion of matters affecting the future of Japan is encouraged by the Allied Powers unless such discussion is harmful to the efforts of Japan to emerge from defeat as a new nation entitled to a place among the peace-loving nations of the world." (cited in Braw 1991, 27). Of course, the sting lies in the caveat, but nevertheless the

Board of Information, which had been responsible for wartime censorship, was abolished on 31 December 1945. Moreover, Article 21 of the new Constitution that came into effect on 3 May 1947 states that "No censorship shall be maintained".

In reality, however, as Braw (1991, 28) points out, "only the censorship masters had changed". Selden (1991, ix) writes that "U.S. censors set out to mold Japanese public opinion, to shield the United States from public criticism, and to preserve a U.S. monopoly on information pertaining to the effects of the atomic bomb on its victims." Although recognizing that censorship is common in occupied territories, Braw (1991, 31) notes that these measures "clearly clashed with the swift actions to demilitarize and democratize Japan". Nishimura (1989, 21), however, argues that there was a crucial difference in that whereas war-time censorship by the Japanese authorities "would never have been terminated, for it was designed to sustain and perpetuate Japanese imperialism", censorship by the Occupation authorities was implemented purely as an interim measure.

Censorship was carried out under the aegis of the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD) of SCAP, with some input from Washington. In 1946 the CCD had 8,734 staff, nearly all of whom were Japanese or Korean nationals because few of the Allied forces were capable of reading Japanese. These censors had to translate questionable works into English, preserving the nuances of the Japanese so that a decision on their fate could be made.

The rules of censorship were laid down in the Press Code that came into force on 18 September 1949, but were vague and inconsistent rather than exacting. Firstly, the prohibited subjects were not stated explicitly, although in reality this covered criticism of SCAP, the US and the Allies, and the Occupation forces; criticism of Japanese treatment in Manchuria; criticism of the Allies' prewar policies; Third World War comments; militaristic or other propaganda; and justification or defence of war criminals. It was forbidden to write about Emperor Hirohito as a ruler, call for the end of the Occupation or a peace treaty, or publish the results of atomic tests (Braw

1991, 63-67). Although restrictions mainly targeted original writing, some translations were also involved. For instance, the translation of John Hersey's 1946 work *Hiroshima*, which consists of interviews with six survivors of the atomic bomb, was not allowed to be published until 1949.

The second area of vagueness was the fact that "the authorities ... did not state the punishment for violations - although it was clear that there were such punishments" (Braw 1991, 44). The usual penalty was temporary suspension of publication, resulting in financial losses, while other punishments included warnings, a return to prepublication censorship (rather than post-censorship), and withdrawal of copies already distributed. Mitchell (1976, 23) notes that objectionable material was "placed under ban without trial. Appeals to courts were not allowed - the administrative decision was final." In contrast to the overtness of censorship under the Japanese authorities, discussion of the very existence of censorship was prohibited, and Rubin (1984, 31) hypothesizes that the Occupation authorities felt this need for secrecy because censorship ran counter to their "egalitarian background". Summing up, then, censorship by the Occupation authorities was rather haphazard and changeable, but was still quite effective in stifling discussion and controlling information.

Most censorship during the Occupation eventually took the form of post-censorship, because the sheer volume of publications ruled out extensive pre-censorship. Thus the onus was again placed on publishers themselves, who refrained from printing questionable works so as to avoid "trouble, costs, and possible punishment" (Braw 1991, 80). Censorship also encompassed foreign news coverage, and only acceptable foreign versions of reality were allowed to be presented in the Japanese media. Tamai (1983, 254) notes that "SCAP ... drew up a blacklist of correspondents for foreign newspapers and news services, forbidding the publication in Japanese newspapers of translations of their dispatches."

Nishi (1982, 103) observes that "MacArthur's desire to control the flow of foreign news into Japan was obvious from the beginning, when he

issued the so-called *Circular No. 12 entitled Admission of Foreign Magazines, Books, Motion Pictures, News and Photograph Services, et cetera, and Their Dissemination in Japan*. These materials could be brought into Japan, provided they were 'not detrimental to the purpose of the Occupation' - with GHQ deciding what was 'detrimental.' There was also a gradual shift in the nature of the works censored. Initially "leftists were encouraged as a counterweight to the old rightists and militarists" (Braw 1991, 79) and the Soviet Union was included in the list of Allied powers that could not be criticized, but as the Cold War developed leftists came to be perceived as a threat and it became permissible to publish material critical of the Soviet Union. Nishi (1982, 103) writes that "Translation of theoretical works on communism was discouraged. *Das Kapital* suffered a temporary suspension." A translation of Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China*, which described the author's life with Mao Zedong, appeared in December 1946, but was banned. Another notable case was the translation of Helen Mears' 1949 book *Mirror for Americans*. Satô (1995, 17) describes it as "a sober look at the postwar U.S.-Japanese relationship at its incipient stage", but it was "so bluntly critical of the premises on which the Occupation was based" that General MacArthur personally reviewed it and prohibited publication, despite his professed abhorrence of censorship. Mears argued that Occupation policies were based on exaggerated and distorted images of Japan as militaristic and expansionist, and she presented some less-than-benign images of the Occupation forces. The translation did not appear until after the Peace Treaty of 1952, and since the recent 'rediscovery' of Mears' original work after a new translation appeared in 1995 it has attracted some attention in Japan.

Gradually restrictions were eased, and on 31 October 1949 formal censorship was abolished on the grounds that Japan was now sufficiently democratic. Braw (1991, 79) points out that increasing access to material from abroad meant it had become more difficult "to control the image of the world in the minds of the Japanese". Yet despite the relaxation of censor-

ship, the intensification of the Cold War in 1949 meant restrictions remained on publications about China and the Soviet Union. The Civil Information and Education Section (CI & E) also "acquired the power to ban translations by requiring that all works that fell under international copyright law be granted permission prior to publication" (Tamai 1983, 254).

Another aspect of ideology in relation to translations is patronage, whereby the canon is actively shaped by certain authorities through the selection of texts conforming to their notion of a desirable canon. After the war the American Embassy and Occupation forces had a great say in what was translated into Japanese. On 5 December 1946 GHQ sent out a circular to Allied Forces facilities about the importance of foreign magazines and books, opening up the way for acquiring the rights to translate foreign works through an approval system. The CI & E instituted a system of competitive bidding for the right to translate Western books. The first bidding was held on 5 June 1948, when 76 American and 24 British books were on display, of which 91 received successful bids (Sato 1987, 17). The highest bid was the Mainichi Newspaper's bid of 36% for a 1944 work called *Ten Years in Japan* by former U.S. ambassador to Japan, Joseph C. Grew. The 2-volume translation was published in 1948 and was very popular - Grew was pro-Japanese, and the Japanese felt he was their ally. The CI & E set up a translation committee, consisting mainly of university professors, to check the quality of the translations, which had to be approved before they could be published (ibid., 20). Nevertheless, only about 40 percent of the works approved for translation by GHQ were published as being suited to the Japanese market (Kawasaki 1950, 11). The bidding system was unpopular, and publishers complained about the unilateral control of translation, so in 1949 after 14 rounds of bidding GHQ allowed certain approved American, British and French agents to set up shop in Japan, opening the way for further translations.

Anti-American sentiments heightened from about 1951, and publishing circles reflected this mood. At the end of that year a translation of Mark

Gayn's *Japan Diary* was published, and this inside account of the Occupation by a journalist became a best-seller in 1952, but the publisher was called in by GHQ for investigation (Sato 1987, 39). Works that did not receive permission included Erskine Caldwell's play *Tobacco Road* (owing to its portrayal of the less savoury aspects of American society) and his *Journeyman*, although they were eventually published. Publication of *The Case of General Yamashita* (1949), a critical look at Yamashita's trial from a humanitarian viewpoint by Frank Reel, one of Yamashita's defence counsel, was suppressed, but this simply aroused greater interest (ibid., 40). It was attacked by the Americans on the grounds that it criticized Occupation policies and violated the press code, and they claimed it might incite riots, thereby prolonging the Occupation. At the time Japanese publishing circles were treading a fine line between criticizing America and fearing its authority, so the publisher abandoned the translation. After the conclusion of the peace treaty a different publisher quickly published a translation in June 1952 (ibid., 134). General Yamashita had been popular and many regretted his death by hanging in 1946, so this translation became a bestseller.

Obtaining permission to translate a foreign work was difficult, as GHQ would find excuses not to allow works that criticized the United States or praised the Japanese military. It often took years to publish translations of problematic works because the CI & E just kept on saying the application was 'being processed', without formally refusing permission (ibid., 133). Despite these problems, there was a great and growing desire for information from abroad, as indicated in the following table from Satô (1987, 192):

Year	Total no. of works translated	No. of American works	% represented by American works
1948	7,937	1,105	13.92
1949	9,164	1,189	12.97
1950	12,561	1,460	11.62
1951	16,835	2,174	12.91

In 1950 Kawasaki (1950, 14) lamented the fact that, influenced by *après-guerre* sentiments, some translators were rendering foreign works into very 'forward' Japanese, so that foreign slang referring to sex and bodily functions was 'brazenly' translated or material was added. This aroused the ire of the conservative and over-sensitive Japanese censors. For instance, the best-selling translation of Norman Mailer's *The Naked and the Dead* was banned in January 1950 by the Japanese Police Headquarters - although this ban was subsequently overturned by GHQ on the grounds that it was "anti-democratic" (Nishi 1982, 103).

Moral censorship

One of the most common motives for censorship is moral grounds, with works or passages whose content or language is regarded as obscene, demeaning or sexually immoral being particularly likely targets for sanitization by conservative authorities who act as an arbiter of morals. Although in many ways the Japanese are franker than Westerners about physical references and sexual matters in print (witness the open way in which pornographic Japanese adult comics are read on trains in Japan),⁶ in other ways they are more conservative. For instance, it is only in the last decade that the practice of blacking out pubic hair in nude photos - even in works of art - has ceased. It is interesting, then, to examine cases of censorship imposed on puritanical grounds, as well as the question of whether Japanese translators themselves have made changes to accommodate the tastes of their readers.

Allison (1996, 163) argues that obscenity laws were originally introduced in Japan to demonstrate to the West that Japan was not 'primitive', a charge that had been levelled at it because of such practices as mixed bathing and nursing babies in public. To gain credibility, the government proscribed such practices and formulated a concept of "public morals". Allison (ibid., 164) argues, however, that this placed Japan in an ambivalent position - "On the one hand, the attempt was made to reform Japan by eliminat-

ing the differences that it posed to, and that were disparaged by, western culture. On the other hand, censorship was invoked in order to protect Japan's own social body from being infiltrated and de-formed by western influence."

What is regarded as morally (un)acceptable not only varies from society to society, but also changes over time within a particular community - and not always in a more liberal direction. For instance, *A selection of seven tales from Decamerone* was translated by Ôkubo Kanzaburô in 1882 under the provocative title *Ôshû jôfu gumpô kiwa* (European Tales of Passion: Strange Stories of Assorted Beauties). Yet translations of *Decameron* were banned in 1910 and in 1916, no doubt because of the sexual content. Similarly, Nagai Kafû's translation of Zola's *Nana*, the story of a prostitute, appeared in 1894 and his summary-translation, *Joyû Nana* (The Actress Nana), was published in 1903, but a 1913 translation of this work was banned. Such examples suggest that a more conservative atmosphere may have prevailed in the early years of the Taishô period than at the end of the nineteenth century.

In the increasingly authoritarian 1930s the translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses* had some of the overtly sexual passages expurgated. Without doubt, however, the most notable instance involving alleged obscenity was the translation of D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. An abridged version had appeared without incident in 1936, but the 1950 complete edition by the same translator was banned. The police seized copies of the translation and the translator Itô Sei was indicted along with his publisher for violating the obscenity provisions of Article 175 of the Criminal Code. Their appeal on the grounds of freedom of expression was rejected by the Supreme Court in 1956. Burks (1985, 43) comments that "The Court chose to enunciate a general principle for the sake of public welfare, whereby expression is not an unrestricted freedom. An "obscene writing," one that offends the normal sense of shame and runs counter to "proper concepts of sexual morality," cannot be freely published even if it is an artistic compo-

sition." Other abridged versions of this work appeared in 1952 and 1955, and apparently in some editions the twelve 'objectionable' parts that had to be omitted from the translation were included in the original English at the back of the book. At least for readers capable of accessing the English, this no doubt heightened the impact of these sections even more than if they had appeared in context. Moreover, it is possible that the very act of censorship creates an underground market, attracting even greater interest to the illicit work than would otherwise have been the case. Certainly the banning of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* led to the existence of pirated versions.

Tamai (1983, 254) points out that since the end of the Occupation "obscenity has been the primary target of publication controls". *Fanny Hill*, the 1749 erotic Scottish work by John Cleland, which was translated by two different translators in 1951, and Henry Miller's *Sexus* (translated in 1954) were both banned. Another famous case was the litigation over the abridged translation in 1960 of Marquis de Sade's *The Travels of Juliette*. The translator, Shibusawa Tatsuhiko, and the publisher, Ishii Kyôji, were indicted for the sale and possession for sale of obscene writings. Although initially acquitted, they were eventually found guilty in the Supreme Court. Hayashi (1978, 23) concludes that despite the guilty verdict the Supreme Court "slightly relaxed the standards by which obscenity was to be judged." Then in 1969 the police seized copies of the translation of *Emanuelle* and prohibited its sale (after 22,000 copies had already been sold). Of course, most of these works were also controversial in their country of origin.

One area that seems to be a particular target for self-censorship by translators is that of female sexuality. Cherry (1987, 15) argues that "Information that might liberate women's views of their sexuality also seems to be taboo." For instance, led by a woman translator, in 1974 the translators of the American classic *Our Bodies, Ourselves: A Book By and For Women* omitted a great deal from their translation. As Cherry points out, "Unnecessary - and thus untranslated - subjects included the Pill and lesbianism." This voluntary censorship was later reversed when in 1988 *The New Our*

Bodies, Ourselves was translated by a volunteer team of 23 translators and 25 editors. This more recent project not only included information that had earlier been omitted, but in a proactive feminist undertaking it also entailed the coining of new Japanese terms for female body parts. Buckley (1996, 186) writes that "The translators saw the negatively marked and highly specialized vocabulary that had been traditionally used to describe and diagnose the female body as a major factor in the widely perceived inability of women to articulate their individual experience of their own bodies. On this basis it was decided to create a new Japanese vocabulary that would be more accessible and less alienating for women seeking a language in which to speak their physical pain or pleasure." One of the translators, Nakanishi Toyoko, relates in Buckley (ibid., 193) how they developed a new vocabulary, giving both the existing medical term and the new word on its first occurrence before dropping the medical word. "For example, we frequently opted to replace the character for "blood" with the character for "sexuality" in words describing a female bodily function. We were aiming at positively redefining these functions as sexual, rather than negatively marking them as polluted." This is an example of reverse or positive 'censorship', and these feminist coinages have the effect of foregrounding these terms/concepts and drawing attention to the translation process.

A case of self-censorship that seems to have been based on eliminating references promoting an active sexual role for women involves the 1982 translation of Colette Dowling's pop psychology book *The Cinderella Complex: Women's Hidden Fear of Independence* (1981). When Cherry (1987, 14) observes that "... *The Cinderella Complex* became a bestseller in Japan after it appeared in translation, conveniently cleansed of any examples that could be interpreted as advocating free sex.", it is not clear if she is implying that the very act of censorship was a cause of its popularity. Yet it was not only explicitly sexual references that were omitted - Cherry (ibid., 14) also points out that the female translator, Kimura Harumi, deliberately omitted all specific case histories and any references to the 'dangerous' topics of

women's anger and mother-daughter conflicts, and "She also eliminated ideas based on psychoanalysis because it's "not common knowledge" in Japan. [...] To explain how her method does deepen cross-cultural understanding, she quotes the Japanese saying: Eat the most digestible parts first, an approach she says is necessary with foreign cultures." In a translator's afterword, Kimura claims that she felt an affinity with the work, but states that she has omitted the parts that are tedious or do not fit in with Japanese circumstances. A complete version of this work was produced in 1985 by the renowned male translator Yanase Naoki. Cherry (ibid., 15) notes that "A Japanese magazine for translators ran a feature contrasting the two versions and giving comments from readers, who mostly said they felt Kimura had "fabricated" her version."

Commenting on "[f]ictional sex with a feminist slant", Cherry (ibid., 15) observes that "Although the Japanese are not prudish about male-oriented pornography, sex scenes enjoyed by the feminist cave woman Ayla in Jean Auel's novel *Valley of the Horses* were removed from the Japanese translation - even though its Japanese title was the more suggestive equivalent of *Ayla in Love*." (This was translated by a woman in 1987.) Translators - usually women - of the popular Harlequin romances are also expected to temper the love scenes to the tastes of Japanese women readers (Shimotsuki 1992). Thus it seems that women translators are often complicit in the censorship of works that present an 'unacceptable' view of women and their sexuality. Nevertheless, Mulhern (1989, 58) found that in Sanrio romances, which are original works by Japanese women, the typical heroine is, "perhaps predictably in view of Japan's postwar policies to encourage birth control and provide safe legal abortions under the Eugenics Protection Law of 1948, ... quite free from sexual repression". There seems to be a contradiction here between the handling of Japanese women's sexuality in at least some translations and its treatment in these original works, suggesting that either the sample is too small to be representative or that there are different standards of acceptability for foreign and domestic works on this topic.

Not all censorship on moral grounds, however, revolves around sexuality or obscenity. Nolte (1987, 102-3) records that in Hermann Sudermann's *Magda* "the heroine defied her father ..., a ... serious breach of traditional Japanese morality" that ended with his death by a stroke. In Meiji times the Police Bureau prohibited performance⁷ of the play until Shimamura Hogetsu added a declaration by *Magda* that the fault was entirely hers.

Censorship by minority groups

References to the *burakumin*, an ethnic minority group,⁸ have also been the occasional target of censorship in Japanese translations of foreign works. This is an instance in which the censorship emanates not from the culturally or politically most dominant group, but from a small but increasingly powerful minority who feel that their community has been portrayed in a negative light. Cherry (1987, 16) claims that "Publishers confess freely that they censor all references to Japan's former outcast groups" For instance, the section on *burakumin* was expurgated from the 1976 translation of Jack Seward's *Japanese in Action*, and such references were also expunged from the translation of former U.S. ambassador Edwin Reischauer's *The Japanese* (1977). Cherry (*ibid.*, 14) also notes that in 1980 "The translation of *Shogun*, James Clavell's popular novel set in feudal Japan, was stripped of its graphic references to the former outcast class after descendants of this minority group protested." As recently as 1992 the word *burakumin* was not allowed to be used in the translation of Michael Crichton's *Rising Sun*. McGregor (1995, 19) observes that *Rising Sun* "featured a *burakumin* character in an attempt to make a point about discrimination in Japan. In the Japanese translation of the book, the words "burakumin" were left out completely, and in the film, the woman character's lines in English were jarringly dubbed over with another voice, so that the subtitles were silent on the controversial issue."

Conclusion

Various instances of translation censorship in Japan have been outlined here, but as David Olson (Honyaku mailing list, 18.9.1999) observes, "The real question is: are there underlying patterns to what gets edited/censored? What do those underlying patterns tell us (in this case, about the Japanese intellectual establishment)." Were there supra-systemic forces rather than local influences at work as to which translatorial voices were silenced? I have tried to demonstrate here that censorship of translations in Japan was often a reaction to crisis or social change - although often it seems also to have been haphazard or even whimsical. There is no assurance that the cases mentioned here are a representative sample, even though they are generally well-known instances, and this makes it difficult to substantiate any claims as to underlying ideological causes or consistent bias. And most importantly, focusing on censorship runs the risk of presenting a distorted image, ignoring the far greater number of works that have not been subjected to censorial practices.⁹

Notes

- ¹ Obviously translations are not always seditious or stretching the boundaries of what is acceptable; they can also function in the opposite direction as a conservative force.
- ² Ben-Ari (2000) raises the question of the type of ideology that is prone to interfere with texts, but we could also ask what ideologies in translated texts are prone to be on the receiving end of such interference. The answers to these questions represent opposite sides of the same coin.
- ³ Delisle and Woodsworth (1995, 142) also suggest the possibility of a reaction against translation at certain times in history on the grounds that it does not involve original creation.

- ⁴ *Fuseji* had been banned by the Home Ministry in 1885, but the ban was not enforced until 1941. Rubin (1984, 31) argues that at that time "The authorities were apparently less worried about Japanese than foreign readers . . . : the rational [sic] for finally doing away with this long-established practice lay in the need for presenting a united front", as *fuseji* would have suggested "to the enemy that there was division within the country."
- ⁵ In 1910 a translation of a French book on entomology was inadvertently banned because the title *Konchû Shakai* (Insect Society) included the word 'society' (Rubin 1984, 149).
- ⁶ This raises the question of whether there are two different standards for obscenity - one for foreign works, and a looser standard for Japanese works.
- ⁷ "The script version had been printed in *Waseda bungaku* two months earlier and had circulated freely" (ibid., 102-3).
- ⁸ The *burakumin* are ethnic Japanese who have traditionally been associated with professions such as slaughtering that are regarded as 'unclean' by Buddhists, and even today there is considerable prejudice against them, despite a very active association campaigning on their behalf.
- ⁹ For instance, despite the undoubted censorship that did exist during the Occupation, many more foreign books were accepted for publication. Nishi (1982, 103) quotes the following statistics for the period between September 1945 and December 1950, broken down by country of origin: USA, 1,583; France, 657; Germany, 466; Britain, 452; USSR, 282; Italy, 64; China, 52 and miscellaneous, 282.

References

- Allison, Anne. *Permitted and Prohibited Desires: Mothers, Comics, and Censorship in Japan*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa. "Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts". *Translation Quarterly*. 16-17, 2000, 40-52.
- Braw, Monica. *The Atomic Bomb Suppressed: American Censorship in*

- Occupied Japan*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1991.
- Buckley, Sandra. *Broken Silence: Voices of Japanese Feminism*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1997.
- Burks, Ardath W. "Japan: The Bellwether of East Asian Human Rights?" in James C. Hsiung, *Human Rights in East Asia: A Cultural Perspective*. New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1985; 31-53.
- Carvajal, Doreen. "History's Shadow Foils Nanking Chronicle", *New York Times*, 20 May 1999.
- Chang, Nam Fung. "Politics and Poetics in Translation: Accounting for a Chinese Version of 'Yes Prime Minister'". *The Translator*, 4, 2, 1998, 249-272.
- Cherry, Kittredge. "Translation or Transgression?", *PHP Intersect*, 3, 1987, 14-16.
- Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth, eds. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.
- Hall, Ivan P. *Cartels of the mind: Japan's intellectual closed shop*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1998.
- Hayashi Shuzo. "Supreme Court Rulings on Constitutional Issues." *Japan Echo*, V, 3, Autumn 1978, 17-30. (Translated from "Sengô 'kenpô saiban' somekuri" in *Seiron*, June 1978).
- Ishizaka Etsuo. "Publication Law of 1893", *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan* 6, 1983, 262.
- Kawasaki Takeichi. "Wadai no hon'yaku o oote". *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō*, 15-12, 1950, 11-14.
- Kornicki, P. *The Book in Japan - A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1998.
- Lefevere, André. "Translation: Its Genealogy in the West", in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History and Culture*, London: Cassell, 1995, 14-28.
- McGregor, Richard. "'Untouchables' finger Japanese book publisher." *The Australian*, 4 March 1995, 19.

- Mitchell, Richard H. *Thought Control in Prewar Japan*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976.
- Mulhern, Chieko Irie "Japanese Harlequin Romances as Transcultural Woman's Fiction." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 48, 1, February 1989, 50-70.
- Nishi Toshio. *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan 1945-1952*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.
- Nishimura Sey. "Medical censorship in occupied Japan." *Pacific Historical Review* 58, 1989, 1-21.
- Nolte, Sharon H. *Liberalism in Modern Japan: Ishibashi Tanzan and His Teachers, 1905-1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Pym, Anthony. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998.
- Rubin, Jay. *Injurious to Public Morals: Writers and the Meiji State*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1984.
- Sato Hiroaki. "Shattering the Mirror That Distorts Japan", *The Japan Times*, 25 December 1995, 17.
- Selden, Mark. Preface to Braw (1991), ix-xi.
- Shimotsuki Keiko. Interview in *Tsûyaku honyaku jânaru* (Magazine for International Communicators), October 1992, 78-79.
- Tamai Kensuke "Censorship." *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, 1983, 1, 251-255.
- Yan Sogiru "Literature that transcends borders." *Japanese Book News*, 25, 1999, 22.

A Cry for Identity: A Case Study of Maori-English Cultural Translation

Akiko UCHIYAMA

'Hoea ra nga waka
E te iwi e,
Hoea hoea ra,
Aotea, Tainui, Kurahaupo,
Hoea hoea ra.

Toia mai nga waka
E te iwi e,
Hoea hoea ra,
Mataatua, Te Arawa,
Takitimu, Tokomaru,
Hoea hoea ra.'

Maori writer Patricia Grace's first collection of English short stories, *Waiariki* (1975), ends with a Maori canoe song. The protagonist of the last story, Mawai, starts to sing the song, joined by the others around her, "Calling on the strength of the people" (1975: 89). The song creates a strong communal voice of her people not only of the present but also of the past and the future.

Language is the main concern in *Waiariki*. Grace interspersed Maori words, Maori syntax and word order in her English writing, which she explains as "experimenting a lot with language" (Grace, in Tausky 1991: 93). Her experiment met with both criticism and exalted praise. Norman Simms

regards the parts of her writing which entail more Maoriness as annoying, claiming that "one feels one is simply reading a poor translation, not an original English tale" (1978: 190). Rachel Nunns, in a more moderate fashion, states that some "stories are written almost as though they are translations from Maori" (1979: 417). Although the use of two languages in a single text is not what is normally regarded as 'translation,' I intend in this article to examine *Waiariki* as a 'cultural translation' of Maori into English, moreover 'translation' from a minority culture into a dominant culture. Translation, in its basic definition, is to express something (written in one language) in another language. In a broader sense, Grace's effort to express her Maori culture in another language (English) can be perceived as 'translation,' in the same way that some African writers regard their (original) writing in European languages as translation (Adejunmobi 1998: 164). Translation is a meeting point of two languages and cultures. I define here 'cultural translation' as translation from a source culture into a target language/culture where the target material is seen as cultural hybridity. I will investigate common elements shared between Grace's 'cultural translation' and translation involved in a dominant-dominated relationship and consider what implications her writing has for translation.

Historical and Personal Background

The Maori people had occupied the land of New Zealand for about one thousand years at the time of early European contact. Estimates of the Maori population in the 1770s range from 120,000 to 150,000, but by the 1840s their numbers had declined to around 100,000. On conclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, New Zealand became a British colony, a change which underpinned more systematic colonisation. New diseases introduced by the Europeans devastated the Maori population, which dropped to less than 60,000 at the time of the first census in 1858. By the 1860s the Maori people

had become a minority group to the European settlers, and today nearly 80 percent of the New Zealand population is of European origin. Maoris represent about 14.5 percent of the population, followed by Pacific Island people at 5.6 percent (*Yearbook* 1998: 100).

Patricia Grace, born in 1937 to a mother of Irish descent and a Maori father, grew up in two worlds: a Pakeha (European) one in the city and a Maori one in the country. She lived her childhood in the city of Wellington and spent weekends and holidays with her father's relatives, living on ancestral land in the country. This dual background is not uncommon - as Margaret Orbell observes: "During the last 150 or so years there has been much intermarriage, so much that nearly all Maoris are now of mixed descent and many Europeans have a Maori ancestor somewhere in their family history" (1978: 252). Grace herself describes her upbringing as being mainly in a Pakeha environment, and she did not speak the Maori language among her father's people. Nevertheless, she has always identified herself as a Maori and strongly felt the need to preserve her Maori inheritance, a feeling she claims to have had even when she was small (Grace, in Tausky 1991: 91).

Grace started writing at the age of 25, while teaching Maori children in a country school. Her debut story appeared some years later in an anthology, *Contemporary Maori Writing*, published in 1970. Her first collection of short stories, *Waiariki* (1975), is the first book published by a Maori woman. Grace is one of the Maori writers who appeared in the 1970s, the period that witnessed the emergence of Maori writing in English. Although some have pointed out the somewhat artificial side of this so-called "Maori renaissance," such as the "token gestures" (Evans 1985: 358) of interest by a Pakeha readership, Grace steadily published her work, including three collections of short stories, three novels and some children's stories.

Grace and Cultural Translation

When translation is involved in a dominant and dominated relationship such as that between coloniser and colonised, there appear general tendencies of translation reflecting the power relationship between the two parties. Even without an obvious coloniser-colonised relationship, translation may entail a power-related textual and cultural relationship. Lefevere and Bassnett explain:

translation takes place on a vertical axis rather than a horizontal one. In other words, either the translator regards the task at hand as that of rising to the level of the source text and its author or... [the] translator regards the target culture as greater and effectively colonizes the source text. (1990: 11)

In examining translation in a colonial paradigm, Jacquemond outlines two tendencies: in dominant-into-dominated translation situations "the translator appears as the servile mediator through whom foreign-made linguistic-cultural objects are integrated without question into his own dominated language-culture"; and in dominated-into-dominant translations "the translator appears as the authoritative mediator through whom the dominated language-culture is maintained outside the limits of the self and at the same time adapted to this self in order for it to be able to consume the dominated linguistic-cultural object" (1992: 155). In the former case, translations tend to be strongly influenced by the original, whether the influence is lexical, syntactical, ideological or otherwise, thereby producing a kind of 'mimicry' of the original, which may bring changes to the language itself in the dominated culture. Venuti, for example, points out that a "minor status" of languages can be "measured through the volume of loan words and calque renderings from hegemonic languages" (1998: 137). In the latter case, translations tend to confine the original within the dominant language/culture framework and/or certain expectations imposed on the dominated by the

dominant, thereby 'appropriating' the original. Such appropriation is pointed out by Lefevere who takes an example of a translator in Victorian England translating Persian poems - the translator "takes what liberties he pleases" (1990: 19). Sengupta also shows an example of such appropriated translation (1990) - the case of Tagore's self-translation of his poems in Bengali into English which conforms not only to English style but also to the stereotypical image of the mystical and exotic Orient created by the dominant West. Although these tendencies observed by Jacquemond are not always applicable to translation between the dominant and the dominated¹, they are seen as strong ones.

Jacquemond further explains that "In the postcolonial moment, this double paradigm is put into question" (1992: 155), reflecting the change in society. Grace's 'cultural translation' of her own work from Maori (dominated) into English (dominant) seems to 'appropriate' English so as to present her culture in the dominant language. Simms categorises Grace's stories into three types: "Maori tales," "Macaronic tales" and "English tales" based on the inclusions of Maoriness in the stories. He points out that "Maori tales" show "liberties taken with normal English syntax and thought patterns" (1978: 189). Here Grace's writing is described as taking "liberties" with the dominant English language. Commenting on the Maori inclusion in the "Macaronic tales," Simms points out that the writing style poses "a tricky aesthetic problem" (ibid: 192), yet his overall attitude toward the "Maori tales" seems to be one of "annoyance." He analyses the opening of a Maori tale "At the River" - "Sad I wait, and see them come slow back from the river. The torches move slow" (Grace 1975: 11) - and argues that these sentences "would be as effective if adverbs were used properly - Sadly I wait, and see them come slowly back from the river. The torches move slowly" (1978: 192). "Sad I wait"; "Slow they bring him"; "Sad they come in the dim light" - apparently this form is associated with the Maori language, as Robinson explains: "The formal placement of the adjective/adverb first is, I am assured, characteristic of Maori oratory" (1993: 17). The

collection also has direct inclusions of Maori words such as:

'What's the dream?'

'E tama, he tuna.'

'Ei! Kia tika ra!'

'Yeh! A big one this eel. Ka nui te kaita!' (Grace 1975: 20-21)

There is also imagery which registers a sense of difference. Simms points out "timelessness" in "Maori tales." "Toki," for example, starting with the unusual word order - "From the north he came, Toki, in his young day. Ah yes. A boaster this one, Toki the fisherman" (Grace 1975: 7) - shows "no one particular time for the story" (Simms 1978: 190).

Robinson regards Grace highly, as she "establishes a Maori norm, adapted with great care to English literary discourse but never subordinated to it" (1993: 18). How Maori writers accommodate their literary purpose in the English language is indeed a difficult question. When we hear an old Maori lady say in English, "The mouths steal the time of the eyes" (Grace 1975: 1), it would be fair to say that Grace's effort to experiment with language has contributed to an enrichment of English expression, bringing "linguistic gains" (Wevers 1985: 355). Or is it still a matter of degree, since Simms describes Grace's "English tales" as being reasonably well-accommodated in the English framework - "no sense of disturbing English syntax beyond its normal bounds" (1978: 189)?

Grace's language-mixed writing has a common element with what Lawrence Venuti calls the "foreignization" approach to translation in order to register cultural differences in the target text. Besides the aesthetic argument, one thing we can be certain of is that the Maori expressions serve to alert the reader to a different culture. Maori culture is explicitly 'translated' into an English context and demands recognition in the monolingual Pakeha culture. Maori writing almost inevitably involves a political element in terms of the disparate social status and relationship between Maori and Pakeha -

Rika-Heke argues that "Many Maori writers understand our writing as a political act of solidarity and collective self-definition" (1996: 156). Given this political aspect, Grace's writing is effective, even if it evokes criticism, in alerting the reader to the presence of the Maori culture.

"Foreignness" in Grace's text also serves to assert the identity of a minority culture in the dominant language/culture. The first story in *Waiariki*, "A Way of Talking," is about tension caused by language and about a young Maori woman who seeks her own way of talking to express her identity in the Pakeha language. The narrator, Hera, is about to be married, and her younger sister Rohe, who has been away to study at university, returns home for the wedding. They visit a Pakeha dressmaker, Jane Frazer, for measurement of their garments. Hera warns Rohe to be careful what she says to Jane, anticipating some trouble between her smart sister and the insensitive Jane. Everything goes smoothly at first. Jane seems to be impressed by Rohe's talk - city life, university, fashions. Hera, who speaks in "simple sentences, fragments, inversions, and vernacular vocabulary" (New 1987: 225), is proud of her articulate sister. Things go awry when Jane makes a careless utterance revealing that her friendliness to Maoris is more tokenism and that she fails to recognise them as individual persons.

There are two power relationships here, as New points out: "class distinctions based on race and English articulateness" (ibid: 226). Difference in race and speech marks the relationships, for difference can function "as a marker of subordination" (Lawson and Tiffin 1994: 230). Hera, feeling intimidated by her inarticulateness, hardly speaks during the conversation. Although "English articulateness" is bound up with race distinctions (English is originally a Pakeha language), Rohe possesses a good command of the language. The balance of power in the conversation between Rohe and Jane seems slanted toward Rohe, as Jane becomes absorbed in Rohe's talk: "Almost as though she was jealous of Rose [Rohe]" (Grace 1975: 2). Language can bestow power, as Fanon explains: "A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language...."

Mastery of language affords remarkable power" (1967: 18). Hera has not "mastered" the language which is dissociated from her own cultural inheritance. For Hera, being articulate is being able to speak like Rohe, impressing Jane Frazer with her entertaining way of talking - ultimately possessing a Pakeha way of talking.

Through this incident, however, Hera realises that her sister is deeply hurt behind her cheerful mask. Hera becomes aware of her sister's "loneliness" - a price for being articulate in a Pakeha way, wresting power of the language from Pakeha (Robinson 1993: 14). In "A Way of Talking" it is Hera who is the narrator and protagonist and who learns from this incident. Hera finds strength derived from her love of Rohe within the family relationship. She sets herself free from the overwhelming demand to be articulate, sharing her sister's pain of isolation. Notwithstanding these gains, Hera is yet to find a way to let Rohe know that she understands her. Her assertion of her own speech in the English language is one way to demonstrate her identity in the dominant language/culture. She realises that Pakeha fluency is not the only way to be 'articulate,' to express herself in English.

The protagonist in the last story, "Parade," again a young Maori woman, is more articulate and politically aware than Hera. The character Matewai returns home during the week of a carnival to perform Maori singing and dancing. The excitement of coming home to be with her relatives is soon replaced by her heavy spirit. Watching the crowd cheer for the carnival, she cannot help thinking about their peculiar reaction to the performers. She has developed a third party's eyes while away from the Maori community, seeing the parade from outside as well as from inside. She observes the enjoyment of the crowd through her detached gaze:

I kept thinking and trying not to think, 'Is that what we are to them?' Museum pieces, curios, antiques, shells under glass. A travelling circus, a floating zoo. People clapping and cheering to show that they know about such things. (Grace 1975: 85)

She resents the Pakeha's token friendliness (like that seen in Jane), showing their enjoyment of the performance. She sits with Granny Rita and Grandpa Hohepa, not attending any other performances. When she tells of her reservations about the parade - how Maoris are only needed once a year for the amusement of the Pakeha - Old Hohepa replies, "It's your job, this. To show others who we are" (ibid: 88). Matewai realises that the old people are also aware of how she feels; their response is more sophisticated and politicised than she had at first thought. On the way home she sings the Maori canoe song with the others, feeling a communal strength welling up inside her.

Matewai regains self-respect - what is important is not being stared at, but the sense of community felt by participants in the parade. In showing her culture to the others, she learns to be free from the stereotype - amusing, entertaining museum pieces - which she feels is inflicted on Maoris by the Pakeha crowd. Although this is her inward change and the fact that Maoris perform for the Pakeha remains, it could be compared with Tagore's translation, which conforms to the stereotype image of the Orient and "ultimately undermines the quality of the translated material" (Sengupta 1990: 56). Matewai's showing her culture to the others would be substantiated by her strength based on the sense of community, not undermined by the stereotype image.

Concluding Remarks: Implications for Translation Studies

In showing her culture in *Waiariki*, Grace does not advocate a single way of talking; her narrative voices vary from story to story - female and male, young and old, awkward and articulate - with various degrees of inclusion of Maoriness. Hera's fragmented, vernacular speech is not the only way to express the Maori culture in English, nor is the direct inclusion of

Maori words. Grace is experimenting with language; Hera's quest for her own way of talking could also be Grace's quest for a way to 'translate' her culture into English. Later in her life, Grace took Maori language classes, but in fact the use of Maori words in her work seems to decline over the period of her writings, and *Waiariki* contains more overt Maoriness than her later works. Although this is explained by the experimental approach she adopted in *Waiariki*, the decline could also be attributed to her growing confidence in her Maori inheritance. Grace seems to have shifted from overt demonstration to more subtle means of expressing herself as a Maori. This indicates that there is more than one way to 'translate' a culture into another language/culture, and somehow corresponds to the lack of fixed standards in translation, where "the production of different translations at different times does not point to any 'betrayal' of absolute standards, but rather to the absence, pure and simple, of any such standards" (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 5). Grace presents plurivocality in her writing, which signifies "the rejection of monologic meanings and of exclusionary canons" (Stanton 1994: 7).

Grace's 'cultural translation' presents a case in which 'translation' is effectively used to assert a minority culture. This involves a political element alerting the reader to cultural differences as well as an ideological element seeking Maori identity while using the English language. Maoris have virtually lost their language as a living first language. Or rather, they have come to speak another language - they are "in effect translated into another language" (Cronin 1998: 148). Grace's inclusion of Maoriness in her writing somehow 'translates' the Maori culture back into the replacing language, English. The effect shares a common ground with "translation-as-diversification," by resisting "incorporation" (ibid: 148) from inside the dominant language. Translation from a minority language/culture into a dominant language/culture is not necessarily to be 'appropriated' by the dominant language/culture. Grace's 'cultural translation' is used to reinforce Maori identity in the dominant culture. The key factors here are Grace's

desire to preserve the Maori culture and her confidence (as well as her characters' confidence) in Maori identity underpinned by family love and community strength. This suggests the importance of cultural weight in a translator's mind. In this sense, translation is, and continues to be, subjected to negotiation between two languages/cultures according to time and space. Grace's plurivocal 'cultural translation' indicates a way (or ways) to translate from a dominated into a dominant language/culture in order to make the presence of the dominated culture felt in the dominant culture and to assert the values of the dominated culture.

Notes

- ¹ Jacquemond himself shows the early characteristics of Egyptian translation from French as being "adaptation," "arabization" or "egyptianization" (1992: 141).

References

- Adejunmobi, Moradewun. "Translation and Postcolonial Identity: African Writing and European Languages." *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 4 (1994): 163-81.
- Cronin, Michael. "The Cracked Looking Glass of Servants." *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 4 (1994): 145-62.
- Evans, Miriama. "The Politics of Maori Literature." *Meanjin* 44 (1985): 358-63.
- Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin and White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove, 1967.
- Grace, Patricia. *Waiariki*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1975.
- Jacquemond, Richard. "Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation." *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Sub-*

- jectivity, *Ideology*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1992. 139-58.
- Lawson, Alan, and Chris Tiffin. "Conclusion: Reading Difference." *Describing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. Ed. Alan Lawson and Chris Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1994. 230-35.
- Lefevere, André. "Translation: Its Genealogy in the West." *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. London: Pinter, 1990. 14-28.
- Lefevere, André and Susan Bassnett. "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies." *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. London: Pinter, 1990. 1-13.
- New, W. H. *The Dreams of Speech and Violence: The Art of the Short Story in Canada and New Zealand*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1987.
- New Zealand Official Yearbook*. Wellington: GP, 1998.
- Nunns, Rachel. "Doing Her Job: Patricia Grace's Fiction." *Islands* 7 (1979): 416-21
- Orbell, Margaret. "Maori Women's Writing: An Introductory Survey." *WLWE* 17 (1978): 252-56.
- Rika-Heke, Powhiri Wharemarama. "Margin or Center? 'Let me tell you! In the Land of my Ancestors I am the Center': Ingigenous Writing in Aotearoa." *English Postcoloniality: Literatures from Around the World*. Ed. Radhika Mohanram and Gita Rajan. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1996. 147-63.
- Robinson, Roger. "'The Strands of Life and Self': The Oral Prose of Patricia Grace." *CRNLE Reviews Journal* 1 (1993): 13-27.
- Sengupta, Mahasweta. "Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds." *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. London: Pinter, 1990. 56-63.
- Simms, Norman. "A Maori Literature in English, Part I: Prose Fiction: Patricia Grace." *Pacific Quarterly* 3 (1978): 186-99.

- Stanton, Domna C. Editor's Column. "On Multiple Submissions." *PMLA* 109 (1994): 7-13.
- Tausky, Thomas E. "'Stories That Show Them Who They Are': An Interview with Patricia Grace." *ANZSC* 6 (1991): 90-102.
- Venuti, Lawrence. "Introduction" *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 4 (1994): 135-44.
- Wevers, Lydia. "Changing Directions: The Short Story in New Zealand." *Meanjin* 44 (1985): 352-56.

Cultures Translated and Appropriated: Rethinking Ethnicity, Nationscape and Cultural Identity¹

MAO Sihui

1. Introduction

Translation, in many respects, is manipulation, appropriation and reconstruction. It is intricately related to issues of identity, gender, class, ethnicity and politics. Talking about 'polysystems translation theory', Susan Bassnett holds that 'Translation has to do with authority and with power' and that the 'fundamental questions' to be asked by those working in translation studies should include 'what is translated, when and by whom, how it is received and what its status then becomes in the target culture'.²

Indeed, one can no longer ignore the various political, social, economic, racial and psychosexual factors that affect the whole process of translation and shape the finished product. Going beyond translation as the production and publication of works from one language to another, this paper looks at the various aspects of translating both Chinese and 'other' cultures in the actual construction of what the Chinese call 'Cultural Villages' in the age of reform and opening to the outside world. As this is a case study, the object of my analysis is the multi-billion dollar project - *Shenzhen Cultural Village* within the boundary of the Shenzhen *Huaqiaocheng* 華僑城 (Overseas Chinese Town) which consists of three parts: 'China Folk Culture Villages 中國民俗文化村', 'Splendid China 錦繡中華' and 'Window of the World 世界之窗'.³ The basic assumption that underlies this paper is that 'the process of translating texts from one cultural system into another is not

a neutral, innocent, transparent activity', but a 'highly charged, transgressive activity', an activity that leads one to be concerned 'with texts and with contexts, with practice and with theory, with diachronics and synchronics and above all with the manipulative process of intercultural transfer and its ideological implications' (Bassnett 1993: 160). And it can be argued here that even within the umbrella term 'Chinese' culture, the intercultural (or intracultural?) transfer between the dominant Han culture and marginal(ised) cultures of minority nationalities in the process of constructing those 'Cultural Villages' is as complex as that between the Chinese culture and the non-Chinese (mainly Western) culture.

Within a period of less than 20 years since China began to reassert itself with increasing economic power and political militancy in the late 1970s, Shenzhen, set up as a 'Special Economic Zone' in 1980 by the Central Government, has undergone more than a sea change from a frontier fishing town bordering on Hong Kong to one of the most modern, prosperous and culturally diverse cities in China. Its population has increased to almost 2.5 million - 80 times the original number of residents. A truly young city with the residents' average age of 27, Shenzhen is a city of immigrants and shareholders that come from all provinces and autonomous regions of mainland China as well as from Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan and other countries. Shenzhen and Hong Kong are linked by the 'mythic' Luohu (Lo Wu) Bridge over which 30 to 40 million visitors pass per year. With its special geographical position, booming business, and increasing emphasis in its policies on the general 'cultural level' of the residents, Shenzhen has so far served as the most successful 'showcase' for China in the new era of reform. The construction of Shenzhen's *cultural image* has been meticulously geared to the ideological, economic and psychological needs of both the city and the nation.

In this huge 'Cultural Village' project, both Chinese and 'foreign' cultures are translated, transplanted and transformed. In the age of mechanical/digital reproduction and globalisation of capitalist economy, hegemonic

appropriation is unavoidable and, in the highly nationalistic reconstruction of 'Chinese' national identity, cultural myths and bias are repeatedly reproduced. Part One of this paper deals with the politics of translating and re-locating the Chinese 'minority' cultures at the margins in the 'China Folk Culture Villages'; Part Two examines the ambivalence of representing the Chinese culture/ nationscape, the 'Mysterious Orient', as spectacle and pride in 'Splendid China'; Part Three looks at how 'foreign' cultures are re-contextualised and re-mythologised in the 48-hectare space of the postmodern 'Window of the World'. These issues will be examined in relation to 'power', 'desire', 'ethnocentricity' and 'intercultural communication'. To speak with an awareness of the multiple subject positions of gender, race, generation, institutional location, geopolitical locale and sexual orientation, we must realise that, as Homi K. Bhabha says, what is 'theoretically innovative and politically crucial' is

the need to think beyond narratives of origin and initiatory, initial subjects and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of "differences". These "in-between" spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood and communal representations that initiate new signs of cultural difference and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation.⁴

But of course, the terms of intercultural engagement which might be affiliative, antagonistic or a mixture of both, as in the case under discussion, are produced through reproduction of cultural artefacts and through 'performances' of daily life and artistic creation. Cultural differences are a complex and ongoing power negotiation rather than a reflection of pre-given ethnic traits embedded in certain fixed traditions. Therefore the actual inter-intra-cultural communications that *happen* in the construction of Shenzhen Cultural Village may be as often conflictual as consensual.

2. 'China Folk Culture Villages': Ethnicity Reimagined

Located on the rim of Shenzhen Bay, 'China Folk Culture Villages' covers a total area of 24 hectares, where folk arts, culture, architecture and customs of China's minority nationalities are assembled. There are 24 groups/ sets of buildings including life-size mountain villages, residential quarters, streets and markets, forming relatively independent small 'native' communities such as the Bouyei stone cottage, the Miao village, the Dong village, the Yao village, the Naxi house, the Mosuo wooden house, the Gaoshan house, the Hani mushroom-shaped house, the Jingpo village, the Li village, the Bai village, the Dai bamboo house, the Tujia water market, the Kazak yurt, the Mongolian yurt, the Tibetan house, the Korean cottage, the Han courtyard house, the Han cave dwelling in northern Shaanxi and the Zhuang village. In order to reproduce 'authenticity', many of these villages and houses were designed and built by native people from their places of origins and the articles for daily life displayed were either bought directly from local families or made to order by local craftsmen. Apart from these life-size architectural reproductions, there are over 20 well-known scenic spots of China constructed in the Villages such as the Coconut Palm Forest of Hainan Island, giant banyans from Xishuangbanna of Yunnan, the 23-metre high statue of the Thousand-armed and Thousand-eyed Guanyin (the Chinese Goddess of Mercy), and the Yunnan Stone Forest.

To ensure a 'faithful' translation of the minority ethnic cultures, customs and practices, the project sets out to fabricate what Umberto Eco calls 'the absolute fake; where the boundaries between game and illusion are blurred'.⁵ For the running of the fabricated village life, several hundred artists and service workers (all bilingual - Mandarin and local dialect) belonging to those 21 nationalities from over 10 provinces and autonomous regions have been recruited for 'artistic and cultural' performances and services which also include a huge Exhibition Hall of Folk Customs from China's 56 nationalities. The performing 'inhabitants' create a microcosm

of the village life of 21 different ethnic minority groups. Visitors can watch and participate in the folk singing and dancing, on-the-spot demonstrations of making handicrafts, and cooking of local delicacies with ethnic flavours such as tea and food prepared by the Dong and Dai People and wine brewed by the Miao minority. Every evening, traditional folk music and dances are performed, from the grand dragon-lantern dance, the folk *Shehuo* Parade, to the spectacular national costume show and these performances and parades change their forms and contents regularly. After that the visitors are treated to the glamour of the laser music fountains and folk wedding ceremonies with laser beams radiating from the forehead and palms of the Thousand-armed Goddess of Mercy.

With undulating hills, roaring waterfalls, winding streams and exotic flowerbeds, the moment you enter the Villages, you experience a certain spatial-temporal haze. You feel the power of a movie-like 'reality', an acute sense of ethnic difference and a strong desire to know whether what you see is reality reproduced or fantasy re-imagined. Of course the exchange of food, articles and services for money is accomplished in the play of fiction. At one level, these 'minority' groups, together with their cultures, customs and ways of life, are well protected within the Villages which is made to symbolise a 'privileged' rather than 'marginalised' position. These minority groups are treated like 'endangered species' such as the giant pandas, the Villages foregrounds some forms of racial differences, cultural divisions and ideological gaps within an imagined, constructed and commodified space. Here ethnicity is reimagined by dominant communist discourses in terms of national unity, ethnic harmony, and cultural co-existence which can be clearly seen in the spectacular 'National Costume Show', the tirelessly repeated catchphrases 'Unity of All Nationalities of China' or 'We Are One Big Family'.⁶

In many respects, the Villages, while representing the dominant Chinese Han ideology's desire to give some 'voice' to the native minorities (which is allowed to take up one-third of the total space in the whole Cul-

tural Village), functions as a tool for displacement. Through a few highly selected aspects of the cultures, customs and practices of only some of the minority nationalities, the spectacular displays of these ethnic cultures seem to romanticise and re-mythologise their life experiences and cultural production, thus enabling the visitor to forget (or not to question) the racial, political, social, cultural, economic and psychological conflicts between them and the Han people. In a highly foregrounded fashion, ethnic differences are made to disappear into surfaces.

In the Villages, they are very often little more than exotic costumes. In the face of organised pleasures, the desired illusion takes over and 'ethnicity' here becomes an ideological abstraction, a cultural cliché, a festive performance. In other words, these ethnic cultures have been translated from a position of monolingual, ethnocentric and hegemonic Han superiority. Everything is stage-managed and ritualised. And all the folk songs, dances, and lyrics must be politically correct. They must not challenge the dominant political, social, cultural and ethnic discourses. They must never question the notion of national unity or ethnic policies.

In other words, the pleasures of artists' performing and visitors' looking and travelling are systematically regulated. The China Folk Culture Villages as fabrication is not just an amusement park, but also a romanticised space of regulated social behaviours, controlled ideological acts and hegemonic cultural appropriation, a space of faked nature where the public is encouraged to desire for illusions. Thus the sweetness of seduction secures a new form of domination by consent.

3. 'Splendid China': Nationscape Reconstructed

Next to the China Folk Culture Villages is the World's largest display of miniature landmarks - 'Splendid China', which occupies an area of 30 hectares.⁷ They include some of China's most well-known historical monu-

ments, cultural attractions and natural landscapes such as the Great Wall, the Terracotta Army of Emperor Qin's Mausoleum in Shaanxi, the Forbidden City in Beijing, the Big Buddha of Leshan in Sichuan, the Mogao Grottoes at Dunhuang in Gansu, the Potala Palace in Lhasa, Mount Huangshan in Anhui, the Shaolin Temple in Henan, and the Three Gorges of the Yangtze River. They consist of three categories: 'Ancient Buildings' such as palaces, monasteries, temples, towers, pagodas and bridges, 'Natural Scenery' including famous mountains, rivers, rock formations, and 'Folk Customs and Local Dwellings' which include different styles of local houses, habits and customs such as the 'Memorial Ceremony for Confucius', Mongolian wrestling, archery and horse race and so on. The 'mysterious Orient' is proudly put on display for public consumption.

One of the very interesting features of 'Splendid China' is that the reproduced historical, cultural and scenic sites are arranged, more or less, according to their real geographical locations in China. The philosophy behind it is that travelling in one day over 'a land of charm and beauty, you see a civilisation with a history of 5,000 years'. It is 'a window of China's history, culture and tourist resources'.⁸ In my view, 'Splendid China', with its spectacular display of China's national landmarks which represent her long cultural history, unique natural landscape and ethnic diversity, reconstructs a new cultural narrative in the post-Mao social context, as a new metaphor in defence of a traditional past and a communist present. It indicates a new use of Chineseness as a desirable collective body to be looked at both by herself and the Other. In other words, China, in the search for modernity, has to negotiate between modernisation and the cultural heritage. Indeed, one of the persistent themes in the Chinese world of ideas is the belief that the only way to modernise is to be free from the cumbersome legacy of Chinese culture.

From the May Fourth Movement of 1919 until today, it is widely thought that this legacy and the consequences of modernization are incompatible. Repre-

sentative of this stance is Su Xiao-kang, one of the creative forces behind the caustic *Yellow River Elegy* of 1987. He avers that '[The Chinese] have always tried to use their ancient glory ... to cover up the poverty, weakness, and backwardness of modern times'. It is argued that only by renouncing this love affair with its past will China be able to proceed with the job of modernizing.⁹

In the last few decades, China has repeatedly used its cultural and natural treasures such as giant pandas to woo the world, to repair diplomatic relations. Like China the nation, 'Splendid China' uses its glorious and glorified cultural icons and myths such as the Great Wall, the Lugou (Marco Polo) Bridge, and the Qin terracotta army as a strong rallying point among the Chinese for national(istic) pride, ideological affinity, cultural identity and psychological solidarity. Travelling among the well-distributed scenic spots, one feels that the whole project is designed to speak the totality of the Chinese nation in a timeless Lilliputian space.

As Ann Anagnost says, 'Splendid China' offers the viewer 'a surreal simultaneity of the architectural monuments of Chinese civilization over five millennia -- a compression of time that matches its reduction in physical size, redoubling the intensity of its ideological effect'.¹⁰ While it is a direct product of the open-door policy and nationalistic efforts for modernisation, 'Splendid China' functions mainly as a spectacular demonstration of a hegemonic model of Chinese multiculturalism with the Han ethnic majority positioned at the centre of a 'family' of 56 Chinese nationalities.

Another point that can be made from looking at the spectacle of 'Splendid China' is that, following modern Europe and America, ethnicity and ethnocentrism can, in the age of global capitalism, be the most successful and profitable export items. Michael Harris Bond observes that the Chinese, like many other cultural groups, are 'desperate to improve the living standards of their people. This struggle brings them into contact with alien, especially Western, cultures, many of the practices of which they regard as

antithetical to “the Chinese way”. This contact sparks the dilemma of modernization: how to develop without sacrificing one’s cultural identity’ (Bond 1991: 115). Then one may argue that, in relation to the miniature park which compresses five thousand years of Chinese history into this site of signification, the status of Shenzhen which ‘contains’ this nationscape is interesting.

In the different discourses of China’s opening to the outside world and of debates over ‘market economy with Chinese characteristics’, Shenzhen has become a symbol, a space of representation itself. As Ann Anagnost (1993: 587) notes, ‘Splendid China’ lies within ‘a larger referential field than the one immediate within the boundaries of the park, for well within the orbit of the viewer’s gaze, one observes the nearby profile of a modern city’. Here different representations connect and contest one another. One representation becomes embedded within another. Illusion and reality become one.

As a fast-growing city of immigrants, Shenzhen is culturally diverse. But neither in ‘The China Folk Culture Villages’ nor in ‘Splendid China’, does Shenzhen occupy any space since the city has not been associated with any ‘subliminal’ culture of its own. Now its status as a ‘special economic zone’ and its pioneering translation of other cultures into its urban space does not only give it a hybrid character in terms of its ‘integration with global capital’ but also as ‘a potent sign, as one of a heteroglossia of models in a sustained debate over China’s proper road to modernization’ (Anagnost 1993: 588). With cultural projects similar to the ones under discussion, Shenzhen has gained among Chinese cities a very ‘cultural’ image. Indeed, for many Chinese, Shenzhen is beginning to become a new cultural myth.

4. ‘Window of the World’: Foreign Cultures Reappropriated

In the vicinity of the two theme parks discussed, ‘Window of the World’

starts from the pedestrian overpass across the Shennan Avenue - in imitation of the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco, as the prelude to a symphonic movement. Covering an area of 480,000 square metres, ‘Window of the World’ reproduces, on 1:1, 1:5, or 1:15 scales, the major sites of historical interest in the world, ancient and modern landscapes as well as indigenous dwellings, well-known sculptures, drawings, folklore and popular theatrical performances. In accordance with the geographical positions and categories of the sights, this park is divided into nine areas - the World Square, Asia, Oceania, Europe, America, Africa, Recreation Centre of Modern Science & Technology, World Sculptures Gallery, and the International Street, totalling 118 scenic spots among which are world wonders such as the Pyramid and the Amon Temple of Karnak from Egypt, the Stonehenge from Britain, the Grand Canyon of America, L’Arc de Triomphe from Paris, the St. Peter’s Cathedral of the Vatican, the Sydney Opera House from Australia, the Leaning Tower of Pisa, Borobudur from Indonesia, and Mount Corcovado from Brazil. Probably the most spectacular attractions are the 108-metre-tall Eiffel Tower (its top reachable by the elevator and where tourists can even see Hong Kong), the Niagara Falls (80 metres wide and over 10 metres in its drop), and the ‘active’ Hawaii volcanoes (with glowing blazes, surging lava and fountains spurting steamy water as high as 100 metres).

The guiding principle behind this project is that the world is seen as a glamorous global village where all cultures meet and speak. At the entrance of the World square, with a standing capacity for over 10,000 visitors, stand six world renowned statues such as Venus, David, Tang Shenwang, African Mother and Son and around the Square there are 108 giant pillars of different styles; six huge gates representing the birthplaces of the ancient civilisations proper: India, China, Islam, Babylon, Egypt and America, and reliefs between the gates on walls of 200 square metres demonstrate the world history of millions of years. The fall of the night precludes the daily ‘World Rejoicing with You’ show: performances of songs and dances by

the 'Five-Continent Song & Dance Troupe' with artists from all over the world, the Big Parade and Carnival Tour of Local Customs, all combining to push the visitors into dreams of peace, freedom, progress, development, joy and happiness. Echoing William Shakespeare, 'O Wonder! How many goodly creatures are there here! How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world that has Such people in it', the theme song goes, 'Here we come along with our colourful dreams/ To this wonderful paradise we build/ Of every beautiful dream, every appealing custom/ And cream of every culture/ Whatever you are, or colour of skin/ No more war and crime, nor hatred and feud/ All the people in the world/ Join together with love, joy and peace/ With hope here to realise/ Our proud dream/ To you, to all the world'. In short, 'Window of the World' attempts to function as a new dream factory with 'Chinese characteristics'.

But it is also postmodern, a world as if built with computer generated images, a new space, a new reality, a world never seen before in China. In many respects, it attempts to deconstruct the gaps, conflicts, inequalities between the different worlds. Cultures from different origins are represented as if they could physically come together, engage in invisible dialogues and unite under the power of capitalism for some common good of mankind. However it is never free from cultural and political hierarchies. In fact it seems to be reproducing an already mythologised Eurocentrism: the number of 'representative' sights in 'Window of the World' from dominant 'Western' powers: 12 from USA, 8 from France, 8 from Japan, 6 from Britain, 6 from Italy. There are only 8 from the whole of Africa.

It seems to me that this indicates a collective unconscious in the Chinese that clings to the residue of an 'imperial' past, a mentality that, on the one hand, wants to project an image of true greatness in its ability to accommodate alien cultures; on the other, it shows a long repressed desire (from the Opium Wars to the May Fourth Movement, from the founding of the People's Republic to the reforms led by Deng Xiaoping) to find a new 'Chinese' *national identity* while learning from what has been called in Chinese

'*lanse wenming* 藍色文明' ('Ocean Blue [Western] Civilisation'). In 'Splendid China', Potala Palace Buddhist monks and figures are, in some respect, represented as expression of tolerance of religions in China; in 'Window of the World', you also have 'The Statue of Liberty' which is interestingly very small and occupies a very marginal place, a sharp contrast to the powerfully foregrounded phallic Eiffel Tower.

5. Beyond Culture and Translation

The Shenzhen Cultural Village has provided a space for 'minority' and 'foreign' cultures to be displayed, to be consumed and to be re-imagined. In this process, the Chinese nationalist and centralising ideology is represented as positive and seductive, thus re-naturalising an already mythologised national imaginary. All those marginalised cultures and voices have been carefully translated and appropriated in order not only to reinscribe and reaffirm the ultimate re-construction of China as a 'naturally' cohesive, democratic socialist nation but also to project to the outside world the *image* of China as a modernising state that is determined to transcend geopolitical, national, cultural, economic and psychological boundaries and barriers so as to re-kindle in the Chinese, both at home and overseas, not the lost dream of a national return to a Classical Golden Age like the Tang Dynasty, but a dream long deferred of a grand resurgence of a powerful modern China that can rival the 'American Empire' in the 21st century.

In many respects, the translation of both Chinese dominant and marginal cultures in 'China Folk Culture Villages' and 'Splendid China' and other 'foreign' cultures in 'Window of the World' can be read as 'interpretation' or 'rewriting' which points in a very important direction *for* an audience desiring the interpretation. Here we can see how such translation can be politically interested and 'how claims for a reading are always direct attempts to affect power relations through coercion or persuasion'.¹¹ But

really who 'needs' these fabricated spaces? In the year of 1995, the total number of visitors to 'China Folk Culture Villages' and 'Splendid China' was 2.8 million, including 392,000 (14%) from Hong Kong and 56,000 (2%) from Europe and America; the total number of visitors to 'Window of the World' was 3.89 million, including 778,000 (20%) from Hong Kong and 116,700 (3%) from Europe and America.

It is clear the majority of the visitors are from mainland China. Although one may argue that these spaces as theme parks and representations are closely connected with the exhibition of cultural commodities as 'signs of China's growing industrial prowess for participation in global market' (Anagnost 1993: 604), one should also see, apart from the nationalistic functioning of the project, the psychological aspect. That is, China as a nation that has been pursuing a modernising programme increasingly faces the unimaginable pressures of new desires in the general public to see other peoples, and other cultures. In spite of the economic miracles in China, travelling to other lands is but for a limited number of the newly rich. For the majority of the 1,200 million Chinese, the desire for social mobility, for the taste of 'The Snow Mountain' in Switzerland or for the touch of 'The Statue of Liberty', has to be satisfied within the national geographical boundaries. The conception of the 'Cultural Village' does not only fit into the open-door rhetoric of the central government but also the life philosophy of the new era: 'Time is money'. As the advertisement goes, 'Give us one day, we will show the whole world. Give us one night, the world will rejoice with you'.

In her seminal book *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, G. C. Spivak says, 'Foucault's genealogy of power has limited uses in the developing world. The combination of modern and archaic regimes of power produces unexpected forms of disciplinarity and governmentality that make Foucault's epistemes inappropriate, even obsolete'.¹² This paper, while offering a re-reading of such statements, demonstrates that translation of cultures in this Shenzhen cultural project is a collective activity still under the

various regimes of power. The politics of such transcultural projects can be seen, in the Chinese case, as hegemonic attempts to boost nationalistic feelings of pride in its own natural beauty and richness of its cultural legacy, to create a facade of three-dimensional opening of China to the outside world while regulating the growing tendency among Chinese of looking at the West as the better object of pursuit in the official anti-total-westernisation discourses. This also tells us that the East and the West may be brought together in a fabricated hyperreal postmodern space in a symbolically dialogic fashion but any attempt at deconstructing the East-West Cultural Divide is by no means an easy task.

6. Conclusion

In my view, the Shenzhen Cultural Village is a huge hegemonic project in cultural translation that nevertheless wishes to break down some long-standing barriers between Chinese and foreign cultures. It represents China's desire to show the world her new efforts to go 'international' by creating a hyperreal space of 'in-betweenism' where cultural hybridity is allowed but within boundaries. With Hong Kong as a secret model, Shenzhen is beginning to play a role that is more than just a showcase for an increasingly powerful China. And with China embracing market economy, culture as show business is hardly anachronistic and Shenzhen is beginning to form a pluralistic cultural identity, one that adds to its own complexity with each passing day.¹³

Notes

¹ This paper was originally presented at the international conference on *Translation and POWER*, University of Warwick, 13 - 15 July 1997. I would like to thank

Mr. Rod Pryde and Mr. David Foster from the British Council (Hong Kong) for their intellectual and financial support for this paper, and Mr. Mao Cheng from Guangdong Tourism Bureau and Miss Wang Dan from Shenzhen Tax Bureau for their assistance in obtaining some of the documents and videos.

- ² See Susan Bassnett (1993), Chapter 7 'From Comparative Literature to Translation Studies', *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*, Blackwell, Oxford UK and Cambridge USA, p.159.
- ³ Constructed with joint investment from China Travel Service (Hong Kong) Limited and Shenzhen Overseas Chinese Town Economic Development Corporation, 'Splendid China' was first open to the public in September 1989, 'China Folk Culture Villages' in October 1991. 'Window of the World', invested by the two old partners and Shenzhen Shahe Industrial Corporation, began to receive visitors from all over the world in April 1994.
- ⁴ Advocating a new era of articulating both cultural and ethnic differences, Homi K. Bhabha seems to be deconstructing traditional notions of unity/ originality/ universalistic humanism that modernist mentality fails to question. See Bhabha's 'Beyond the Pale: Art in the Age of Multicultural Translation', in *1993 Biennial Exhibition*, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, 1993, pp. 62-3.
- ⁵ Umberto Eco, 1986, *Faith in Fakes*, trans. William Weaver, Secker & Warburg, London, p. 8.
- ⁶ For a detailed critique of this nationalistic Chinese ideology in relation to the controversial song and video entitled 'Da Zhongguo' / 'Great(er) China' by the young Chinese pop star Gao Feng, see Gregory B. Lee's 'Chineseness and MTV: Construction of the "Ethnic" Imaginary and the Recuperation of National Symbolic Space by the Official Ideology', Universidade Nova de Lisboa Conference: *Music and Life-World: Otherness and Transgression in the Culture of the 20th Century*, Lisbon, Portugal, December 13-18, 1996.
- ⁷ 'Splendid China' is three times larger than the 'Taoyan Lilliputian Land' in Taiwan and twenty times larger than 'Pattaya Lilliputian Land' in Thailand and 'Madurodam Lilliputian Land' in Holland. While the miniature scale in these places is 1: 25, most of the attractions in 'Splendid China' are reproduced by the

scale of 1: 15, some 1: 10 or 1: 8, and the largest 1:1. With more than 100 of China's celebrated ancient-building experts, carving artists and horticulturists as advisors or participants, over 2,000 engineers and technicians from around 20 provinces and regions and thousands of workers took part in the actual construction.

- ⁸ Of course, the economic factor is too obvious. As Ma Chi Man (who first put forward the conception of 'Splendid China' in 1985) says, the project 'will make the world know more about China, arouse the interest of tourists from various countries to visit China, bring about a great advance in China's tourist industry'. See *Splendid China*, Research & Development Dept., China Travel Service (Holdings) Hong Kong Ltd, Hong Kong, 1992, p.3.
- ⁹ Michael Harris Bond, 1991, *Beyond the Chinese Face: Insights from Psychology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, p. 109.
- ¹⁰ Ann Anagnost, 'The Nationscape: Movement in the Field of Vision', in *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*, Vol. 1, No. 3, Winter 1993, p. 586.
- ¹¹ Steven Mailloux, 'Interpretation', in F. Lentricchia and T. McLaughlin (eds), 1995 (2nd ed.), *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, pp. 121-34.
- ¹² G. C. Spivak, 1987, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, Methuen, New York, p. 209.
- ¹³ On December 1998, construction began on six new 'key' projects in the new city centre (4.13 sqkm) which include the Civic Hall (110,000 sqm), the TV Centre (51,282 sqm), the Children's Palace (31,000 sqm), the Central Library, the Music Hall, and the 14.8 km Shenzhen's Metro.

翻譯理論對譯者有用嗎？

羅倫斯·文努提著 區劍龍譯

本文的題目取自捷克翻譯學者利維 (Jiri Levy) 的一篇文章。我從那篇文章得到了一些啟發，擬在此就當前的翻譯研究和譯員培訓提出幾個問題。利維的文章是一九六五年問世的；由此看來，這些問題不僅仍然存在，而且必須結合第二次世界大戰以來翻譯研究的大趨勢來理解。把目光放遠，才能評估翻譯的現況，才能就未來的發展提出一些設想。任何批判總隱含若干準則，即批判所依據的一套價值標準，因此，我的問題無可避免會帶出我對翻譯理論在未來的翻譯研究中的角色所作的一些設想。翻譯理論最重要的角色，也許是批判翻譯背後的種種意識形態；所謂意識形態，就是滲透於每種文化行為的價值觀、信念和再現 (representation)，最終是為某些社會團體服務，從另一些社會團體身上謀取利益的。

不過，利維認為，理論的任務是提高譯者對翻譯方法的自覺性，以改進翻譯技巧。他的文章一開頭就宣稱：“探討翻譯問題的論文，必須能幫助我們了解影響譯者的工作和素質的各種因素，否則毫無意義。” (Levy 1965: 77)

這句話引發我的第一個問題：讓翻譯理論為實踐和培訓服務，究竟會有甚麼危險呢？過去四十年來，翻譯研究的主流顯示，在譯員培訓環境下產生的翻譯理論，有可能為教學提供分析工具，從而解決教室內的翻譯問題。初學翻譯的人，因為剛剛開始累積實踐經驗，以培養直覺，增強自信，所以對於具體明確的“策略”、“步

驟”、“方法”等尤其趨之若鶩。加拿大語言學家維奈 (Jean-Paul Vinay) 和達爾貝勒內 (Jean Darbelnet) 在一九五八年首次出版的一部書，是翻譯研究當中最廣為流傳的作品之一。他們從比較修辭學的角度研究法英翻譯，從而為各種翻譯方法提供理論基礎。結果，他們編寫的教程，四十多年來一直為多個翻譯培訓課程所採用。該書第一章有關翻譯“步驟”的論述，是迄今最常被引述、討論和採用的一節 (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 30-50)。

翻譯理論為了教學的需要而突出語篇分析 (textual analysis) 的地位，到底有甚麼危險呢？利維還說，“理論家的目的”之一，是“分析原本的信息整體與經轉換後的信息模式之間的關係，從而提供評價的理性基礎” (Levy 1965: 77)。利維把翻譯視為用符號傳意的過程，所牽涉的是為另一個語言社群進行“解碼、詮釋及重新編碼”。他認為理論的任務之一，是要在外國文本和譯文之間建立對等關係。根據他的想法，語篇分析可以擔當這個任務。

不過，危險在於，這會使人以為語篇分析已經足以指導我們作出或者解釋翻譯決定。這類分析工具通常是由語言學的某些分支衍生出來的，特別是語篇語言學、話語分析和語用學。採用語言學的這些工具，總會產生大量的分析細節，對於幫助譯者解決翻譯問題，既多於所需，又少於所需。多於所需，是因為語言學創造了令人望而生畏的分析概念，大有把翻譯研究變為應用語言學的分支，即為語言研究而非翻譯服務的語篇分析之勢。少於所需，則是因為翻譯的決定也是基於語篇效果、文化價值以及社會功能而作出的，並非單純尋求對等；以語言學為基礎的分析不考慮左右翻譯決定的社會文化因素，因此不能充分解釋這些決定。社會語言學略為有助於發掘這些因素，但是沒有文化理論和社會理論的支持，也不會有

多大作為。

貝爾 (Roger Bell) 一九九一年出版的專著，有人用於譯員培訓，卻正好說明語言學的局限。該書屬於一個應用語言學系列。書中指出，“翻譯理論的必要條件”是須能解釋兩種現象，其一是翻譯的“產品”，其二是翻譯的“過程”。貝爾十分詳盡地論述了語篇分析和處理，但是幾乎隻字不提文化價值和社會功能，甚至“觀眾設計” (audience design) 這個翻譯的因素（此概念的運用可參考 Hatim and Mason 1997）。

哈蒂姆 (Basil Hatim) 和梅森 (Ian Mason) 的翻譯論著《作為傳意者的譯者》(1997) 是特別為譯員培訓而編寫的。書中運用一連串的概念，就風格、體裁、話語、語用、意識形態等方面，對譯文進行細緻入微的分析。在其中一章，他們採用禮貌理論 (politeness theory)，分析電影對白的翻譯。所謂禮貌理論，就是將說話者維持或破壞對話者的“面子” (face) 的言語行為形式化。（“面子”的定義是“希望不受阻撓的慾求”，或“希望在某些方面受到尊重的慾求”：Brown and Levinson 1987: 58）。他們對字幕翻譯的分析很有說服力，證明外語對白中的禮貌現象在譯文中“大量消失”。所謂禮貌現象，是一種語言指標，顯示劇中人物在照顧對方的“面子慾求”。

不過，書中的分析就到此為止，完全不談翻譯方式怎樣影響觀眾對電影中的角色的觀感；而譯者作決定時很可能考慮過這種影響。要分析這個問題，首先需要關於在故事裡如何塑造角色的概念，也就是一套文學和電影形式的理論，其次需要更加仔細地研究接受的情況，也就是在文化口味的歷史學和社會學的基礎上，研究觀眾設計。

一套為教學而設計的強調語篇分析的翻譯理論，可能會給翻譯初學者幾個錯誤的印象。他們會以為翻譯必須包含語篇分析的成果，以求“準確”或者“對等”；而事實上，這類判斷最終要視乎譯文的用途而定。更糟糕的是，翻譯初學者會以為只要採用某個“步驟”，翻譯問題就可以迎刃而解；而事實上，翻譯並不是那麼精確、單純的一回事，總有許多意想不到的問題出現，也常靠神來之筆解決問題。初學者甚至會以為這些“步驟”本身不會在不同的情景下改變意義、價值和功能；而事實上，翻譯中的“調整”、“明晰化 (explicitate)”、“改寫 (adapt)”等手法，會為不同受眾製造不同的語篇效果。

具諷刺意味的是，維奈和達爾貝內的討論，卻也反映出文化和社會範疇在翻譯理論和培訓中的重要性。他們抱著支持標準用語的意識形態，因此在選擇語言的問題上為譯員制訂保守的規範。他們這樣寫道：“譯者宜採用傳統的表達形式”，以免“被人批評使用法國習語、英國習語、德國習語、西班牙習語等。” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 38-39)。他們又質疑翻譯在全球的文化經濟和政治經濟中的位置。全球一體化的趨勢使他們“對這樣的前景感到憂慮：世界上五分之四的人將不得不完全依賴譯本過日子，他們的才智將變得空洞貧乏，因為一直進食的都是語言糟粕”，也就是跨國機構和公司所用的翻譯語言。（同上：40）

為教學而設計的翻譯理論引發的另一個危險，就是功能主義大行其道，迅速變成純為職業訓練服務，因而局限了初學者的翻譯知識。“功能對等”這個概念在六十年代出現於培訓環境中，影響甚為廣泛。這套理念所描述——有時甚至規定——的翻譯，是將外國語篇同化於譯語的語言和文化規範，以傳遞其信息。經過奈達 (Eu-

gene Nida)、紐馬克 (Peter Newmark)、豪斯 (Juliane House)、萊斯 (Katharina Reiss)、弗米爾 (Hans Vermeer) 等多位理論家二十年來的理論發展後，這套功能主義學說更由霍爾斯－曼塔里 (Justa Holz-Manttari) 徹底改造成“譯者行動” (translatorisches Handeln)¹ 理論。這個理論把譯者視為一個專家，他與顧客商討之後，定出“產品規格”，然後製成“信息傳播工具”，以求在目的文化中達到某個特定目標。在這類翻譯之中，對等不如功能般重要：原文由可以滿足顧客需要的譯文所取代。

這套理論不單是在譯員培訓課程中發展出來的，而且真實反映出技術、商業、官方文件的譯者的工作方式。它強調譯員的專業角色和責任，從而引出翻譯道德的問題。

可是，人們不免懷疑，這種道德，不外是指精明的商業手法而已。霍爾斯－曼塔里的理論經過抽象演繹後，令翻譯淪為流水作業式的語篇製作過程，一如福特汽車所標榜的效率至上的福特主義 (Fordism)。這套功能理論有可能誤導翻譯初學者，使他們以為翻譯只是而且只應向會計師負責，更有可能把一切並非商業導向的價值觀完全摒諸譯者的行動以外。其實，就連技術文件的譯者，也須經過考慮，才能決定是否接受某項工作，例如應否為剝削工人、危害工人福利、破壞生態環境，或者與極權政府朋比為奸的機構做翻譯。“顧客”一詞過於抽象，不能令人提出並且思考這等問題。各種功能主義的學說，不論是霍爾斯－曼塔里的行動理論，還是弗米爾的目的論，都是基於商業主義的意識形態，最終限制了譯者的道德反省。

利維的文章提出有趣的一點，就是譯者有必要獲得更多有關文化和社會差異的知識。他採取折衷的態度，主張採用一個“包括心

理語言學、結構人類學、語義學以及當今應用於溝通過程研究的所有學科 (和‘跨學科’) 的複合分析方法” (Levy 1965: 77)。同時，值得指出的是，他討論具體的譯例時，只是零碎地運用這個分析方法，削弱了它的解釋力。

他根據一個實驗研究的結果指出，“中下等的譯文”有兩種“風格特色”：譯者往往“選用詞義比原文寬的類屬詞”，並且“明確交代各個意念間的邏輯關係，甚至是原文所無的；把思路不銜接或者視角轉變的地方講通；把表達方式‘正常化’” (同上：78-79)。為了解釋上述不良趨勢，利維提出了一個“簡單的心理原因”：譯者的目的在於“詮釋，也就是讓本國讀者看得懂一本外國書”，所以就使用比較通俗而且前後呼應的語言。

雖然利維描述了一個複合分析方法，但他提出的這個心理語言學的解釋，卻迴避了人類學及其他學科的研究。然而，由於他的研究聚焦於文學作品的翻譯，本來還有其他問題必須探討。譯文所選用的風格，是否反映譯語文化的翻譯價值和翻譯傳統？與譯語社會的原創文學作品的風格是對應還是有所偏離？利維把一個可能牽連甚廣的文化模式約簡為心理問題，也就錯失了一個機會，去探討翻譯與大部分譯者以各種途徑內化 (internalize) 了的文化價值和文化傳統之間的關係。這種內化過程由閱讀和教育開始，但也包括與出版商的交易和書評所反映的對他們的譯文的接受。

利維的論文還提出另一個例子，以說明“作者和譯者之間的文化背景差異”所引起的問題，就是專有名詞的翻譯 (Levy 1965: 80)。利維促請譯者“不僅比較兩個語言系統的文法，而且要對照兩個文化區域的人類學模式”，以解決這些問題 (同上：81)。但是，究竟有沒有可能發展出一套人類學來解釋利維所描述的風格貧

乏現象，從而證明一個簡單的心理因素會帶來如此複雜的社會後果，實在很成疑問。

到了八十年代，這些風格貧乏的現象被視為翻譯語言的“普遍”特色，使譯文既不像所譯的外文語篇，也不像譯語中的原創語篇。一九八六年，布魯姆—庫爾卡 (Shoshana Blum-Kulka) 把翻譯語言的一種普遍特色稱為「明晰化」。她推測，翻譯總會增加譯文各部分的語義關係，透過明晰化、重複、增加冗餘信息、解釋以及其他話語策略，提高接應度 (cohesion)；而譯文中的連貫性的偏移 (shift of coherence)，即偏離外文語篇的底層語義模式，則取決於語篇的接受 (reception)，即讀者和譯者的詮釋。布魯姆—庫爾卡建議用實驗來研究閱讀模式，對語篇處理進行心理語言學研究，以驗證這幾個命題。就這樣，從文化和歷史的角度尋求解釋的機會再度錯失了，翻譯中的意識形態因素仍然未曾探索。

不過，這類解釋由其他理論家提了出來，特別是在七十和八十年代。多元系統理論家如埃文—佐哈爾 (Itamar Even-Zohar 1990) 和圖里 (Gideon Toury 1995) 等人的影響深遠的論著發表之後，翻譯首先被視為譯語文化的事實，而文化則被定義為一個文學系統，包含各種互相關聯的形式和準則 (canon)，構成“規範” (norms)，制約著譯者的選擇和策略。進行這種面向譯語文化的研究，就必須探求文化和歷史上的解釋。受形式主義影響的理論家 (如圖里) 和受波珀 (Karl Popper) 影響的理論家 (如徹斯特曼 Andrew Chesterman) 認為，這些解釋將引出一些蓋然性的「規律」。因此，學術研究的價值在於證實 (或否定) 若干假說，從而提出翻譯規律，或者加強已經提出的規律。

然而，倘若這些規律涉及文化模式和社會關係，則必須加入歷

史學和社會學的原則，而這兩者都是形式主義學派和波珀學派所缺乏的。事實上，波珀素以攻擊各種形式的歷史主義而聞名 (Bennett 1979, D'Amico 1989)。利維也希望理論能夠作出預測，以解釋“譯文對讀者的效果如何取決於譯者所採取的方法” (Levy 1966: 77)。但是，歷史上有太多的例子證明，翻譯策略的效果因受眾的期望、知識和品味而改變，有時甚至與譯者的意圖相反，尤其是在譯文到了另一個文化地區的時候 (Venuti 1998)。找尋翻譯規律的理論會令初學者把規律視為解決策略和效果問題的最佳答案，以及選擇外文語篇甚至決定是否翻譯的便捷準則。但是，要預測譯文的接受，首先必須研究具體的文化情景，評估過去和現在的翻譯方式、文學傳統和語言運用。

迄今為止，發展得最精深的面向譯語文化的理論，已經將翻譯過程對外文語篇的影響納入研究範圍。貝爾曼 (Antoine Berman) 的理論正是如此。

跟利維一樣，貝爾曼 (2000) 認為翻譯“扭曲”了外文語篇，原因有時是譯文風格貧乏 (貝爾曼用的正是“風格貧乏”一詞)。貝爾曼跟維奈和達爾貝勒內一樣，也細緻地描述了翻譯散文時導至扭曲的策略。有趣的是，他採用心理學來解釋譯員為甚麼採用這些策略。但他所用的是心理分析學而不是心理語言學的解釋。他指出：當代的文學翻譯策略“大致上是潛意識的”，是“兩千年傳統的內化表現” (2000: 286)。

因此，貝爾曼最終是從文化和歷史的角度來解釋的。扭曲的傾向雖然自古以來在西方文化中一向是主流，但並非世界性的，而且在不同時空中的表現形式也有不同，例如法國的“不忠的美人” (belles infideles) 的翻譯傳統，或者龐德 (Ezra Pound) 翻譯古詩或

外國詩歌的實驗性手法。貝爾曼跟語言學取向的理論家最主要的分歧，也許在於他們的翻譯觀。利維認為翻譯的主要目的是讓讀者看得懂外文語篇；貝爾曼則認為是“接受外文語篇的外國風味”，讓譯語的語言、文學和文化嘗試把外文語篇納入其架構之中，從而使自身產生變化 (2000: 285-286)。這種翻譯觀成為了翻譯道德的基礎，但是跟霍爾斯-曼塔里的行動論或者弗米爾的目的論不同，貝爾曼的理論與商業利益、商業手法和客戶需要毫無關係。他關心的，是要在譯文之中建立一套與外國語篇和文化的道德關係。

貝爾曼說，他的“翻譯分析方法”是“暫定的”，如果“要系統化，就需要其他領域（其他語種和作品）的譯者、語言學家、‘詩學家’，以及……心理分析學家一起參與，因為扭曲的力量〔對外國風味〕構成了許多指摘和抗拒” (2000: 286)。然而，他也是根據自己做翻譯（主要是將拉丁美洲文學譯為法文）的經驗，提出這套理念的。因此，這些概念對譯員培訓無疑會有用處。

根據貝爾曼的理論，翻譯初學者須同時具備語言知識、理論知識、文化知識和歷史知識。他顯然把篇章性 (textuality) 的概念引進了翻譯之中，以便進行語言特點的分析：由於他討論的是小說的翻譯，他借用了巴克廷 (Mikhail Bakhtin) 的小說話語 (novelistic discourse) 理論。但是，他的理論也證明了歷史對翻譯的重要性，證明了譯者要懂得本土和外國的文化傳統（就他的情況而言，包括小說歷史和法國翻譯傳統）。貝爾曼寫道：“譯者如果沒有歷史意識，就會成為自己的翻譯的再現以及反映當時的‘社會論述’的再現的囚徒” (Berman 1995: 61)。從理論和歷史的角度觀察翻譯，可讓譯者評估自己的翻譯實踐並且增加可用的話語策略。這個研究途徑還會引領我們分析批判翻譯理論中的意識形態，看到就連語篇語言學

這樣看似中立的方法，也會因為把翻譯分析局限於語言層面而偏袒某種社會或政治價值（例如商業主義或語言學這個學術科目本身）。

1972年，霍爾姆斯 (James Holmes) 提出影響甚大的純翻譯研究和應用翻譯研究之說，容許純理論與實踐和培訓脫鉤的可能性。與受他影響的一些學者（例如 Toury 1995）相比，霍爾姆斯認為理論與實踐之間有較大的相互作用。但是，理論雖然往往在潛意識中暗地指導具體的翻譯決定，它往往來自實踐這一點似乎是沒有疑問的。

因此，譯者必須學習翻譯理論，也必須學習翻譯史。他們需要理論和歷史作為基礎知識，才能有靈活性和創造性，以發展出多種多樣的翻譯策略，才能具備成熟的思想，以評估各種翻譯策略的文化價值和社會功能。自從面向文化的翻譯研究在近二十年崛起以來，翻譯理論和譯員培訓已能把語言學的分析方法應用於更有效益的用途上。維奈和達爾貝勒內籠統地把語言裡的意義視為文化建構，但是他們把譯者的語言操作程序和“超語言信息”區別開來。所謂“超語言信息”，就是“該兩個語言社群的文學、科學、政治等領域的現況” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 42)。貝爾曼證明，試圖劃清兩者之間的界線，就會隱藏了這樣一個事實，就是譯文中的語言必然已經帶有文化價值和社會功能，值得作道德反省和意識形態上的批判。正在修讀翻譯的初學者，如果不單閱讀、評價維奈和達爾貝勒內的著作，而且閱讀、評價貝爾曼的著作，必定得益不少。

當然，一定會有一些從實踐中學習翻譯而且累積了豐富經驗的翻譯員不贊同我的提議。美國一位專門翻譯帕茲 (Octavio Paz)、伯吉斯 (Jorge Luis Borges) 等西班牙語作家的翻譯家溫伯格 (Elliot

Weinburger), 在一篇格言式的文章〈翻譯〉中聲稱：“翻譯理論不管有多漂亮，對翻譯都是沒有幫助的。熱力學的定律是一回事，烹飪是另一回事。” (Weinberger 1992)

溫伯格對翻譯的科學定律抱有懷疑，我顯然也有同感。翻譯活動即使能約簡為腦部功能，它也免不了是一種文化行為，其牽涉範圍遠遠不止生理機能之類的自然過程。不過，溫伯格認為翻譯就像烹飪，毫無理論可言，這種說法似乎謬誤。烹飪須有食譜和烹調技巧，而食譜和烹調技巧須建基於何謂可口的假設。如果譯員就像廚子，那麼他們都要有一套理論指導，才能決定怎樣選擇材料、策略和效果。他們必須懂得有甚麼材料，這些材料有甚麼用途，尤其是文化和政治上的用途。

註釋

¹ 譯者註：文努提的英譯是“translatorial action”。另一個說法是“translational action”（翻譯行動）（見 Vermeer 1989: 173, 以及 Christiane Nord. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing), 17)。

參考書目

- Bell, R. (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, London: Longman.
- Bennett, T. (1979) *Formalism and Marxism*, London and New York:

Methuen.

- Berman, A. (1985) “La Traduction comme epreuve de l’etranger,” *Texte* 4: 67-81.
- (1995) *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*, Paris: Gallimard.
- (trans. Lawrence Venuti) (2000) “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign,” in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 284-297.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986) “Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation,” in J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, Tubingen: Narr, pp. 17-35.
- Brown, P., and S.C. Levenson (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997) *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- D’Amico, R. (1989) *Historicism and Knowledge*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990) *Polysystem Studies*, *Poetics Today* 11(1).
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Holmes, J.S. (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holz-Manttari, J. (1984) *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und*

- Methodes*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- House, J. (1977) "A Model for Assessing Translation Quality," *Meta* 22: 103-109.
- (1977/1981) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Levy, J. (1965) "Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators?" in R. Itälahti (ed.) *Übersetzen*, Frankfurt: Athenäum, pp. 77-82.
- (1966) "Translation as a Decision Process," *To Honor Roman Jakobson II*, The Hague: Mouton, pp. 1171-1182.
- Newmark, P. (1977) "Communicative and Semantic Translation," *Babel* 23: 163-180.
- (1982) *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Nida, E. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden: Brill.
- and C. Taber (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: Brill, rpt. 1982.
- Reiss, K. (1971) *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*, München: Hueber.
- (1981) "Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation," trans. S. Kitron, *Poetics Today* 2(4): 121-131.
- and H.J. Vermeer (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2nd ed., 1991.
- Toury, G. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: Porter

- Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H.J. (1989) "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action," trans. A. Chesterman, in A. Chesterman (ed.) *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ob, pp. 173-187.
- Vinay, J.-P. and J. Darbelnet (1958) *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*, Paris: Didier.
- (1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, trans. and eds J.C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Weinberger, E. (1992) *Outside Stories, 1987-1991*, New York: New Directions.

用多元系統理論研究翻譯的意識形態的局限

莊柔玉

一、意識形態與翻譯研究

“意識形態”一詞，可說是學者公認為沒有公認的定義的一個複雜概念。正如戴維·麥克萊倫 (David McLellan) 說，這是“一個本質上富爭議性的概念”，無論在定義上或應用上都惹來極大的爭論。¹不少專談意識形態的學者也抱有相同的看法。邁克·科馬克 (Mike Cormack) 談及意識形態的定義時列舉了珍妮特·沃爾夫 (Janet Wolff)、比爾·尼科爾斯 (Bill Nichols)、約翰·菲斯克 (John Fiske)、路易斯·阿爾蒂塞 (Luis Althusser) 對意識形態的不同理解，指出不同學者各有所指，定義之分歧，令人迷惘。²特里·伊格爾頓 (Terry Eagleton) 在《意識形態導論》一書中更明確地指出：“目前還沒有人能就意識形態作出一個唯一充分的定義，本書也不例外……原因是意識形態這個術語包含了一整套有用的意義，但當中不是所有意義都互相兼容的，因此，即使能夠把涵蓋面豐富的意義壓縮成為一個唯一全面的定義，也不見得有很大的指涉作用。”³不同年代、不同時期、不同學術範疇的研究者如哲學家、政治學家、社會學家、甚至是心理學家使用意識形態這個詞語時都抱有不同的理解，或廣或狹，或褒或貶；因此，意識形態這個概念難以有統一的定義，委實在所難免，自有其歷史的原因。⁴

本文並不試圖就這個內容涵義隨時代、學科或使用者的立場或

詮釋而變化的術語，下一個放諸四海皆準確的既富統攝性又具排他性的定義；要下這樣的定義，似乎是不大可能的。相反地，本文論及的意識形態，是取其最廣泛最普遍的意義，即借用布朗 (L. B. Brown) 的說法，認為意識形態泛指許多社會或個人行為背後的思想及解釋系統⁵。這可說是對意識形態這個概念的普遍理解。本文採用這個包容廣闊的定義，就是認為舉凡這個廣泛的定義包含的事情，只要與翻譯有關的，都可納入翻譯的意識形態的研究範圍。更確切地說，一切談及翻譯行為背後的思想及解釋系統的觀點或論述，都是本文談論翻譯的意識形態的指涉範圍。

把意識形態的研究與翻譯研究結合起來，是學術研究上越來越明顯的趨勢。正如彼得·福西特 (Peter Fawcett) 所說，隨着解構主義與文化研究的興起，意識形態這個課題，或更確切地說，權力關係的意識形態，成為了學術研究上重要的課題。在許多學術研究領域上，意識形態之說越來越多，而翻譯的研究也不例外。⁶福西特列舉了一些例子加以論證，其中包括安德烈·勒菲弗爾 (André Lefevere) 和泰賈斯溫尼·尼蘭詹納 (Tejaswini Niranjana) 的言論。勒菲弗爾聲稱：在翻譯過程的每一個層次，如果語言上的考慮跟意識形態上的考慮有所衝突，通常會是後者勝出。⁷尼蘭詹納的說法同樣立場鮮明、論點清晰。她認為翻譯可成為壓制的策略；通過採取某些表達的模式，翻譯強化了殖民地統治者的領導或霸權地位。⁸意識形態在翻譯中扮演的重要角色，從兩位學者的言論可見一斑。羅倫斯·文努提 (Lawrence Venuti) 編的《翻譯再思：論述、主觀性、意識形態》一書，更開宗明義地把意識形態與翻譯研究扯上關係。他在引論中明確表示：“本論文集的編撰目的，是為了引起大家對翻譯的反思；翻譯是哲學的，也是政治的，牽涉語言、論述、主觀

性等問題，與此同時也顯示了這些問題跟文化差異、意識形態矛盾和社會衝突之間的關係。”⁹ 由此可見，在翻譯研究上，翻譯的意識形態確實是一個備受某些學者重視的課題。

二、多元系統理論與翻譯的意識形態探討

要研究翻譯作為個人或社會行為背後的思想及解釋系統，不免牽涉多個層面、多種角度、多項資料的剖析。換言之，要解構翻譯作品的譯者、讀者群體、譯入語文化等的意識形態，不能單單依賴規範性的美學原則作為審視的標準，而是需要描述性的研究方法，把一個地區一個文化或一個群體的翻譯規範，以及規範背後的價值取向、矛盾、制約等，加以較全面和系統化的分析。

那麼，多元系統理論的分析架構，是否適用於闡析翻譯牽涉的規範、文化取向、價值體系等各種意識形態的問題？要解答這個問題，必須先界定何謂多元系統。多元系統 (polysystem) 的說法源自伊塔馬·埃文-佐哈爾 (Itamar Even-Zohar)。埃文-佐哈爾認為翻譯作品不應視作個別的文化現象，而應連繫到更大的文化層次上來加以探討，因為它們正是譯入語多元系統存在着的各種條件關係的表徵。埃文-佐哈爾恐怕使用“系統”這個既有名稱叫人聯想到封閉、靜態的運作模式，於是創立“多元系統”的說法。所謂系統，埃文-佐哈爾界定為針對某一些可供觀察的事件或現象而假設出來的關係網。¹⁰ 至於多元系統，他則一再強調是一個動態的、開放的、多層面的、由不同元素組成的系統。在多元系統中，不同的系統互相交疊或部分重疊，卻又彼此依賴，共同運作而形成一個有等級的大體系。¹¹ 換言之，多元系統是一個整體的結構內不斷變動的

關係的總和。

多元系統理論如何處理翻譯作品呢？多元系統理論假定翻譯作品是譯入語文化多元系統的一部分，因此，翻譯活動必然與多元系統內各種變動的關係息息相關。要解釋某些特殊的翻譯現象，就必須剖析在特定時空下與翻譯活動交疊在一起的並存系統，如何互相依賴、互相影響而交織成獨特的文化現象。

多元系統理論的研究方向，跟翻譯的意識形態研究頗為一致。兩者都以研究系統、剖析系統之間的關係為焦點。翻譯的意識形態，即翻譯行為背後的思想或解釋系統，牽涉相當複雜且不斷變動的關係組合，絕不是某一個因素、某一個角度或某些零碎的資料片斷就可把它描述或解釋出來的。從這個角度看，多元系統理論這種以描述或解釋翻譯行為或規範為研究焦點、嘗試對翻譯現象作出全面和客觀分析的理論框架，可說是頗適用於翻譯意識形態的探討。多元系統的理論正好提供了一個現成的理論架構，讓翻譯研究者把各種直接或間接地形成或塑造翻譯的意識形態的因素納入其中，加以仔細和具體的剖析。即使是對多元系統理論嚴加批評的西奧·赫曼斯 (Theo Hermans)，也提出了同樣的觀點，認為這套理論“提供了一個全面又雄心勃勃的框架，從事研究的人可藉着它找出真實行為背後的解釋和處境。”¹²

以多元系統理論來研究翻譯的意識形態，對翻譯研究有一定的貢獻。其一，這樣的研究為翻譯的研究開拓了新的視野，使翻譯研究的焦點由個別作品擴展到翻譯的意識形態，以及塑造意識形態的整個社會文化體系。多元系統理論的分析進路把個別的翻譯作品從原文譯文之間狹窄的主次關係中解放出來。翻譯作品不再被視為只是依附原文而存在、用規範性的審美標準來檢視的獨立個體，而是

整個社會文化體系的一部分。在多元系統的理論框架下，翻譯作品甚至能具體揭示產生翻譯作品的文化群體的意識形態，這確實大大豐富了翻譯研究的內容。翻譯研究因而從個別作品的分析，邁向產生作品的歷史文化體系的描述；從平面單向的討論，走向立體多向的辯證。

其二，這樣的研究能把翻譯作品跟文化社會經濟政治文學等各種系統都連上關係，使翻譯研究者可用較整全的角度去探討翻譯現象。多元系統理論賦予了翻譯活動獨特的詮釋角度，翻譯活動不再處於社會文化孤立的邊陲位置，翻譯被視作形成、推動甚至是塑造整體社會文化的一分子。翻譯的意識形態問題，也就隨着多元系統研究的開拓而變得越來越受重視；翻譯的研究也隨着翻譯的意識形態研究的展開而越趨系統化：從表層現象的論述，進入深層結構的探討；從一元靜態的觀測，跨進多元動態較全面的系統性研究。

三、用多元系統理論來研究翻譯的意識形態的局限

1. 理論上的矛盾

誠然，以多元系統理論來探討翻譯的意識形態，可為翻譯研究開拓新的視野，注入新的觀點與角度；但是多元系統理論在理論上或應用上不足之處，也無可避免地規限了翻譯的意識形態研究的成果。

埃文-佐哈爾的多元系統理論最備受爭議的地方，如埃德溫·根茨勒 (Edwin Gentzler) 所指出，就是這套理論在尋求建立普遍客觀定律的過程中那種簡單化、籠統化、絕對化的傾向。¹³ 埃文-佐哈爾就文學系統的普遍發展規律的論述¹⁴，又或就翻譯文學在文學

多元系統中的位置之歸納和分析¹⁵，都被批評為只屬抽象籠統的假設、缺乏足夠的學術論據支持、不能超越時空限制排除主觀色彩等。赫曼斯的觀點跟根茨勒的可謂互相呼應，他認為埃文-佐哈爾以高姿態發表的所謂規律，對他來說要不是不證自明、流於瑣碎；就是疑問重重、難於接受。¹⁶

埃文-佐哈爾的多元系統理論的籠統化、絕對化傾向，可從以下一個例子加以說明。埃文-佐哈爾抱有一個重要的假設：在多元系統裏的各個組成部分並非同樣重要的；相反地，它們有等級之分，並佔據着系統內不同的位置，而且從不間斷地角力，爭取中心的位置。因此，就翻譯系統而言，作品究竟站在中心的還是邊緣的位置絕不是固定不變的事實，它們只是某個時空下的特殊現象，它們的位置也會隨着多元系統內各種關係的變動而改變。¹⁷

循此假設的思路，研究者必然會想到更深入、更具體的問題：在偌大的多元系統內究竟存在着哪些個別的系統，它們之間的關係又如何建構了翻譯的意識形態？能否完全找出多元系統內各種交疊系統及它們之間的變動關係？研究者又怎能判斷他們從事的是排除了價值判斷、不受自身文化滲透的客觀研究？雖然，或許意識到上述問題的埃文-佐哈爾曾經指出：“研究開放的系統遠較封閉的困難，要作出全面的分析更面對諸多的限制”¹⁸，不過，他並沒有因而放棄尋求複雜多變的翻譯現象的“客觀”規律。¹⁹ 找出這些埃文-佐哈爾認為是絕對客觀的規律，一直是多元系統理論的研究核心。

埃文-佐哈爾在這方面的堅持，使多元系統理論的可靠性受到質疑。一方面，多元系統理論從事的是歷時性的研究，旨在描述與詮釋變動不定的系統內各種互動關係的變化；另一方面，它又努力尋求與建立共時性的規律，旨在歸納、概括或解釋翻譯的文化現

象。埃文－佐哈爾提出的所謂廣泛而普遍的定律，是帶有絕對性和排斥性的；與此同時，他卻忽略了這些從歷史的現實歸納出來的定律，是帶有歷史基礎或條件的。即是說，埃文－佐哈爾試圖用共時性的定律來絕對化歷時性的現象，這樣的觀點又怎能自圓其說？除非埃文－佐哈爾放棄絕對化的立場，承認多元系統的研究成果並不是也不可能是完全客觀或全面的，承認研究本身也受制於這個研究處身的多元系統的條件關係，否則，多元系統的理論是站不住腳的。

文努提對吉迪安·圖里 (Gideon Toury) 等從事描述性研究的學者的批評，則從另一個角度指出了多元系統理論這種“絕對客觀”立場的局限。文努提認為這些學者缺乏一樣重要的認知，就是在建構翻譯或文化理論、甚至設計或執行研究計劃的時候，主觀的判斷是無可避免的，任何學術性的詮釋必然帶着其處身的文化處境的價值判斷。提倡不受價值觀左右的翻譯學研究，反而窒礙了翻譯學作為一門學科的發展，使翻譯學不能充分地作出自我批判，充分地承認和檢視自身對其他相關學科的依賴，充分地考慮翻譯研究可能會產生的、在較廣泛的文化層面上的影響。²⁰ 文努提以下的說話，簡要地道出了強調絕對客觀性不足之處：

埃文－佐哈爾和圖里植根於俄國的形式主義的學說，忽視了各種理論發展在文學和文化研究上帶來的急劇變化——即目前林林總總的心理分析、女性主義、馬克思主義、後結構主義——一切強調在人文主義的詮釋上難以把事實和價值分割開來的論述。沒有這些，翻譯的理論家就不能想及翻譯的道德規範，或翻譯在政治運動中扮演的角色，而在今天，這些問題似乎較劃下狹隘的學科界線來得重要。²¹

2. 應用上的困難

埃文－佐哈爾上述的立場不獨在理論上留下破綻，在實踐上也叫研究者無從入手。在宏大的多元系統裏面，該如何釐定研究的對象呢？不同的系統互相牽扯或制衡，關係錯綜複雜，拉力或弛或張，要判別哪些是相干或最相干的系統，絕不容易（唯恐不自覺地加入了主觀色彩），要斷定哪些是不相干的系統更加困難，（唯恐錯誤地排斥了相關的因素，）選擇的過程與結果完全視乎研究者的着眼點和視野。試想，有誰可以站在超越時空的角度來觀察事物？觀察者本身既已帶着他所處時空、所屬系統賦予他的條件或限制，他又怎能排除主觀的色彩，漠視他在偌大的多元系統裏選擇研究的對象的當兒，其實已經帶着本身的認知意向，且同時摒棄了其他的認知意向與角度？既然選擇甚麼是相關的系統作為研究焦點本身已經反映了研究者獨特而主觀的觀察和判斷，他又該如何着手研究呢？

這一片實踐上的空白地帶，埃文－佐哈爾並沒有帶領我們撥開迷霧，穿梭其中。埃文－佐哈爾只從反面的角度指出在挑選研究對象時宜避免的事情，卻從來沒有從正面的角度列出明確的挑選準則。具體來說，在挑選研究的項目上，埃文－佐哈爾主張要摒棄主觀的價值判斷，極力反對“偏頗的精英主義”，認為拿來剖析的對象不應局限於主流文化認定是權威的、標準的項目，而應該把一些即使被界定為非正統的、不受注意的、甚至是表面上不相干的系統，都納入研究的範圍；因為正統或不正統之分，不過是依附於權力關係的主流意識。他舉出的例子是研究歷史不應再停留在研究王侯將相的事蹟。²² 不過，究竟哪些才是與特殊的翻譯現象相關的研究項目，埃文－佐哈爾的理論則欠指引或解說。²³

就這個問題，根茨勒提出了很有說服力的一個論點。根茨勒認為埃文－佐哈爾的研究方法不一定可靠，因為他雖然採取科學辯證的態度，但在他試圖建立普遍定律的過程中，只是基於非常單薄的數據，而那些數據又是來自研究者本身獨特的文化體系。根茨勒認為從事多元系統理論的研究者可能會犯上一個毛病，就是特別重視或集中採納合乎他對整個多元系統結構假設的資料，自圓其說，而這種甚至是不自覺的主觀性是很難排除的。²⁴ 因此，假如以埃文－佐哈爾的多元系統理論來研究翻譯的意識形態，研究者必須嚴加提防這種把主觀詮釋當作客觀定理的危機。假如多元系統理論未能在研究方法上提供明確的指引，上述的危機是不能化解的。

就數據單薄這點，赫曼斯還道出了應用多元系統理論的另一個危機。赫曼斯指出多元系統理論雖然意識到翻譯與社會文化是不可分割的，然而在實際的應用研究上卻往往離不開文本的分析研究，絕少談及真實的政治和社會權力關係或具體的機構和組織，也沒有就人為的因素諸如個別群體的利益問題作出深入的研究。這種抽象的、抽離人為因素的、依賴單薄的文本數據作為分析基礎的研究，很容易把文學或文化的演變描述為自動化的、循環不息的、依照某些固定不變的歷史規律的演變過程，帶着濃厚的決定論色彩。²⁵ 一旦多元系統理論未能具體指出如何把文本以外的因素詳加剖析，這方面的研究不免帶有解釋自動化的決定論傾向。

此外，正如荷西·朗貝爾 (José Lambert) 指出，埃文－佐哈爾的多元系統理論提供了一種跨越學科界限的文化研究視野，這無疑是多元系統理論難能可貴的地方。²⁶ 不過，正是這個跨學科的研究方向，使多元系統理論在分析翻譯的意識形態上面對另一個困難：跨學術領域研究的限制。多元系統研究的好處是兼收並蓄，把不同

學科如語言、文化、歷史、社會、宗教，甚至是政治、經濟等範疇也牽涉在內。例如，用多元系統理論去探討文化，就會面對如帕特里克·卡特里塞 (Patrick Catrysse) 所描繪的複雜情況：

文化不是孤立地運作。研究各系統與子系統間的（系統）關係會帶來一連串有趣的問題：能否把兩個鄰近的（子）系統—例如政治與經濟，或美學與技術系統視作完全分割的系統來研究/處理？子系統之間的關係如何？它們又如何建構了或改變了整個文化多元系統？只有通過對各（子）系統之間的相互關係，以及它們在整個大系統內的共同運作情況，作出徹底的研究，才能證明這是否可行，並如何能做到。²⁷

若要對卡特里塞提到的複雜情況作出跨學科研究，不免問題叢生。這是因為每一門學科都有其專家，都就涉及其學科的問題作過深入的研究；多元系統研究嘗試集大成之餘，卻難逃每門學科專家對涉及其學科的問題的獨特要求。那些要求可以是截然不同或互相排斥的，以致任何一種學科出身的人或許都會認為多元系統的研究非驢非馬，研究成果有欠堅實。

那麼，假定研究者精通各種學問，能夠融會貫通，是否就可作出無懈可擊的多元系統研究？答案也不是。不同學科的研究目的、方法、預期研究成果不盡相同，不一定可兼容並包。例如，文化哲學的研究者或會認為某個解釋太偏重歷史現實的層面，欠缺抽象而深入的形而上層次的反思；但從事歷史研究的人或會質疑形而上剖析的客觀基礎。要提出兩者兼容又兩類研究者都認同的解釋可能是一種奢想。埃文－佐哈爾的多元系統理論，似乎並沒有提供如何解決不同學科研究方法不協調的問題，也沒有提供分析翻譯現象時在採用各種學科的研究方法上的優先次序問題。

再進一步說，假若擴展研究的規模，展開浩大的研究工程，邀請不同學科的專家共同參與，負責不同部分的研究計劃，跨學科研究的問題是否就能夠迎刃而解呢？那當然並不盡然，除非各個研究部分互不相干，否則必然會同樣面對上一段提到的問題，因為不同專家各有不同的信念和研究方法，碰上意見分歧時如何協調？不同的觀點如何衡量孰輕孰重？不同系統之間的關係如何界定？研究的成果如何綜合？顯然，這些問題的答案，尚待發掘。

對跨學科研究的價值甚為推許的朗貝爾甚至提出了一個更現實、更偏激的說法。他從政治的考慮出發，指出在我們這些較為封建的學術組織裏，要推行跨學科研究異常困難，原因是政治因素較學術論爭具決定性。他認為在人文學科的範疇，集體合作的研究模式是很難開展的。此外，他相信那些針對規範和權力問題的研究，要是不從鞏固建制的規範和權力出發，只會構成建制的威脅，因而難以像歌功頌德的研究般得到支持和認同。²⁸

3. 猜測與推論

為甚麼埃文－佐哈爾的多元系統理論並沒有就上文談到的理論上的矛盾與實踐上的困難，提供一套合理的解釋，或一些解決的方法？這不得不推論到多元系統理論本身的發展階段問題。埃文－佐哈爾在七十年代開始提出多元系統理論，雖然寫了好些文章闡釋他對翻譯的觀點，但是他的理論框架是較為粗疏的，他談到文學以外的系統如政治、經濟、宗教等時，並沒有具體說明如何研究這些系統、如何處理這些系統之間的相互關係、如何通過分析這些系統來闡明翻譯的現象等。換言之，埃文－佐哈爾雖然提供了研究翻譯現象的角度和方向，卻沒有陳述應用多元系統理論的細節，諸如搜集資料的方法、如何處理不同學科之間的矛盾、如何整理綜合不同的

資料而創建一個詮釋體系等。

即使在九十年代的今天，埃文－佐哈爾發表的文章均沒有就上述問題提供令人滿意的答案。赫曼斯的研究顯示，相比於文學理論在七十至九十年代二十多年間在發展規模和性質上的變化，多元系統理論在思想發展上相對的停滯，以及它與其他理論缺乏交流的情況，確實叫人大惑不解的。²⁹目前我們只能說埃文－佐哈爾的多元系統理論的框架仍然較為粗疏、有待完善。也許，當多元系統理論在未來的日子發展更為成熟時，上文提到的在研究上遇到的種種問題不復存在；也許，多元系統理論的局限正在於此，上述問題是始終不能解決的。究竟是哪種情況，只能拭目以待。總的來說，多元系統理論雖然適用於研究翻譯的意識形態，但是多元系統理論本身一些尚未盡善之處，不僅構成了研究者在理論應用上的困難，而且在闡釋翻譯的意識形態上，也規限了研究的成果。

鳴謝

此項研究蒙嶺南大學研究及高等學位委員會支援及撥款資助，特此鳴謝。

註釋

- ¹ David McLellan, *Ideology*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1995, p.1.
- ² Mike Cormack, *Ideology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992, p.9.

- ³ Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*. London; New York: Verso, 1991, p.1.
- ⁴ 意識形態一詞的源流，參 Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985, pp.153-157。
- ⁵ L. B. Brown, *Ideology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education, 1973, p.9.
- ⁶ Peter Fawcett, "Ideology and Translation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker. London; New York: Routledge, 1998, p.106.
- ⁷ André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992, p.39.
- ⁸ Tejaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, p.3.
- ⁹ Lawrence Venuti ed., *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992, p.6.
- ¹⁰ Itamar Even-Zohar, "The 'Literary System'." *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring 1990): 27.
- ¹¹ Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory." *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring 1990): 9-26. 這篇文章的修訂版本刊登於以下的網址：
<http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez>。
- ¹² Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1999, p.102.
- ¹³ Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London, New York: Routledge, 1993, p.121.
- ¹⁴ Itamar Even-Zohar, "Laws of Literary Interference." *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring 1990): 53-72.
- ¹⁵ Itamar Even-Zohar, "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring 1990): 45-51.
- ¹⁶ Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems*, p.111.
- ¹⁷ 參 Itamar Even-Zohar, "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem"。

- ¹⁸ Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory," p.12.
- ¹⁹ 雖然埃文－佐哈爾指出他的理論遭到誤解，強調他提倡的並不是膚淺的“客觀主義”研究（見 Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory," p.13），但是他的理論的核心還是通過搜集有力的資料數據，找出各式各樣複雜多變的翻譯現象背後的客觀規律（見 Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory," p.9）。埃文－佐哈爾在 "The Quest for Laws and Its Implications for the Future of the Science of Literature" (In G. M. Vajda and J. Riesz eds., *The Future of Literary Scholarship*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986, pp.75-79) 一文中，更明確地指出在研究人的科學（包括文學研究）的領域裏，一旦理論的概念與規律的假定脫鉤，就流於濫用。他強調在非科學的範疇裏，一切歸納或概括現象的嘗試，其實都在訂定內隱的規律，問題在於人一方面拒絕接受規律的概念，另一方面又信奉另一些東西為絕對與無可辯駁的真理，自相矛盾。因此，人的研究應邁向科學化，以尋求與建立客觀的規律為目標。
- ²⁰ Lawrence Venuti, "Unequal Developments: Current Trends in Translation Studies." *Comparative Literature* 49:4 (Fall 1997): 361-362.
- ²¹ 同上，頁 363。
- ²² Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory." 埃文－佐哈爾在 1990 年的文章用的術語是“精英主義” (elitism)，在網址刊登的文章則用“偏頗的精英主義” (biased elitism)，在加強語氣之餘，也稍為修正了他的說法。
- ²³ 埃文－佐哈爾雖然強調多元的系統研究概念，但自己的研究範圍卻局限在文學、語言系統內的項目，系統以外的事物如經濟、政治、宗教等範疇鮮有觸及。由是觀之，埃文－佐哈爾並不能提供實踐的範例，證明多元系統研究在挑選研究項目上要做到客觀全面是可行的。正如根茨勒所說，埃文－佐哈爾談及個別文本時，往往從他假定的結構模式或歸納出來的抽象規律出發，絕少把文本放在生產的真實情況來審視，而文學以外的因素，更明顯地欠奉。參 Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.123。
- ²⁴ Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.124.
- ²⁵ Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems*, p.118.
- ²⁶ José Lambert, "Itamar Even-Zohar's Polysystem Studies: An Interdiscipli-

nary Perspective on Culture Research." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 24:1 (March 1997): 7-14.

²⁷ Patrick Cattrysse, "The Polysystem Theory and Cultural Studies." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 24:1 (March 1997): 54.

²⁸ José Lambert, "Translation, Systems and Research: the Contribution of Polysystem Studies to Translation Studies." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction* 7:1(1995): 134-135.

²⁹ Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems*, p.106.

Re-reading Yang Mu in Translation

Göran MALMQVIST

No Trace of the Gardener: Poems of Yang Mu, translated by Lawrence R. Smith and Michelle Yeh. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998. xviii + 239pp.

The modernistic Chinese poetry, which made its appearance shortly before the May Fourth Movement 1919 and flourished in the following three decades, has received considerable attention in the Western world. A number of eminent Chinese poets of this period have been made subjects of monographs, and significant parts of their oeuvres have been well translated into Western languages. The same is true of the wave of modernistic poetry that has welled forth on the Mainland from the end of the 1970s and which signaled the end of the political repression of literature. It is therefore strange and highly regrettable that the rich and flourishing poetry of Taiwan until recently has been practically unknown to the general reading public in the Western world. In fact, the lacunae in Western translations of Taiwanese poetry-and indeed of modern Taiwanese literature as a whole-are so large as to render the subject almost totally invisible.

One scholar who has done more than most to remedy this situation is Michelle Yeh, professor of Chinese at the University of California-Davis. In her work *Modern Chinese Poetry: Theory and Practice since 1917* (Yale University Press, 1991), she treats certain aspects of the transition from traditional to modern poetry, illustrating her theses with translations of Mainland poetry from both the May Fourth era and the 1980s, together with Taiwanese poetry of the last five decades. In her *Anthology of Modern Chi-*

nese Poetry (Yale University Press, 1992; paperback, 1994), she presents translations of works by sixty-six poets from the Mainland and Taiwan, arranged in chronological order, beginning with Hu Shi (1891-1963) and ending with Chen Feiwen (b. 1963). In her elucidating Introduction Yeh outlines the widely differing sociopolitical and cultural milieus under which Mainland and Taiwanese modernistic poetry grew to maturity. Yeh is presently engaged in the final editing of a large anthology of modern Taiwanese poetry, for which she serves as chief editor.

Yeh's most recent work, *No Trace of the Gardener*, is devoted to the poetry of Yang Mu, whose multifarious cultural background and achievements, both as a poet and a scholar in the humanities, have created for him a unique and pivotal position on the literary scene in Taiwan. It is interesting to note that Yang Mu's poetry has exerted significant influence on some of the most outstanding contemporary modernistic poets of the Mainland, such as Yang Lian.

Yang Mu, whose real name is Wang Ching-hsien, was born in Taiwan in 1940. As Taiwan was then under Japanese colonial rule, his first spoken language was Japanese. He learned Taiwanese at home and gained a perfect command of Mandarin as a young man. During his subsequent career as a university student, both in Taiwan and in the United States, he acquired knowledge of Old English, ancient Greek, Latin, and German. His language competence allowed him access to literatures which were not readily accessible to his contemporaries.

Although Yang was absent from Taiwan for many years—from 1970 to 1996 he taught Chinese and comparative literature at American universities—he has continued to play a very active role on Taiwan's cultural scene. Apart from his scholarly works, several of which are devoted to *Shih-ching* (The Book of Poetry), one of the oldest of the Chinese Classics, his publications comprise ten books of poetry, a play in verse, seven books of prose, two Chinese translations of poetry, and two collections of essays and editorials. In 1996 Yang Mu accepted the position of Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at the National Dong Hwa University in

Hua-lien, his home town, situated on the east coast of Taiwan.

In her Introduction Yeh gives a short but lucid account of the sociopolitical and cultural background of Chinese modernistic poetry and traces Yang Mu's development from a predominantly romantic lyricist to an avant-gardist, whose use of special stylistic effects, complex imagery, ambiguity and dramatic tension is akin to that of the symbolists and surrealists. Stressing the uniqueness of Yang Mu's poetry, Yeh writes: "Yang Mu's language is a blend of the literary, which is derived from classical Chinese poetry and prose, and modern vernacular. Yang Mu is one of the few poets who succeed in assimilating the classical tradition into modern poetry" (xxi).

Yang's academic training and his thorough acquaintance with Western literary traditions, Classical, Pre-modern and Modern, inform some of his works with cross-cultural images, motifs and ideas rarely found in modern Chinese poetry. Some of the poetic worlds of Yang Mu may not be readily accessible to a reader who lacks the keys to their gates. In her introduction Yeh occasionally lends less experienced readers her own keys to some of these worlds, thus enabling them to detect deeper levels of meaning, which otherwise would have eluded them. In many instances her interpretations have made it possible for the present reviewer to re-read Yang Mu's poetry with a new understanding.

The volume contains translations of 134 poems by Yang Mu, dating from the period 1958-1991. The translations are the result of collaboration between Michelle Yeh and Lawrence R. Smith, translator of modern Italian literature and founder-editor of *Caliban*. The linguistic density, intellectual depth, intertextual complexity, and sophisticated poetic diction of many of Yang Mu's poems present great difficulties, which the translators have been able to overcome in an admirable way.

No Trace of the Gardener is a major contribution to our appreciation of the poetic oeuvre of one of the major figures not only on the literary scene in Taiwan but indeed on the scene of World Poetry.

論文摘要 Abstracts

西方傳教士與中國近代之外國文學翻譯

Missionaries and Literature: Translating the Western Culture into China

LIU Shusen

Western missionaries in early modern China made pioneer efforts to localize foreign literature into Chinese context, but their fruitful and influential contribution has remained beyond the reach of academic studies. With a view to exploring the nature of literary translation as a cultural phenomenon, this paper intends to probe into how the missionaries translated foreign literature into Chinese, how they manipulated translating, and how their translated texts were received among the Chinese reading public and literary translators.

文學翻譯中的刪改

Intervention in Literary Translation

WANG Xiaoyuan

From a relatively macro perspective, this paper investigates the phenomenon of bowdlerization in literary translation in China, attributing it to, among other things, three major factors which can operate independently or in a combined manner: (1) ideology, or socio-cultural constraints; (2) reading habitus; and (3) literary poetics.

Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts

Nitsa BEN-ARI

This paper is an attempt to formulate, and answer, a series of questions pertaining to the possible influence of ideology on translation: Who manipulates the translations? In what methods? When is “ideological” manipulation made possible? Is the target public aware of it? Can it “defend” itself against it, and read “between the lines”? History shows us that ideological manipulation of translation is as old as translation itself. It can take the extreme form of censorship, sometimes self-imposed, but it can also take the more subtle form of normative do’s and don’t’s. Two sets of examples are presented: one dealing with religious ideology and the second with national ideology. It will describe and analyse their interference with Jewish literature written in Germany and with Hebrew literature written in Eastern Europe and Israel in certain historical periods.

Subversion, Sex and the State: The Censorship of Translations in Modern Japan

Judy WAKABAYASHI

This paper examines censorship, which is an extreme manifestation of the influence of ideology on translations, focusing in particular on the censorship of translations in Japan since the end of its national seclusion in 1854. It discusses the general relationship between censorship and translation before investigating the historical and social circumstances that have triggered waves of censorship in modern Japan, both by Japanese authorities, the Occupation authorities, minority groups and translators themselves. This censorship has usually been based on moral, political or military grounds, with fewer cases of censorship for religious reasons.

A Cry for Identity: A Case Study of Maori-English Cultural Translation

Akiko UCHIYAMA

Maori writer Patricia Grace experiments with language in her first collection of short stories, Waiariki. She intersperses Maori words, Maori syntax and word order throughout her English, creating the impression that her writing is a translation from Maori into English. This article examines her writing as 'cultural translation' from a minority culture into a dominant language/culture, investigating the common grounds that 'cultural translation' shares with translation between dominated and dominant languages/cultures. The article shows the political element of Grace's writing that alerts the reader to cultural differences, as well as the ideological element that seeks Maori identity while using the English language. Her writing has implications for translation in terms of asserting a minority culture in a dominant culture.

Cultures Translated and Appropriated: Rethinking Ethnicity, Nationscape and Cultural Identity

MAO Sihui

Going beyond translation as the production and publication of written texts from one language to another, this paper looks at the various aspects of translating both Chinese and 'other' cultures in the actual construction of what the Chinese call 'Cultural Villages' in the age of reform and opening to the outside world. Taking the multi-billion dollar project - Shenzhen Cultural Village as the object of analysis, this case study deals with motivated representations in terms of reimagined ethnicity, reconstructed nationscape, and reappropriated 'foreign cultures', which cannot simply be seen as the cultural logic of market economy or tourist consumption.

翻譯理論對譯者有用嗎？

Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators?

Lawrence VENUTI

Although professional translators tend to look upon translation theory as an unnecessary addition to the practical work of translating, the fact remains that translation theory can influence practice in numerous ways. Hence, it is important to evaluate theoretical traditions in translation, taking a social and historical approach that seeks to understand how the institutional sites where theories were developed shaped theoretical concepts. What we can learn from this approach is (1) that theories serve particular cultural values and political agendas, (2) that purely linguistic and empirical theories, therefore, are too short-sighted in their approach to what is finally a cultural political practice, and (3) that a translator needs to develop a theoretical and historical understanding of his or her work to avoid the unconscious application of values and agendas that are currently dominant in the translating culture.

用多元系統理論研究翻譯的意識形態的局限

The Limitations of Polysystem Theory for the Study of Ideology in Translation

CHONG Yau-yuk

With the spread of literary theory and cultural studies in the academy in recent decades, ideology has become an important area of study. Translation studies presents no exception to this general trend. In an attempt to explore whether Polysystem Theory, which is proposed by Itamar Even-Zohar to account for the behaviour and evolution of cultural systems, can provide a framework or methodology for the description and explanation of ideology in translation, this article seeks to analyze the advantages and limitations of Polysystem Theory, the latter in particular, with regard to argumentation over absolutism, subjectivity, determinism, interdisciplinary research, etc.

作者簡介 Notes on Contributors

CHANG Nam Fung (張南峰) B.A. and M. Phil., the University of Hong Kong; Ph.D., the University of Warwick, all in translation studies. Taught translation as Lecturer/Senior Lecturer at the City Polytechnic of Hong Kong before joining the Department of Translation, Lingnan University in 1994, where he is now Associate Professor. Publications include 《王爾德喜劇選》(translations of Oscar Wilde's four comedies), 《好的首相》(translation of Jonathan Lynn and Antony Jay's *Yes Prime Minister*), and a number of papers in journals such as *Babel*, *The Translator*, *Perspectives* and *Foreign Languages*.

劉樹森 北京大學英語系副教授、文學博士。多年來講授與研究英美文學及英漢翻譯，近來致力於研究中國近代的外國文學翻譯。主要著述包括《英國文學教程》(合著，1991)，《美國文學教程》(合著，1995)，以及《論中國近代外國小說翻譯的敘事語態特徵》等論文三十餘篇。

王曉元 上海外國語大學英語語言文學專業翻譯研究方向碩士，現為華北工學院外語系副教授，曾在《外國語》、《中國翻譯》等學術刊物發表翻譯研究論文，曾翻譯並出版英語小說。目前主要從事文學翻譯及其研究。通訊地址：030051 中國 山西省 太原市 華北工學院外語系。電郵：masha@ncit.edu.cn

Nitsa BEN-ARI lectures at the University of Tel-Aviv. Major in Translation Studies, especially in the role of norms in translation. PhD in Cultural Studies, mainly in the study of the role of literature and translation in building a national identity. Head of the program “Diploma Studies in Translation and Revision” in the T.A.U. Chief editor in one of the biggest publishing houses in Israel, the Zmora-Bitan-Dvir Publishing House. Translator of about twenty-five books, from English, French, German and Italian, among which figure: Toni Morrison’s *Beloved* and *Jazz*; Lewis Carroll’s *The Hunting of the Snark*; Albert Cohen’s *Le Livre de ma mere*; and Alfred Doebelin’s *Berlin Alexanderplatz*.

Judy WAKABAYASHI is a lecturer in Japanese-English translation at the University of Queensland, Australia. Her research interests are in the history of Japanese translation, translation theory (particularly in Japan) and Japanese-English translation. She is currently working on a manuscript for a book on the history of translation into Japanese and on a textbook for Japanese-English translators.

Akiko UCHIYAMA has been teaching part-time English-Japanese translation at the University of Queensland in Australia since 1995, while also working as a professional translator. Her research interest lies in postcolonial translation and in examining translation as a social and cultural medium that reflects the complex relationships between dominant and dominated cultures.

MAO Sihui (毛思慧) is presently dean of the Faculty of English Language and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies and also director of the Centre for English and Comparative Cultural Studies. Holder of two MA degrees (GUFS & Lancaster) and a doctorate (HKU), he has been offering both BA and MA courses and supervising PhD theses in English and comparative cultural studies. His major publications include books such as *American Feminine Humour* (1990), *A Historical Survey of Western Literary Theory & Criticism* (1992), *Contemporary British Culture and Society* (1996), *Contemporary British Cinema: Technologising the Male Body* (1999) and also a number of papers. Email: maosihui@gdufs.edu.cn

區劍龍 香港大學社會科學學士，中文大學翻譯碩士。現任教於香港城市大學中文、翻譯及語言學系，教授商業財經翻譯、法律翻譯、翻譯概論等科目，曾發表論文探討電視字幕、廣告翻譯、法律翻譯等課題。

Lawrence VENUTI is professor of English at Temple University, Philadelphia, in the United States. He has been a professional translator, mostly from Italian, for the past twenty years. His translations include the work of fiction writers (I.U. Tarchetti, Dino Buzzati, Barbara Alberti) and poets (Milo De Angelis and Antonia Pozzi), as well as writers of nonfiction (the architect Aldo Rossi and the sociologist Francesco Alberoni). He is the author of *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995) and *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Differ-*

ence (1998) and the editor of *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology* (1992) and *The Translation Studies Reader* (2000), all published by Routledge.

莊柔玉 香港大學文學士、哲學碩士及哲學博士。現任教於嶺南大學翻譯系。著作環繞中國當代詩、傳譯及翻譯理論之研究。譯作以文學、宗教、社會科學、翻譯理論等課題為主。

Göran MALMQVIST was President of the European Association of Chinese Studies and Professor of Chinese at the University of Stockholm until 1990. Since 1985, he has been one of the eighteen life members of the Swedish Academy, directly responsible for the annual award of the Nobel Prize for Literature. He is also member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, and Academia Europaea. He has published over 200 learned articles and numerous books, including Swedish translations of a large number of Chinese poems, works of Shen congwen and Li Rui, *Shuihu Zhuan*, and *Xiyou Ji*.

稿約凡例

《翻譯季刊》為香港翻譯學會之學報，歡迎中、英文來稿及外譯中之翻譯作品（請附原文及作者簡介）。有關翻譯作品版權問題，請譯者處理。

一、稿件格式

1. 來稿一式三份，請用原稿紙謄正，打字稿更佳。
2. 來稿請用另頁附上：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、註釋、頁眉等處提及個人身分，鳴謝等資料亦宜於刊登時方附上。
4. 來稿每篇以不超過一萬二千字為宜。
5. 來稿獲審評人建議刊用後，如論文為打字稿，請附錄有該文件檔之電腦磁片，並註明檔案格式。

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，超出二行者，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、註釋

1. 請用腳註。凡屬出版資料者，請移放文末參考資料部分。號碼一律用阿拉伯數目字，並用（ ）號括上；正文中之註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，不另作註。

六、版權

來稿刊登後，版權歸出版者所有，任何轉載，均須出版者同意。

七、書評

中文書評格式與中文稿例同。

八、贈閱本

論文刊登後，作者可獲贈閱本三冊。書評作者可獲贈閱本兩冊。

凡合署者，以均分為原則。

九、評審

來稿經本學報編輯委員會審閱後，再以匿名方式送交專家評審，方決定是否採用。

十、來稿請寄：新界屯門嶺南大學文學與翻譯研究中心轉《翻譯季刊》編輯收。

Guidelines for Contributors

1. The *Translation Quarterly* is a journal published by the Hong Kong Translation Society. Contributions 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. Manuscripts should be typed on one side of the page, double-spaced and submitted in triplicate.
3. Besides 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. Footnotes should be kept to a minimum, typed single-spaced, and placed at the bottom of each page. Page references should be given in parentheses, with the page number(s) following the author's name and the year of publication. Manuscript styles should be consistent; authors are advised to consult the MLA Handbook for proper formats.
5. Chinese names and book titles in the text should be romanized according to the "modified" Wade-Giles or the pinyin system, and then, where they first appear, followed immediately by the Chinese characters and translations. Translations of Chinese terms obvious to the readers (like *wenxue*), however, are not necessary.
6. There should be a separate Reference section containing all the works referred to in the body of the article. Pertinent information should be

given on the variety of editions available, as well as the date and place of publication, to facilitate use by the readers.

7. All contributions will be first reviewed by the Editorial Board members and then anonymously by referees for its suitability for publication in the *Translation Quarterly*. Care should be taken by authors to avoid identifying themselves on the first page, in the top or bottom margins, or in footnotes. A separate cover page with the title of the article, the name of the author and his/her institutional affiliation should be provided.
8. Book reviews are to follow the same format as that for submitted articles; they should be typed and double-spaced, giving at the outset the full citation for the work reviewed, plus information about special features (like appendices and illustrations) and prices. Unsolicited book reviews are as a rule not accepted.
9. Final versions of articles are to be submitted in a hard copy and a computer diskette to the Editor, The *Translation Quarterly*, c/o Centre for Literature and Translation, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, N. T., Hong Kong.
10. Contributors of articles will receive three complimentary copies of the journal, but these must be shared in the case of joint authorship. Book reviewers will receive two complimentary copies.



*First Call for Papers***FIT Third Asian Translators' Forum****Translation in the New Millennium:
Inter-Continental Perspectives on Translation**

**Venues: 6-7 December 2001 at The University of Hong Kong, and
8 December 2001 at Lingnan University**

Working Languages: English and Chinese

(If the presentation is in a language other than English and Chinese, the presenter needs to supply interpretation or translation.)

The Asian Translators' Forum is a regional conference held once every three years under the auspices of the Federation Internationale des Traducteurs [FIT]. The first Forum was held in Beijing in 1995 and the second in Seoul in 1998. The Third Forum will comprise sessions in the following formats.

plenary sessions

colloquia

workshops

publishers' sessions

panels for individual papers

roundtable discussions

Special book exhibitions on translation studies and Chinese literature translations

As part of the commemoration of its thirtieth anniversary in 2001, The Hong Kong Translation Society will also be hosting a number of commemorative activities during the Forum.

Objectives

1. to provide an opportunity for translators and translation scholars in the Asian-Pacific region to meet their European and North American counterparts;
2. to strengthen the network for practicing translators to exchange experience;
3. to build a basis for inter-regional cooperation and foster more joint translation efforts and trans-national translation research; and
4. to enable researchers in various translation-related fields to present their most recent findings and a selection of scholarly articles from amongst those presented will be published after the Forum.

Preliminary Schedule

The Forum will take place between 6 December and 8 December 2001. Sessions on the first two days will be held at The University of Hong Kong and sessions on the last day at Lingnan University. There will be a sightseeing tour of Hong Kong planned for the day after the Forum, subject to demand.

Sub-themes

- (1) The Profession of Translator/Interpreter;

- (2) The Computer and the Translator;
(3) Translation and the Law;
(4) Teaching Translation;
(5) Translation Theory/ Translation Studies; and
(6) Translation and Publishing.

Submission of Abstracts

The Organizing Committee invites submissions of 300-word abstracts on any topic related to the sub-themes of the Forum, though abstracts on all translation-related issues are welcome. Abstracts will be refereed and acceptance of abstracts and papers will be issued. The organization of workshops, colloquia and roundtables sessions focusing on related areas of interest is encouraged. For further information, please contact the Organizing Committee directly. Please forward the topics and abstracts by **28 February, 2001** to:

Dr. Yifeng SUN
c/o Centre for Literature and Translation, Lingnan University
Tuen Mun, Hong Kong
Fax: (852) 2838-1705
Email: CLT@LN.EDU.HK
(E-mail abstracts in MS Word format are preferred.)

The abstracts should include the following:

Submission of Abstracts for the Third Asian Translator's Forum	
Name:	
Title:	<input type="checkbox"/> Prof. <input type="checkbox"/> Dr. <input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input type="checkbox"/> Mrs. <input type="checkbox"/> Others
Affiliation:	
Correspondence Address:	
Tel:	
Fax:	
Email:	
Title of Abstracts:	

Important Dates

28 February 2001	Deadline for submission of topics and abstracts
30 April 2001	Participants will be notified of the acceptance of their abstracts
1 August 2001	Registration begins.
1 September 2001	Deadline for early registration at a special discount

Second call for papers, with information on keynote and plenary speakers, and hotel accommodation, etc., will be issued in December 2000. For regular updates, please check the website:

<http://hkts.org.hk>

General inquiries can also be directed to:

The Hong Kong Translation Society
c/o Centre for Literature and Translation, Lingnan University
Email: CLT@LN.EDU.HK, fax(852) 2838-1705

Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong
Email: CASGEN@HKU.HK, fax (852) 2559-3185

Centre for Literature and Translation, Lingnan University
Email: CLT@LN.EDU.HK, fax(852) 2838-1705

Organizers:

The Hong Kong Translation Society
Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong
Centre for Literature and Translation, Lingnan University

Organizing Committee

Representatives from The Hong Kong Translation Society [HKTS]
Chi-hong LO, Vice-president of HKTS, and C & C Joint Printing Co., (H.K.) Ltd.
(Convenor)
Leo CHAN Tak-hung, Hon. Secretary of HKTS, and Lingnan University (Secretary-General)
Paul LEVINE, Open University of Hong Kong (Deputy Secretary-General)
Elsie CHAN, City University of Hong Kong
Serena JIN, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Jane LAI, Hong Kong Baptist University
Ching-chih LIU, President of HKTS, and Lingnan University
Candy WONG, Hon. Treasurer of HKTS

Representatives from The University of Hong Kong
Elizabeth SINN, Deputy Director of Centre of Asian Studies
Teresa TSAI, Assistant to the Director, Centre of Asian Studies
Joseph POON Hon-kwong, Department of Chinese

Representatives from Lingnan University
Ching-chih LIU, Director of Centre for Literature and Translation
Leo CHAN, Department of Translation
Yifeng SUN, Department of Translation

September 2000
Hong Kong

Organizing Committee
Third Asian Translators' Forum

Translation Quarterly 《翻譯季刊》

Subscription Order Form 訂閱表格

請填妥下列表格，並連同劃線支票抬頭「香港翻譯學會有限公司」寄（或傳真 + 852 26664889）：

黃紹顏女士收
香港翻譯學會義務司庫
中華商務印刷大廈 14 字樓
大埔汀麗路 36 號
新界 香港

Please complete the following order form and return it together with a crossed cheque payable to “**The Hong Kong Translation Society Limited**” by mail to (or by fax at + 852 26664889):

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

訂閱年期及費用	本地(local)	中港台	海外(overseas)
<input type="checkbox"/> 一年(1 year)	HK\$240	HK\$280	US\$45
<input type="checkbox"/> 二年(2 years)	HK\$450	HK\$500	US\$80
<input type="checkbox"/> 三年(3 years)	HK\$650	HK\$730	US\$110

Starting from issue # _____ 期起訂閱

Payment method:

- by cheque/bank draft: number _____ (Bank _____)
- by T/T to Hang Seng Bank Ltd., 4 Hankow Road, Tsimshatsui, Kowloon
Account holder - Hong Kong Translation Society Ltd.
Account number - 024-295-003941-001

Office use _____

Signature _____ Date _____

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