太原理工大学

硕 士 学 位 论 文

题　　　　目　　对翻译原理的研究和探索

英文并列题目　　**Research and Exploration of Translation Principles**

研 究 生 姓 名：　　　　张　菁

学　　　　号：　　　　20020003

专　　　　业：　外国语言学与应用语言学

研 究 方 向：　　翻译理论与实践

导 师 姓 名：　　　　杜耀文

职　　　　称：　　　　教　授

太 原 理 工 大 学

College of Arts

Taiyuan University of Technology

Research and Exploration of Translation Principles

Zhang Jing

A thesis submitted to College of Arts in TYUT

in partial fulfillment of the requirement

for the degree of Master of Arts

April 2005

Taiyuan, China

Research and Exploration of Translation Principles

Abstract

This thesis is to make a research and exploration on the principles of translation, which were presented by different kinds of translation theorists, translators and scholars from the ancient to the present times at home and abroad. The main goal is to find out and explore some common rules which may be abided by and followed by translators and translation theorists. Besides, it is expected to give some enlightenment to the readers of this thesis.

Both in China and in the West, the large and early scale translation activities began over three thousand years ago and began from the translating of religious works. Many famous translators and translation theorists appeared from the religious world such as Buddhism and Judaism. In the process of translating, most of them talked about and discussed on the theory of translation, especially the principles of translation.

In ancient China, there were a lot of famous translators and translation theorists including Yan Cong (彦琮), Zhi Qian (支谦), Dao An (道安), Kuramajiva (鸠摩罗什), Xuan Zang(玄奘) and so on who were both famous translators translating a large number of Buddhist scriptures and translation theorists making great contribution to the theory of translation, especially to the principles of translation.

In Modern China and the contemporary times, with the developing of translation enterprise, numerous outstanding translators and translation

theorists sprang up like mushrooms who have made great contributions to the theory of translation and the principles of translation such as Liang Qichao (梁启超), Yan Fu (严复), Ma Jianzhong (马建忠), Lin Shu (林纾), Lu Xun (鲁迅), Qu Qiubai (瞿秋白), Lin Yutang (林语堂), Fu Lei (傅雷), Qian Zhongshu (钱钟书)and so on.

In the west, from the ancient times many famous translators and translation theorists also made their profound research on the theory of translation and the principles of translation. For example, Quintius Horatius Flaccus (贺拉斯 65—8 B.C), a very famous poet and translation theorist, who opposed the principle of metaphrase translation and put forward the principle of sense for sense translation; St. Jerome (哲罗姆 347—420 B.C), an outstanding translator and translation theorist who not only finished the translating of the Holy Bible into Latin but also issued his four principles of translation.

In the modern times (from the 17th century to the beginning of the 20th century), a lot of expert translators and translation theorists appeared in many countries of the west. This period was called "unparalleled golden age" for translation theory. The representatives of translation theorists included Perrot Ablancourt (德·阿伯兰库) and Charles Batteux (巴托 1713—1780) in Frannce, M. V. Lomonosov (罗蒙诺索夫 1711—1765) and V. G. Belinsky (别林斯基 1811—1848) in Russia, Alexander Fraser Tytler (泰特勒 1747—1814) and Francis W. Newman (纽曼 1805—1897) in Britain, and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (歌德 1749—1832) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (洪堡 1767—1835) in Germany. All of them made deep research on the principles of translation and make great contributions to the principles

of translation from different aspects. The 20th century (the contemporary age) was regarded as "the Translation Times" by Peter Newmark who summarized seven great achievements in the translation world of the West. During this period we can list a lot of expert translators and learned translation theorists of the west such as Benedetto Croce (克罗齐 1866—1952) in Italy, Walter Penjamin (本杰明 1892—1940) in Germany, J. P. Postgate in Britain etc. After World War II, different kinds of translation schools in the west sprang up like mushrooms mainly including The Prague School represented by Roman Jakobson (雅可布逊, 1896—1982), the London School represented by John Catford (约翰·卡特福德), American Structuralism School represented by C. F. Voegelin (沃吉林, 1906—), Dwight Bolinger (博林杰) and W. V. Quine (奎恩), Communicative Theory School represented by Eugene A. Nida (尤金·奈达, 1914—), and Russian Literary School and Linguistic School of Translation Theories represented by 费道罗夫.

Key Words: theory, principle, theorist, translator

对翻译原理的研究和探索

摘 要

本论文主要研究和探讨古今中外各学派的翻译理论家、翻译家和学者所提出的翻译原则问题。旨在找出和探索出可供翻译家和翻译理论家共同遵循的翻译原理。此外，本论文希望给本文的读者带来某种启发。

无论在中国和西方，大规模的早期翻译活动已历经三千余年并多数起始于宗教作品。很多著名的翻译家和翻译理论家来自宗教领域，诸如佛教和犹太教。在他们的翻译过程中，大多数人都谈及和讨论了翻译理论，特别是翻译的原理问题。

在古代中国，有很多杰出的翻译家和翻译理论家，包括彦琮，支谦，道安，鸠摩罗什，玄奘等人。他们都对翻译理论，特别是翻译原理的问题作出了巨大的贡献。在中国近代和当代，随着译事的发展，无数优秀的翻译家和翻译理论家如雨后春笋般涌现，如梁启超，严复，马建忠，林纾，鲁迅，瞿秋白，林语堂，傅雷，钱钟书等等。

在西方，远在古代，就有许许多多著名的翻译家和翻译理论家同样就翻译理论和翻译原理问题进行了深入的探讨和研究。例如贺拉斯，一位著名的诗人和翻译理论家，曾反对僵硬的字字对译，提出了意译的翻译原则；又如哲罗姆，他既是一位杰出的翻译家还是一位翻译理论家。他不仅完成了《圣经》的拉丁文本的翻译工作，而且提出了翻译的四项原理。在近代西方(从十七实际到二十世纪初期)，各个国家都涌现出很多著名的翻译家和翻译理论家。在西方，把这段时期称作翻译理论的前所未有的"黄金时代"。翻译理论界的代表人物有：法国的德•阿伯兰库和巴托，俄罗斯的罗蒙诺索夫和别林斯基，英国的泰特勒和纽曼以及德国的洪

堡。所有这些著名的翻译家和翻译理论家都从不同的角度对翻译理论和翻译的原理问题进行了深入的研究并对此做出巨大的贡献。二十世纪(即当代)被纽马克称为"翻译时代",他对西方翻译领域所取得的成就从七个方面进行了总结。我们可以列举出许许多多这个时期杰出的翻译家和翻译理论家,如意大利的克罗齐,德国的本杰明,英国的波斯盖特等。二战后,西方涌现出众多的各类翻译学派,主要有布拉格学派,代表人物雅可布逊;伦敦学派,代表人物卡特福德;美国结构学派,代表人物有沃吉林,博林杰和奎恩;交际理论学派,代表人物尤金·奈达;苏联翻译理论的文艺学派和语言学派,代表人物费道罗夫。

关键词: 理论, 原理, 理论家, 翻译家

Contents

Introduction

Ever since translation activities came into being in human history in China and the west, people have been discussing about and dispute over the principles of translation. What is the principle of translation then? There are different kinds of it in the translation world. Whatever principles some translators or interpreters keeps, they must have some ideas in their minds. As long as they begin to translate something, some kind of translation principles will begin to affect their translation activities no matter they acknowledge the fact or not. Therefore we say the criteria of translation plays an important part in translating process. Perhaps somebody will maintain that he has no principle in translating process, but no principle is a principle itself.

In fact, a principle of translation is an attitude a translator or interpreter holds to translation or interpretation. All of the principles of translation have their own features from the ancient times to the contemporary age, at home and abroad. However, the principles of translation have some points in common which may be followed by translators and translation theorists. This thesis is aimed to make efforts to study the translation principles which exist not only in China but also in the West. The writer tries his best to explore some specific points that may provide valuable reference for translators because to a translator, the principle of translation is too important to ignore. I believe that the principle of translation is related directly with the translation's text meaning, form, style and quality. To some extent, it is believed that what principle of translation a translator holds, he or she will

have corresponding translation texts.

In the translation world including both China and the West, there are various principles of translation. In this paper we will introduce some important principles of translation at home and abroad, from ancient times to the contemporary age respectively, and then discuss about the principles of translation in order to find out some valuable points in common, which may be useful to some translators in their translation.

In Chapter I, the author will introduce some traditional principles of translation in Ancient times of China including Zhi Qian's translation principles on literal translation and free translation, Dao An's translaion principle about "Five Deviation From the Original" and "Three Difficulties", Yan Cong's translation principle of "Eight Conditions", Xuan Zang's principle about "Transliteration in the Five Cases" and so on.

In Chapter II, during the period of the modern times and the contemporary times of China, translation activities including text translation and interpretation work, especially theoretical research on translation principles were fully developed. A large number of expert translators and translation theorists joined the discussion about the principles of translation and put forward their own opinions on translation principles which enriched translation theory and promoted translation's development in China. For example, Yan Fu put forward his famous three-character principle of translation which is faithfulness, expressiveness and elegance and it influenced the translation world in China for more than a hundred years. In the past century some people praised the three-character principle highly and some criticized it severely. In this chapter, we will also introduce and discuss

about other famous translation theories and principles in details.

In Chapter III, the author is to introduce some expert translators and their theories and principles in the ancient times of the West. For example, the famous poet and translation theorist Quintus Horatius Flaccus who insisted on the principle of free translation and put forward the principle of "sense for sense" translation and opposed "word to word" translation. His well-known saying that "A translator who is faithful to the original is not suited to metaphrase" is often quoted by many translation theorists from ancient times to the modern times in the West and even in China.

In Chapter IV, the thesis is to introduce and research on the translation principles of the west in the Modern times and the contemporary times roughly from the 17the century to the end of the 20th century. During the long period, a large number of outstanding expert translators and translation theorists emerged in the western countries like Russia, France, Britain, Germany and the United States etc. All of them made a lot of contributions not only to translation enterprises but also to the research on the principles of translation. Both translation cause and the research of translation theory made great progress and gained great achievement, especially from the beginning of the 20th century to the end of the 20th century. The whole translation enterprises including translation works and translation theoretical research entered the "unparalleled golden age". Some famous principles of translation have influenced today's translation world. For example, E.A. Nida's theories of translation including principles of translation have affected the whole translation world both in the west and in China for the past decades. The theory of translation such as the principles of text center by Peter

Newmarkhas established a multiple model of translation principle. Peter Newmark also put emphasis on the semantic translation and the communicative translation theory regarding the two points as the principle of translation

In the end, author of the paper tries to make a proper conclusion after studying different kinds of the principles of translation both in China and in the west, and wants to find out some points in common about the principles of translation through studying and comparing the principles of translation at home and abroad from the ancient times to the present. The author hopes that the points in common may bring about some positive effects for translators and translation theorists as some reference, and may give her readers some elicitation to the principles of translation.

Chapter One   The Traditional Principlesof

Translation in Ancient China

1.1 A Brief History of Translation Practice in Ancient China

Translation in China has a long history of over two thousand years. As early as the Zhou Dynasty, in the 9th Century B.C., there were special government officials in charge of Interpreting and translating work. The term for a government interpreter of this period was Sheren (舌人), literally "tongues-man". The current China word for "translation", yi (译), forms the basis for the .official title adopted since the Han Dynasty(195 B.C.—7 A.D.)—yi-yuan (译员) or yishi (译师), literally "translation officials". Historical records also show that during the Han Dynasty, translators or interpreters were routinely employed by merchants on their long trips to South-east Asia and India; they were also present in the merchant caravans bound for states such as Bactria to the north-west of China.

The first wave of translation activities in China is the translation of Buddhist scriptures which came in the wake of the spread of Buddhism. By the mid-second century A.D, the first Chinese translations of Buddhist sutras had been undertaken. This marked the beginning of a massive translation movement which lasted for nine centuries.

The translation of Buddhist sutras from Sanskrit into Chinese can be divided roughly into three phases: Eastern Han Dynasty and the Three Kingdoms Period (148—265 A.D); Jin Dynasty and the Northern and Southern Dynasties (265—589 A.D); and Sui Dynasty, Tang Dynasty and

Northern Song Dynasty (589—1100 A.D).

During the first phase, the translators were monks from central Asia and Xinjiang; most of them were respected for their religious knowledge, but their command of Chinese was very poor. This linguistic disadvantage is reflected in the translation produced during this period: although the foreign works had the assistance of their Chinese pupils or counterparts, many of their translations still read awkwardly. During this period, we have An Shigao (安世高), Lokaksema (支娄迦谶), Zhi Qian (支谦) and Dharmaraksa (竺法护) as the earliest translators. Later, Translation Forums, or yichang (译场) were set up, with a highly respected Buddhist monk Dao An as Chief Translator. He leaded the translation of Buddhist Scriptures of Former Qin dynasty by organizing monks home and abroad for the translation of Buddhism Scriptures. Till this time, translation became organized activity. In the Translation Forums, translation work went on in the following steps: First, the foreign monks explained in detail the precise meaning of the texts, under the foreign monk were one or more interpreters who knew the monk's language well; their tasks was to interpret the monk's explanation into Chinese. Then, in the audience were scores, sometimes hundreds, of Chinese monks and lay scholars who recorded in note form the foreign monk's explanation. At last, the Chinese translation was compiled consulting not just the Recorder's own notes, but also notes taken by others in the audience. The three steps of interpreting, recording and checking were the basis for all Translation Forum work.

The second phase of sutra translation was marked by officiation of prominent foreign monks (some directly form the Indian subcontinent) who

had learned Chinese, and were thus capable of delivering a verbal Chinese translation of the texts in the Translation Forum without the assistance of an interpreter. Their translation were put into writing by the Recorder, who then checked the written form directly with the monk-translator. One of the most respected and productive monk translator was Kuramajiva (鸠摩罗什, 344—413 A.D), who translated over 300 volumes of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese. It was also after the arrival of Kuramajiva in China (401 A.D) that detailed records were kept of the number of participants in the Translation Forums. The scale of forums at Duramajiva's time was particularly grand with over 3,000 participants.

The third phase of sutra translation was greatly different from previous practices in that the processes of explanation and translation became separated. The size of Translation Forms was reduced dramatically—normally no more than three dozen monks were involved. This is true of al forums held from the late 6th century onwards, including those leaded by the most prominent monk-translator in Chinese history, Xuan Zang (玄奘, 602—64 A.D). Xuan Zang was famous for his pilgrimage to India and translated over 1,300 volumes of sutras into Chinese. One major reason for the change was the increased expertise of Chinese monks. Whereas almost anyone could join the old-style Translation Forums, the third-phase forums were highly selective: only monks or lay officials with special abilities were allowed to take part. In the Song dynasty (984 A.D), the government at one point established a Sanskrit School, recruiting some dozen pupils from various monasteries with the intention of fostering a new generation of Buddhist translators. However, the decline of Buddhism in India as well as

change in government policy led to a rapid decline in Buddhist translation activities towards the 1050s. The days of the Translation Forums were over, and the Buddhist translation done after this period were the works of individuals rather than the collective efforts of a unique translation establishment.

1.2 Representative Translators and Their Principles

1.2.1 An Shigao and Zhi Qian

An Shigao, a Persian, was the earliest translator of Buddhist Scripture in Chinese history. He lived at the Period of the Eastern Han Dynasty and translated more than thiry volumes of Buddhist scripture, and at the same time introduced Indian astronomy to China. He was also the earliest representative of literal translation who firmly believed that the least variation could ensure faithfulness at the most. Devices in An Shigao's translation were used such as transliterations, repetitions or syntactic constructions closely modeled on the Sanskrit original. His translations proved to be too alien to Chinese readers.

Another translator of the same period was Zhi Qian, who translated about thirty volumes of Buddhist scriptures in a literal manner. He maintained "translating adhering to the original essence and giving no polish to the language.". Therefore, his translation was hard to understand because of the extremely literal translations. It might be in this period of time that there was a debate on literal translation vs. free translation. Since the debates mainly focused on the styles of translation, we also call it debate "wen" ("elegant style") vs. "zhi" ("simple style"). And it proved to be a long-lasting dispute that accompanied the Buddhist scriptures translation from its very

beginning to its end.

1.2.2 Dao An

In the 5th century, translation of Budhhist scripture was officially organized on a large scale in China. A State Translation School was founded for this purpose. An imperial officer—Dao An was appointed director of this earliest School of Translation in China. Dao An advocated strict literal translation of the Buddhist scriptures, because he himself didn't know any Sanskrit, therefore, to avoid any meaning loss, he strongly maintained literal translating approach by saying that "...so I closely followed the original with as little change as possible. Except for occasional changes for original reversed sentences, I adhere to the original text without any alteration at the expense of original words and sentences." (遂案本而传，不令有损言游字，时改倒句，余尽实录也。" 《鞞婆沙序》). Later, he proposed his famous principles of "Five Deviation from the Original and Three Difficulties in Translation" ("五失本而三不易").

It proposed five cases of translating Sanskrit into Chinese that permitted meaning loss and three aspects that were difficult to achieve. "the Five Deviation from the Original" refers to five cases that make the translation lose its original meaning. The first case is that Sanskrit sentences are always reversed, in translating, we should restore the Chinese sentence order; secondly, Sanskrit is simple and plain, whereas, Chinese prefer ornate diction, in translating, there should be some polishing; thirdly, there were lots of repetitions in the original scriptures, in translating, omissions and simplifications must be made. Fourthly, in the Buddhist scripture, there were lots of complimentary addresses that repeatedly used, in translating, deletions should be made; fifthly, when relating one thing after another, the formerly

9

mentioned thing would be related again, in translating, the repetition part should not be deleted.

"The Three Difficulties" refers to three difficult things to achieve when translating from Sanskrit to Chinese. One is that to adapt the old customs to people of the time. The second is to make the ordinary people understand the profound sayings of the saint and wit. The third is to translate the great thoughts of saints by ordinary people.

The core of Dao An's translation principle was to be faithful to the original. It was valuable that he could see the differences between two languages and permit "Five Deviations from the Original". However, he only demanded that the translation approach the original in form and made no breakthrough in meaning transference. Therefore, he was still confined to strict "literal translation".

1.2.3Kumarajiya

Kumarajiya was the contemporary translator of Dao An. He was a famous Indian Buddhist monk and was invited to translate and direct the translation of Buddhist scriptures in Dao An's translation school. Kumrajiava himself translated a large number of Sanskrit sutras. His arrival in China made the translation school flourish and his translations enabled Buddism to take root as a serious rival to Taoism. Kumarajiva, after a thorough texual research on the former translation of Sanskrit sutras, carried out a great reform of the principles and methods for the translation of sutras. He emphasized the accuracy of translation; therefore, he applied a free translation approach to transfer the true essence of the Sanskrit sutras. In his translation, syntactic inversions of the original were smoothed out according to target language usage, and the drafts were polished to give them a high

literary quality.

Kumarajiva compared literal translation as "chewing food for others and as a result makes the food tasteless and disgusing." ("...有似嚼饭与人, 非徒失味, 乃令呕秽也.") and hence he strongly opposed it. He favored liberal translating method by advocating "making refinement on the premise of keeping the original meaning." In his translation practice, Kumarajiva often conformed repetitions or circum-locations in the original to omissions or simple native expressions. The clarity and intelligibility in his translation exerted a profound influence on the later translators.

From the time of Kumarajiva until the 8th century, the quantity of translations of Sanskrit sutras increased and their accuracy improved.

1.2.4 Xuan Zang

The period between the Sui dynasty and the Tang Dynasty was the first peak of translation in China. The most important figure of this period was the famous monk of the Tang Dynasty—Xuan Zang (600—664 A.D), who was the main character in *A Journey to the West*. In 628 A.D, he left Chang'an (today's Xi'an), the capital of the Tang empire, and set out for India on a quest for sacred texts. He returned in 645 A.D, bearing 124 collections of Sanskrit aphorisms from the "Great Vehicle" and 520 other manuscripts. Xuan Zang spent the rest of his life working with collaborators on the translation of the precious Buddhist manuscripts he had brought back. In nineteen years, he translated 1335 volumes of Buddhist manuscripts. These translations helped to make Buddhism popular thoughout China.

Xuan Zang was also the first Chinese translator who translated out of Chinese. He translated some of Lao Zi's works into Sanskrit. He also attempted to translate some other classical Chinese literature for the people of

India.

Not only was he a great translator and organizer of translation, Xuan Zang was also a great translation theorist whose contribution to translation studied still remains significant today. He set down the famous translation criteria that translation "must be both truthful and intelligible to the populace."

In a sense, Xuan Zang, with such a formula, was trying to have the best of two worlds—literal translation and free translation. That is to say, he combined the advantages of both Dao An's literal translation—respect for the form of the source text—and Kumarajiva's free translation with his won translation practice. On the one hand, he put forward a principle of "Transliteration in the Five Cases."(五种不翻), in which he proposed five cases in Buddhist scripture translation that there should be no free translation but transliteration. That is, don't translate: 1) what is mysterious 2) what is poly-semantic 3) what is too alien to be accepted 4) what is hereditary 5) what produces different interpretations. On the other hand, he used devices of addition, omission, transposition, division or combination, substitution and restoration of nouns for pronouns to domesticate his translation.

Indebted to his good mastery of the Chinese language and Buddhist learning, Xuan Zang's translation was featured by his "harmonious application of literal and liberal translating skills."

Therefore, he was regarded as "the peak of Buddhist scripture translation."

Chapter Two   The Principles of Translation in

Modern Times and Contemporary Age in China

2.1.   Translation from the Opium War to the May 4th Movement

2.1.1.   A Brief Introduction of the Translation Practices During This Period

Translation into Chinese had almost ceased for roughly a hundred years with the expelling of foreign missionaries in 1723. It resumed following the British invasion (1840-1842) and the subsequent arrival of American, British, French and German missionaries. Foreign missionaries dominated scientific and technical translation initially, but Chinese translators, trained in China or at foreign universities, gradually took over the transmission of western knowledge.

In the early 19th century the trade invasion of the European powers threatened the well-being of the Peking government, and Lin Zexu (1785-1850) was appointed to Canton in 1838 to put the foreigners in their place. It was his insight that "in order to control the foreigners we have to master their arts"(师敌之长技以制敌) that prompted the first official team of translators. They translated excerpts from local foreign press and various English pamphlets on Chinese matters and international law. Their main achievement was *Geography of the Maritime Nations* (《海国图志》), which was based on Murray's *Encyclopaedia of Geography*. Lin's mission eventually proved a failure, and after a series of military defeats the Manchu

13

ruler agreed to found a College of Languages—Tongwen Guan (同文馆) in Peking in 1862. The college provided students with language courses and played important roles in the field of diplomacy. It also translated and published books on law, politics and natural sciences.

In the south, the Jiangnan Arsenal (江南制造厂)set up its own translation bureau in Shanghai in 1865. It concentrated on technical manuals and was responsible for Chinese translation of standard Western works like Herschel's *Outline of Astronomy*, J.D.Dana's *System of Minerology* and Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology*. Both the Peking and Shanghai Bureaus employed foreign experts who had learned some Chinese. The normal translation procedure was for the foreign experts to translate and explain verbally to their Chinese collaborators, who took their words down and made a draft version. Their manuscripts were then polished and improved stylistically by monolingual Chinese scholars without further reference to the original. A number of Chinese translators employed by the bureaus were scientists in their own field, such as Li Shanlan—a famous Chinese mathematician, who collaborated with the British missionary Alexander Wylies (1815-1877) on a translation of a work on differential and integral calculus. The Chinese mathematician Hua Hengfang (1833-1902) and the British Missionary John Fryer (1839-1928) translated a text on probability taken from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. In 1877, Hua and Fryer translated Hymers' *Treatise on Plane and Spherical Trigonometry* (1858). This translation is a perfect example of how knowledge is both transmitted and generated through the translation process; it contributed to the dissemination of modern mathematical theory and, at the same time,

14

stimulated the personal research carried out by the translators. Fryer and his collaborators also translated some one hundred chemistry treatises and textbooks. Many of these were published by the Jiangnan Arsenal, where Fryer was an official translator.

The other force in the translation of Western works emerged in the 1890s and was composed of native intellectuals and leaded by political reformists, the best known of them being Kang Youwei(1858-1927) and Liang Qichao (1873-1929). To impress upon their people the need to struggle if they did not wish to perish, they introduced lessons of other empire in world history; they also undertook translations in the fields of politics and sociology as a way of ensuring national survival. By now, the leading intellectuals had realized that Western thought and skills had to be made their own. Not only the focus but the channel of translation shifted; Japanese became the chief source language, both for original works in that language and also for Japanese translations of Western works. The reformists were very much involved in the rapid growth of independent publishing houses. Their newspapers and magazines carried translations of items from the foreign press. The most prestigious of the newspapers were the *Shiwu bao* (《时务报》)in Shanghai, edited by Liang Qichao, and the *Guowen bao* (《国文报》)in Tientsin, edited by Yan Fu(1853-1921). Yan Fu's translation of Thomas Huxley's long essay *"Evolution and Ethics"* (《天演论》) was first published in the Guowen bao in 1897 before being issued in book form under the title *Tianyan lun.* This book was a milestone in Chinese translation history, both because of its content which popularized Social Darwinism and style.

If Yan Fu can be considered the main translation figure in the field of philosophy and social science, the prize for fiction has to go to Lin Shu (1852-1924), his almost exact contemporary. During the late Qing dynasty, literary translation was popular and marked another peak of translation in China. Literary translation during the late Qing dynasty consisted mainly of the translation of western novels into Chinese. The large scale of introduction of western novels enriched the literary creation of China where poems and poetic essays were the main literary forms. This translation of novels, especially political novels, was initiated by political reformers and erudite scholars. However, among the many translators during this period, Lin Shu is the most distinguished because of his large quantity of translations of western novels.

2.1.2. Representative Translators and Their Principles

2.1.2.1. Liang Qichao

To remedy the situation in which Western countries had learned much about China by translating Chinese works, while China knew little about Western countries, Liang Qichao came up with two proposals:

> "First, let scholars of the country master Western languages from childhood; second, have books written by Westerners translated into Chinese--books that are of practical use to us."
>
> (Editorial Board, 1984: 9-10)

Liang further argued that the reason European countries had become so strong was that they had translated Greek and Roman classics into their respective languages. For that matter, Peter the Great had collected books from Western countries and had them rendered into Russian, and the Japanese did likewise during the Meiji Restoration. Liang, therefore,

16

considered the translation of books published in Western countries "the most essential of all essential undertakings to accomplish" in speeding up the process of learning from the West and thereby making China strong.

Liang decided that three things needed to be done right away: first, select the right books for translating; second, lay out rules and conventions for translating; and third, train competent translators.

What, then are the right books to translate? According to Liang, works dealing with military science could be dropped out of consideration. He believed that, while on the surface the Western powers appeared to have great military strength, what had made them strong was not the building of military force itself, but the development of basic science courses such as mathematics, electronics, chemistry, hydrodynamics, etc., which worked together to contribute to the growth of their military prowess. In Liang's vision, a stronger China could only emerge from a more substantial foundation in these sciences. It was therefore of primary importance to translate Western charters, constitutions, and civil, criminal and commercial laws, into Chinese so that China could reform its own legal system by modeling itself on Western systems. The next category should include the translation of historical works, including histories of agriculture, commerce and trade, arts and crafts, mining, communication, physics, and of "blue papers" chronicling events of the year. Progress in these fields could be traced and followed and provide references for China's own reforms. Works specific to agriculture, mining, commerce, physics, geometry, algebra, and such should be translated for the purpose of training new generations of professionals.

The second challenge was to formulate conventions for translators to follow when translating. Most troublesome was the translation of proper names, be they personal names or place names. To allow all translators to follow the same transliteration rules for translating proper names, Liang favoured using the English pronunciation as the norm for representing all sounds in Occidental languages, while Beijing dialect, which was familiar to all speakers of Chinese, could be used for translating foreign names. There were further problems translating terms indicating official or military rank, especially when the ranking systems of the two countries in question did not correspond. In such a situations, transliteration could be employed to create a word for that foreign rank in Chinese. Translating the names of things that were unheard of in China was a third difficulty. In such cases, either an existing Chinese character which stood for an old thing would be borrowed to designate the new thing, or an entirely new word would be coined for this purpose, with a phonetic component to give the sound of the thing and a cardinal component to indicate its property. Next was the translation of weights, measures, and currencies. Again Liang proposed that a conversion table be drawn up to offer ready references for translating in either direction. For currencies, a transliteration of the name of the monetary system should be preferred. Coming last in Liang's list of translation challenges is the use of different calendars by different countries, like the Chinese lunar calendar, Christian Gregorian calendar, the Indian calendar, the Islamic calendar, and the Japanese calendar. According to Liang, the mode of numbering years should follow the practice of the country from which the work was being translated, with the corresponding birthday anniversary of the Chinese Sage

Confucius and the anniversary of a given dynasty provided as a side-note for easy reference.

As regards the training of translators, Liang noted that the best translators were those fluent in both the foreign language and Chinese, who were also specialists in the field to which the work pertained. Next best was the translator who meet two of these three requirements; meeting only one of the three requirements meant that someone could not be trusted with the work of translation. Of the three requirements, expertise in a specific discipline outweighed the consideration of mastering both the mother tongue and a foreign language. To train translators and interpreters who could meet these three requirements, translation schools had to be set up.

2.1.2.2. Yan Fu

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Yangwu Group (洋务派), comprised of highly placed Foreign Affairs officials, initiated the translation of technical documents dealing with subjects like shipbuilding and the manufacture of weapons, and even established a number of translator training institutions. After the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895, Yan Fu (1853-1921), one of the most important figures in the modern period of translation in China, was the most influential translator and translation theorist. Yan Fu was a cultural intermediary who, at a critical moment in history, sought to make European works of political and social science accessible to the people.

Born into a poor family in Fu Zhou, a port in the province of Fujian, Yan Fu attended a naval college and served on warships which took him to places such as Singapore and Japan. From 1876 to 1879, he was in Portsmouth and Greenwich, in England, where he had been sent with a group of naval officers

who would later serve in the Sino-Japanese War. In England, he read philosophical and scientific texts voraciously. Upon his return to China, he was appointed director of the Northern Chinese Naval Academy, becoming vice-president of the institution in 1889 and president in 1890. After 1896, he supervised several translation institutes operating under central and local government authority. After the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911, he became president of the Capital Municipal University, later known as the University of Beijing.

Yan Fu was profoundly shocked by the humiliating *Treaty of Shimonoseki* of April 1895, which sealed China's defeat by Japan. Yan Fu was a patriotic and liberal intellectual, well aware of the dangers that threatened the entire nation. In 1896, he founded a newspaper in which he published a great many articles and editorials defending his political views. Yet it was through his translation, in particular his 1898 translation of Thomas Henry Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* (《天演论》)(1893) that he established a reputation throughout the country. His list of translations includes Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (《原富》)(1776), published in Chinese in 1902, Herbert Spenser's *The Study of Sociology* (《群学肄言》)(1872) and John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* (《群己权界论》)(1859), both translations published in 1904, writings by Edward Jenks published in Chinese in 1904, Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws* (《法意》)(1748), J.S.Mill's *A System of Logic* (《穆勒名学》)(1843), translated in 1905, and William Stanley Jevon's *The Theory of Political Economy* (《名学浅说》)(1878), translated in 1909.

In the space of just ten years, several of the major works of European political thought had been translated into Chinese. The impact of Yan Fu's work was well illustrated by the reception of Huxley's work. As can be imagined, the

translation of *Evolution and Ethics* set off a heated debate throughout the country, involving scholars, conservative bureaucrats and the Manchu aristocracy, and the schools, where the text was frequently used for instructional purposes and the "survival of the fittest" became a favorite essay topic. The same year as he translated *Evolution and Ethics*, Yan Fu and other intellectuals initiated the "Enlightenment"(维新运动), hoping to reform the country by inputting foreign stimulus. In lhis letter to Zhang Yuanji (张元济), Yan Fu expressed his translation aim by claiming that, "Without enlightening our countrymen, neither conservation nor reform could work. If more and more officials and the young educated are allowed to learn more about the West, the Yellow would not been enslaved by foreign powers, with nothing done by Dynasty to change the situation. Even if the misfortune happened, China will free itself someday. Thus I took translation as a way of education."

Yan Fu was soon highly regarded by university intellectuals, becoming known as the person most competent to possess and communicate the essence of western knowledge. Two other factors may help explain Yan Fu's success as a translator: his choice of source texts and his excellent style. As he said himself, good translators must have a thorough understanding of the source texts, but they must be aware of the desires and expectations of their compatriots so they can select works appropriate to their time. Yan Fu's choice of language and style in the target language also won him many readers. He wrote in classical Chinese, which had developed during the Zhou (1100BC-256BC) and Han (221 BC-207BC) dynasties, eventually to became the language of the elite and which was still in use in all publications, official or otherwise. He also rearranged chapters and paragraphs so they would be consistent with the style of

presentation and organization of ideas founded in the Chinese classics. Yan Fu was thus able to appeal to government officials, who at the time played an important role in national politics, and win their support.

Yan Fu won his reputation as a famous translator also as a result of his contribution to translation theory. He set down the three-character translation criteria of "Faithfulness, Fluency and Elegance," (信达雅)which produced a far-reaching effect on succeeding translators of literary work. In his preface to the version of *Evolution and Ethics*, Yan wrote: "Translation has to do with three difficulties of "xin'(faithfulness), 'da'(fluency) and 'ya'(elegance). It is rather difficult to achieve faithfulness, but mere faithfulness without fluency will make no sense. Hence fluency of translation should be required to the utmost." ("译事三难: 信、达、雅. 求其信, 已大难矣. 顾信矣不达, 虽译犹不译也, 则达尚焉.") These criteria influenced the development of translation practice and theory for almost half a century after it came into being. "Faithfulness" requires that the meaning in the target language should be faithful to the meaning of the original; "Fluency" is the requirement of intelligibility of the target language text, the translated text should be in accordance with the language rules of the target language; "Elegance" requires a translation to be esthetically pleasing.

The putting forward of the three-character criteria served as a link between past and future and carried forward the translation cause and forge it ahead into the future. It was of great significance and profound impact for being both concise and comprehensive in the generalization of translation criteria and for being well-arranged. It is even accepted by translation field as "the golden rules and infallible law". Although some experts thought Yan Fu's three-character criteria might derive his inspiration and borrow some ideas from the ancient

Buddhist scripture translation, however, he is the first one in Chinese translation history to make an organic whole of the three based on the generalization and summation of his own profound experience of translation practice.

However, there have been different comments and critiques of Yan Fu's triple criteria. In the application of Yan's principle of the three-character criteria, many translators and scholars have come to find some limitations to the three characters and put forward a variety of new standards. Most translators or translation critics accepted Yan Fu's "faithfulness" and "fluency," but some thought that "Elegance" is not always valid. To most of them, Yan Fu's explanation of "elegance" is not acceptable for modern translation practice. He derived his "elegance" from language of classical antiquity as the medium of translation, which betrayed his principle of "faithfulness". Taking his famous *Evolution and Ethics* as an example, apart from being a loose rendering of the original, it incorporated some observations by Yan Fu himself. In his own translation practice, Yan Fu followed "it's rather to be elegant than faithful"("与其伤雅，毋宁失真"), therefore, his translation is not only difficult to understand but also unfaithful to the original, which is almost adaptation. Some said Yan turned down "faithfulness" and "fluency" with "elegance", which sounded to take some ground.

Though there have been different opinions on Yan Fu's triple criteria, they have not been abandoned by translators in China. His theory successfully guided technical translation during the late Qing dynasty and the early Republic of China. Yan Fu, himself, with his translation output and translation theory, opened a new chapter in the translation history of China.

2.1.2.3. Ma Jianzhong

There was another figure during the Qing dynasty who has long been neglected as a translation theorist—Ma Jianzhong. Ma was a grammarian who was a specialist in Classical Chinese grammar, and was the author of the very influential *Ma's Grammar*. He was also one of the famous representatives of Bourgeois Enlightenment Group (资产阶级维新派)In 1894, five years before the publication of Yan Fu's triple criteria in the preface of *Evolution and Ethics*, in his *On Establishing a Translation Institution* (1894),Ma Jianzhong set forth several questions in translation theoretically. At first, he had a discussion on the importance of translation, that"...the emergency of establishing a translation institution will benefit the whole country" ("...窃谓中国急宜创设翻译书院..., 则中国幸甚."). He said that the establishment of translation institution was based upon two aspects: one reason is the urgent need to "learn from the West"("学习西方"), so "it is pressing for the translation of Western works" ("译书之不容少缓"); the other reason is that "the translators must be trained in due course of time." ("译书之才之不得不及时造就"). By saying these, Ma had seized the root of the problem, that is, in order to translate Western works, capable translators must be trained. Furthermore, Ma set forth three requirements for "a good translation" ("善译") namely:

(1) A translator should have a good mastery of the two languages. He is required to know the differences and similarities between the two languages.

(2) A translator should have a full understanding of the meaning, style and spirit of the source text and transfer them exactly into the target language.

(3) There should be no discrepancy between the source text and the target text. After reading the target text, he reader can have the same feeling as reading the source text.

The three requirements is rich and comprehensive in content. It involved a lot of fields of language such as stylistics, grammar and rhetoric. Especially the last requirement could be regarded as the father of modern "Functional Equivalence" Ma was not as influential as Yan Fu in the field of translation, partly because he was a grammarian and not a translator and partly because he has done no translation himself. Therefore, his translation theory has been ignored for a long time.

2.1.2.4 Literary Translation and Lin Shu

During the late Qing dynasty, literary translation was popular and marked another peak of translation in China. Literary translation during the late Qing dynasty consisted mainly of the translation of western novels into Chinese. The large scale of introduction of western novels enriched the literary creation of China where poems and poetic essays were the main literary forms.

This translation of novels, especially political novels, was initiated by political reformers and erudite scholars. However, among the many translators during this period, Lin Shu is the most distinguished because of his large quantity of translations of western novels.

Lin Shu translated about 160 literary works into Chinese. Surprisingly, he himself did not know any of the foreign languages. He cooperated with hisfriend Wang Shouchang (王寿昌) in translating. He composed into classical Chinese what Wang translated to him orally. Considerable care ,

however, was given to revising the draft by Wang and Wei Han (魏瀚). The publication of *The Life and Death of the Parisian Lady of the Camellias* (《巴黎茶花女遗事》) in 1899 was an instant success. Those who bought, read and praised it had no way of judging whether it was a good translation; they simply responded to the beauty of the writing. In 1901, Lin's translation of Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin was published under the title "黑奴吁天录"; he had Wei Yi (魏易)as collaborator and they were to form a lasting partnership. By 1911, Lin had translated over 50 books, and more than 100 more were to come before he died; he worked with many collaborators, over 20 in all, translating from English and French. Interestingly, the actual translators were completely overshadowed by the "rewrite man". Nevertheless, Lin Shu's translation undoubtedly owed their popularity to his skill with words, and also to his discrimination. The leading contemporary scholar Qian Zhongshu (钱钟书) has testified that despite their omissions and mistakes, the Lin Shu translations have more wit and feeling than more "faithful" renditions which were published later. Lin was inclined to expand on emotive passages and cut description. He also contributed enthusiastic prefaces and analyses of the chief virtues of the original works, which no doubt increased their impact. The younger generation which later overthrew the tradition that Lin Shu held dear and discarded the use of classical Chinese in which he excelled admitted that they were engrossed in and indeed enraptured by his translations.

Lin Shu's contribution to China's literary translation cannot be denied. He was the first translator to translate western literature into classical Chinese. He has been regarded as the pioneer of literary translation in China. His

translations cover a wide range of works by a large number of writers from more than ten countries, including Britain, America, France, Japan and Russia. Among his works, the most famous are: *La Dame aux Camelias, Uncle Tom's Cabin, David Copperfield,* and *Hamlet.*

Literary translation during the late Qing dynasty broke the Manchu's "closed-door policy," and brought to the Chinese people the lives, customs, ideology and social lives of western countries. The introduction of western ideology and democratic progress had an impact on the intellectuals and social reformers of China.

2.2 Translation From the May 4th Movement to the Founding of P.R.C

2.2.1 A Brief Introduction of the Translation Practices During This Period

2.2.1.1. The Translation of Marx-Lenin Works

The May 4th Movement which was the starting point of the new democratic revolution in China opened a new chapter in history of translation in China. The translation atmosphere was dynamic and active with the focus on the translation of Karl Marx's(1818-1883) and Lenin's(1870-1924) works on socialist and communist theories, and the translation and retranslation of western literature.

The Chinese version of *The Com munist Manifesto* (Marx and Engels, 1848) by Chen Wangdo was published in April, 1919. And then after the founding of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in July 1921, a large number of socialist and communist theories were translated for the needs of Chinese revolution. In 1922, Ke Baonian translated *Nations and Revolution.* In 1928, *New Youth,* a magazine for disseminating new knowledge,

democracy and science, published the *Outline of Leninism*; in 1929, *Die Heilige Familie* (*The Holy Family*, Marx,1844) was translated by Yang Xianjiang and *Imperialism* (Lenin,1917) was translated by Liu Pin; in 1930, Marx's monumental work *Das Kapital* (*Capital*, 1859), the fundemental text of Marxist economics, was translated by Chen Qixiu and in the next year Guo Muoruo translared Marx's *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* (*Critique of Political Economy*, 1852).

The central committee of the Communist Party of China established a Translation Bureau for the translation of works of Marxism-Leninism. The translations and publications of the classical works of Marxism-Leninism served as guidelines for the new democratic revolution before the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949.

2.2.1.2. Literary Translation

Literary translation after the May 4th Movement and before 1949, made a significant contribution to the introduction of foreign literature to China and the development of literature in China. Translators in this period of time, by comparison with those during the late Qing dynasty, were more selective regarding source texts. The quality and quantity of literary translation greatly improved. Most of the world famous literary works, from both large and small nations, were translated into Chinese.

In response to the appeal for realism, naturalism and romanticism in the May 4th Movement, western European and American literatures were further introduced to China with the translation of Balzac, Zola, Flaubert, Maupassant, Goethe, Victorian writers, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, Dreiser etc. At the same time, as the result of the efforts of the left-ring writers and

translators headed by Lu Xun, a large quantity of Russian literature and literatures of "the oppressed Nations" were also introduced to China with the translation of Tolstoy, Turgenev, Gogol, Chekhov, Gorky etc. Translation of foreign novels went on flourishing, but translation of foreign literatures were not confined to the translations of novels alone. Many western drama and poems were translated into Chinese. Translations of foreign literatures at this stage were also characterized by the interference of politics and ideology. What to translate became a major issue of principle.

The translators, most of whom had learned the source languages and literary theory before carrying out the translations, were aware of the significance of transferring literary styles on the basis of linguistic accuracy. Professionalization of literary translation in this period also helped improve translation quality.

Another improvement in literary translation was the linguistic change. Before the May 4th Movement (1919), the language used in literary creation and translation was classical Chinese. After that, a more simplified and easily-understood vernacular Chinese (Bai Hua) came to be used for literary creation and translation. The use of vernacular Chinese in translation enlarged the readerships. Since then, vernacular Chinese has been used instead of Classical Chinese in all types of translation.

2.2.1.3. Developments in Translation Theory

Translation theory, especially literary translation theory, was effectively developed during this period of time when large quantities of literary works were translated. Translation issues like: *the necessity of translation, translatability and untranslatability, the relation between translation and*

literary creation, the improvement of translation quality etc. were raised and adequately discussed by translation practitioners. However, the heated topics on translation theory were still: *translation criteria, literary vs free translation.*

Lin Yutang, the author of *Peking Moment*, put forward his translation criteria: "the first is fidelity, the second coherence, the third is elegance." Namely, the meaning of a translation should be faithful to the original, the language of the translation should be smooth, coherent and esthetically pleasing. As can be seen that Lin's translation criteria were no more than a reproduction of Yan Fu's "Xin Da Ya" (faithfulness, intelligibility and elegance). However, among the many translators and translation theorists, Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai were the most influential in the development of translation theory in China in this period.

2.2.2. Representative Translators and Their Principles

2.2.2.1. Lu Xun

Lu Xun, one of the great writers of China, translated more than 200 literary works from 14 countries. His correspondence on translation with Qu Qiubai contributed significantly to the development of translation theory. He fought against the tendencies of irresponsible translation in the first decade of the century and gave particular importance to faithfulness. He thought that a translation is creative work, but that it differs from literary creation. The value of a translation lies in its faithfulness to the original text. He insisted that the main purpose of translation is to introduce the culture and social lives of foreign countries to the Chinese people. He advocated that there should be an exotic atmosphere in the translated works which would familiarize the readers with the foreign cultures. He wrote in the prelude of one of his

translated works: "A translation must have both intelligibility and the style of the original text". He advocated strict literal translation so as to be more faithful to the original text; he was against those who liked to borrow words and phrases from the target language in their translation for the sake of intelligibility and fluency. He believed that literal translation of culturally loaded words was one of the important means of enriching the mother tongue.

In 1930 there was a heated debate between Lu Xun (1881-1936) and Liang Shiqiu (1902-1987) and Zhao Jingshen (1902-1985). Liang Shiqiu accused Lu Xun of making "hard translations", which were "close to literal translation. This fashion for literal translation should not be encouraged." Lu Xun replied,

> "Owing to my inadequacy as a translator and the limitations of the Chinese language, upon reading through my translation I find it obscure and uneven, and in many places very hard to understand. Yet if I were to cut the redundant phrases, it would lose its original flavour. As far as I am concerned, I must either go on producing these hard translations, or produce none at all. I can only hope readers will be willing to make the necessary mental effort to read it. " (Luo Xinzhang, 1984: 262)

However, Liang could not see any difference between hard translation and literal translation. Liang's essay *On Hard Translation* starts by declaring distorted translations better than literal ones.

"It is impossible for a translation to be a complete misrepresentation ... Maybe unfaithful renderings give a wrong idea of the original, but they give the reader something even though they are mistaken. Even if the wrongness does damage, it is still pleasant to read." (Luo Xinzhang, 1984: 264)

Lu Xun took up the argument by noting the loophole in Liang's reply,

"I am not quite such a fool as to look for a foreign language which is like Chinese language, or hope that 'the grammar, syntax and vocabulary of the two languages will be identical. ' But I believe it is relatively easy to translate from languages which have a complex grammar. It is relatively easy, too, to translate from a language akin to your own, although that still requires some effort. ... have to be made by "hard translation". In my experience, you can retain the flavour of the original better by this method than by rearranging your sentences..."(Luo Xinzhang, 1984: 246)

The point that Lu Xun was making was that time and patience were required for readers to accept expressions borrowed from foreign languages. At first, these foreign expressions might appear quite odd, but people could mentally adapt to the new images. Therefore some time we needed "hard translations", which would in time appear less hard to understand.

To the accusations of Liang and others, Lu Xun answered,

"And I can say with confidence that I never deliberately distort the meaning of any work. When it touches critics on

the raw, I laugh. When it touches me on the raw, I put up with it. But I absolutely refuse to make additions or cuts, hence I have always believed in " hard translation".In the long run better translators are bound to appear, who will neither distort the meaning nor give " hard " or "literal" translations;...All I am trying to do is fill the gap between "having none" and "having better" translations." (Luo Xinzhang, 1984: 232)

We can see that there was a reason for Lu Xun's stubborn adherence to his notion of "hard translation". And, indeed, while many instances of such "hard translations" have survived into current Chinese language, others have been rejected.

Because Lu Xun was a proponent of literal translation and emphasized that "he would rather be faithful to the original than be fluent in the translation" many people thought that he was against meaning-based free translation and that he himself used the literal method throughout the process of translating. But this was not so. He was for free translation, or at least a combination of both methods. In his « Preface to *Little Peter*, » he said:

"... as a result, the reader would find it hard to read. This version (itself the translation from the Japanese translation of the German original) has numerous flaws of this kind, therefore, I altered the translation at many places during the time of checking, so that it reads much more smoothly now."

(Luo Xinzhang, 1984: 262)

It only serves to prove that Lu Xun's approach to translation methods was not of an extreme literalist.

He also advocated absorbing new words and expressions from foreign languages to enrich the Chinese language. He said: "We should not only introduce culturally-loaded idioms to Chinese readers, but also accept them as a part of colloquial Chinese."

2.2.2.2. Qu Qiubai

Qu Qiubai was a politician. But his views on translation were very influential in China. He was one of the early translators of Russian literature into Chinese. His translation has been highly valued for its faithfulness to the meaning, the syntactic structure and the writing style of the original text. He believed, like Lu Xun, that translators should be faithful to the original text. "A translation should be faithful to the original meaning and enable the target language readers to have the same concept from the translated text as the source language readers get from the original text."

He also advocated absorbing new words and expressions from foreign languages to enrich the Chinese language. He said: "We should not only introduce culturally-loaded idioms to Chinese readers, but also accept them as a part of colloquial Chinese."

Qu Qiubai was one of those who challenged Yan Fu's translation criteria. He pointed out that Yan Fu's choice of language and style for translations, which returned to the Classical, cut him off from the social development of the time. In one of his letters to Lu Xun, he said: "How can we reach Yan Fu's requirement of 'faithfulness' and 'fluency' if we have to make the translation elegant by using the language and style of almost two thousands years ago?". With a sound grip of relationship between "faithfulness" and "fluency", he demonstrated that the relationship between the two was one of

independence rather than one of conflict, and that a translation could be both faithful and readable at the same time. Although Qu Qiubai did not neglect to accuse Yan Fu for inactivating "xin" and "da" with "ya", his exposition of the relationship between "xin" and "shun" was actually an elaboration of Yan Fu's understanding of the relationship between "xin" and "da". The difference lies in the interpretation of "faithfulness" and "fluency" and of the means to achieve the two in translation, and this is where Qu Qiubai went a step further. While "fluency" for Yan Fu implies the use of classical Chinese language and classical Chinese syntax, for Qu Qiubai it means the use of idiomatic, modern vernacular Chinese. If the translation was indeed done in modern Chinese, it could obviously not be unintelligible, as far as Qu Qiubai was concerned. However, if it was done in classical or semi-classical Chinese, it had nothing to do with the great masses of common readers even if it read as smoothly as Yan Fu's translation into classical Chinese. Yet Qu Qiubai's denial of classical or semi-classical Chinese as the target language doesn't imply his allowance of a target language which does not read like Chinese. In contrast with Lu Xun, he adopted a much more careful attitude in the issue of introducing foreign expressions to enrich the Chinese language. He warned that an unreadable Europeanized Chinese which was "neither ass nor horse" "amounted to an abuse, not to the introduction of new expressions".

He also argued against those who advocated that "intelligibility is more important than faithfulness" He thought that "intelligibility is just as important as faithfulness." And that in fact, practical translators sometimes have to sacrifice part of the "intelligibility" in order to achieve "faithfulness".

2.2.2.3. Lin Yutang

Lin Yutang (1895-1976), a proliferate writer and scholar, wrote an article on translation which gave a perspicacious summary of several controversial issues of the time. According to him there were no ready-made rules to follow in translating; only technical problems which needed to be discussed. One technical problem was the criteria for judging translation, which he considered to be (1) fidelity ("zhongshi"), (2) mellifluence ("tongshun"), and (3) aesthetic quality ("mei"). The criteria Lin laid out coincide with the three-character criteria formulated by Yan Fu, which are (1) faithfulness ("xin"), (2) readability ("da") and (3) refinement ("ya"). In Lin's opinion, his criterion of "aesthetic quality" covered more than Yan's "refinement". In both sets of criteria, point (1) concerns the translator's faithfulness to the original, considers a matter of responsibility to the original author; point (2) concerns the translator's fluency in Chinese, which is translator's responsibility to Chinese readers; and point (3) concerns translation's relation to the arts, and raises an artistic responsibility.

Other discussions about translation involved random comments on the translator's working experiences, which were superficial observations. But Lin Yutang went further, realizing that translation had to do with linguistics and psychology. Lin saw faithfulness or fidelity as a matter of degree, that is, the quality of translation could be assessed by determining if it was done by the literal method or "dead" method (an "extreme form" of the literal method), or by the "sense" method or "imprudent" method (an "extreme form" of the "sense" method). Casting aside the two extreme forms of translation, Lin went on to say that the "literal method"("zhiyi") and "sense method" ("yiyi") were two misnomers. He believed people could not help

taking the "literal method" to mean "word-for-word" literal method, and would then see the word-for-word method as no different than the "dead" method of translating. Similarly, some translators boasted of their imprudently translated texts as being translated by the "sense method", which led some people to think that two sets of rules actually applied to the process of translating, which was not true, according to Lin, "There should be only *one applicable criterion*, and *one appropriate technique* too.". But Lin went on to talk about "translation by word" and "translation by sentence" as being *two ways* of translating. "Translation by word" could be used where the translation was deemed correct from the context; and "translation by sentence" had to be used where "translation by word" could not render the "global meaning" of the sentence. The global meaning of a sentence could not be derived a simple summation of the meanings of each and every individual words making up that sentence. It could only be derived after grasping the global idea of the sentence. If the translation happened to be a word-for-word match of the original sentence, so much the better. Otherwise, the meaning of certain individual words had to be ignored in order to catch the global meaning of the sentence . To perceive a logical error in Lin's argumentation would be mistaken and imply a failure to follow his logic. According to Lin, it is not a matter of saying "yes" to both "translation by word" and "translation by sentence", but a matter of "yes" or "no". If "translation by word" is correct in a particular context, then "translation by sentence' would be wrong, and vice versa. Hence "one applicable criterion" and "one appropriate technique".

Lin believed that "fidelity" did not necessarily mean a wo rd-for-word correspondence. He thought that the meaning of a word was formed by two parts: "fixed meanings" and "variable meanings", which made it impossible to realize word-for-word correspondence in all cases. He maintained that the translator not only had to transfer the meaning of a sentence, but also the beyond-the-sentence meaning, or what he called the "feeling-tone", which was not an easy task. He further argued that one could not translate all facets of a sentence at the same time--the basic meaning, the spirit, the implication, the style, and the sound. Therefore there was no such thing as absolute faithfulness . Next, Lin considered the problem of mellifluence of translation. Like writing in the mother tongue, translating must proceed at the sentence level, that is, the translator must have a "total concept" of the original sentence in mind before turning it into a Chinese sentence, which must be constructed according to Chinese grammar. If the sentence were translated according to the grammar of a Western language, the result could not be regarded as a Chinese sentence. Therefore Lin was opposed to so-called Europeanized sentences, which followed Western grammar too closely to be read smoothly in Chinese. When translating literary works, the translator also had to consider the aesthetic quality of the translation, and make it comparable to that of the original work. The translator therefore had to pay attention to the language used in translating; the language must be beautiful. But, again, this is not an easy thing to do. Poetry, for example, a belle art of the supreme form, cannot be rendered into a different language without losing something. That something is the style of the original work. Lin thought that the enjoyment of a piece of literary work was not derived from

the story but from the way it was told. The manner of telling a story often revealed the writer's style and the task of the translator was to imitate that manner of writing. The problem of style had to do with the discussion of form, which Lin divided into "outer form" and "inner form". The "outer form" refers to the lengths of sentences, rhyming schemes, meter, etc., while the "inner form" refers to those elements that bespeak a writer's idiosyncrasies, mentality, and moods. Lin disdained the use of "free verse" to translate Western poetry, irrespective of the original blank or rhymed verse forms. He called that a "prankish act".

2.2.2.4. Zhu Shenghao

Zhu Shenghao (1912-1944) was the first Chinese translator to attempt to translate the complete works of William Shakespeare. Though his early death brought the ambitious project to a halt, his status as a great translator was secured. No writings of his own about translating Shakespeare remain except for a short « Foreword » (1944) he wrote for the translated edition of the *Complete Theatrical Works of William Shakespeare*. He observed that there had been more cases of translators rendering "hard" translations of Shakespeare than of more careless work.

> "... the result of rigidly following the grammar of the original
> will produce a translation which has lost much of its 'spiritual
> flavour' and worse still, that has been so abstrusely and
> obscurely translated that nobody can understand it." (Editorial
> Board, 1984: 364)

Zhu set out the goals he himself tried to reach:

"I will try to retain the spirit of the original as far as I possibly

can; if this cannot be achieved, I will at least try to convey the

intentions of the original, using fluent, plain Chinese; as to

word-for-word 'hard' translations, I dare not venture to go

along with." (Editorial Board, 1984: 365)

Apparently Zhu was opposed to the word-for-word method of translating. His main consideration was not burdening readers with the hard-to-understand grammar of the alien language.

"Wherever the syntax of a sentence in the original text has

been found to clash with the grammar of Chinese, I would

always mull it over for hours and days until I came up with a

version which was totally different in construction from the

original, so much so that the intended message of the author

had been brought to the foreground without being blurred by

obscure Chinese." (Editorial Board, 1984: 365)

How did Zhu actually do this? He was not a rough-and-ready sort of translator. When he had finished translating a paragraph, he would revise it with the reader in mind, to see that there were no ambiguities in the paragraph, then read it aloud to check that the version read smoothly and rhythmically. He would muse over a word or a sentence for days before making a choice. Although today we can detect errors of translation here and there in the volumes, these errors appear as occasional blemishes of a great translator.

2.3 Translation from the Founding of P.R.C to the Present

2.3.1 A Brief History of Translation Practices During This Period

The founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 enabled translation to enter into an new era. Translation became a very important part of the national cultural and educational cause. National organizations for translators were established in order to protect the interests and benefits of translators.

In the 50s and 60s while Western naturalism was out of favor but critical realism could still be appreciated critically, mainland China was flooded with translations of Russian literature, particularly modern Russian literature. It was also a period when African literature and Latin American literature was introduced to China on a large scale. Translation of Russian literature came to a sudden Halt when the relation between China and the Soviet Union steadily deteriorated, and translations of foreign literatures basically came to a stop during the early years of the Cultural Revolution. Nixon's visit to China in 1972 gave rise to a craze for learning English, which in its turn led to a revival of the translation of foreign literatures, particularly novels by contemporary American writers. Herman Woouk's *The Winds of War* was among the first American novels translated into Chinese during this period. Its Chinese version was such an immediate success that the Chinese reader considered it a pleasure to be among the first to read the book. However, the real comeback of foreign literatures was not staged until the end of the Culture Revolution in 1976. In 1977, together with numerous Chinese classics, a great number of Chinese translations of foreign novels, short stories and poems were reprinted. Since then, *Catcher in the Rye,*

Catch-22 and many other masterpiece by contemporary Western writers of various literary schools were translated one after another. The ban has been lifted, but not completely, for Chinese translators still felt it like walking on thin ice even in the 80s to translate works like D.H.Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* or George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four*, which were either not supposed to be translated or translated for restricted publication only.

The use of vernacular Chinese in translation has given rise to rapid increase of readers, for more people could accept translations in a language they could understand. This increase of the readership of translation is also the result of the enhancement of the quality of translations. One Characteristics of this stage was the involvement of major Chinese writers in literary translation. Lu Xun, Lin Yu-tang, Hu Shi, Lao She, Guo Mo-ruo, Ba Jin and many other leading Chinese writers with some knowledge of a foreign language has tried their hands at translation. Meanwhile, the number of professional translators has been growing steadily, too. This is a period with the participation of a great number of excellent translators with a much better command of both the source and target languages and the source and target literatures. Leading translators of this time, being aware of the nature of literary translation, have learned to be much more selective in the choice of source materials for translation. Instead of picking up literary works by several authors, of various literary genres or styles, in several languages, or at random, as translators of the earlier stage used to do, most of them dedicated their efforts to the translation of the literature of a particular country, or literary works of a particular time or by one or two particular authors. Fu Lei

focused on translating Romain Rolland and Balzac, Zhu Shenghao on translating Shakespeare, Zhang Guruo on Thomas Hardy, and Zhou Xu-liang on John Galtheworthy; Dong Qiusi came to fame for his translation of Dicken's *David Copperfield* while Yang Bi for *Vanity Fair*. Some of their translations enjoy such great popularity that the names of translators have been associated with the works, as Fu Donghua with *Gone with the Wind* and Fu Lei with *Jean Christophe*.

2.3.2 The Development of Translation Theory in General

Most of the translators in the period between 1949 and 1978 took a literary approach to the study of translation theory. They pointed out that literary translation, which requires a higher standard, is different from general translation. Literary translation is an act in which the translators reproduce exactly the artistic conception of the original text into the target language; this requires literary translators to have not only a good command of the two languages but also mastery of artistic creation processes and the ability to catch the literary spirit of the original text. The transfer of the original spirit, advocated by Fu Lei, was regarded as one of the main tasks of literary translation. Fu Lei is one of the famous translators who translated from French into Chinese. He translated many of Balzac's works. In the preface of one of his translations, he wrote: "As a product, translation is like imitating a picture. What is more important is the likeness of spirit not resemblance to the original one."

Thus, an artistic literary translation depends on the transfer of the spirit of the original text; if the original text is an artistic work, it should remain artistic after it is rendered into another language. The advocating of "being alike in spirit" for literary translation does not deny the significance of "being

alike in appearance." A good translation product should both be "alike in spirit and appearance." If, for linguistic and cultural reasons, the translator is in a dilemma as to whether to transfer either the appearance (grammatical and syntactic structure etc.) or the literary spirit, he should, according to Fu's principle, sacrifice appearance to spirit.

Fu's advocating for literary translation was widely accepted. Tang Ren, a translator and translation theorist, pointed out in response to Fu's theory that "a translator should first catch the thoughts, emotion, style and spirit of the original text, and then express them exactly in another language."

After China opened its door to the outside world, Chinese translators and translation theorists were able to broaden their views. The discussion of translation theories were no longer focuses on issues like translation criteria, literal translation vs free translation and the like. With the introduction of different views on translation from the west, Chinese translators are rethinking the theories they have followed, and research in translation theories has diversified. However, there are two main schools of translation theorists, namely, the linguistic school and the literal and cultural school. Those who take a linguistic approach to the study of translation are mainly linguists, teachers of translation at universities who have read extensively on the western translation theories. They may be influenced by Catford, Nida and others, and stress that translation theory is an independent linguistic discipline, derived from observation and providing the basis for practice. While those who take the literal and cultural approach are mainly writers, literary translators and practical general translators who have read literature on translation by Chinese theorists.

Jin Di, who lectured on translation theory and practice at Nankai University and the Foreign Languages Institute of Tianjin for many years, coauthored with Eugene Nida the popular *On Translation* (1984) introducing to the Chinese translation community his "dynamic equivalence" translation with reference to English and Chinese. Jin Di, taking consideration of the history of translation in China and applying his linguistic expertise and his research on translation theory, concluded that "dynamic equivalence" translation, which is based on the comparison of reader response to the source text and the target text, is applicable in China.

Translation theorists like Professor Jin Di, who had opportunities to do his research and exchange academic views with experts in the U.S and European countries, brought to the translation community of China a more westernized model of translation theory. They absorbed the essence of western translation theory and combined them with their own research in order to develop a new theory, which is more applicable in China. They, like most of their western colleagues, took a linguistic approach towards their research on translation, aiming to establish translatology in China.

Traditional scholars, who did their research on translation theory with references which were mainly from the history of translation of China, took a literal and cultural approach towards their research. The main issues on translation they discussed continued to be the principles, criteria and methods of translation. In their works we can see that Yan Fu and his three-character translation theory are still influencing translation theorists in China, although they have endowed the three characters (xin, da, ya) with new interpretations.

Apart from research on the systematic translation theory, the study of technical and specialized translation has also been popular among Chinese translators since Deng Xiaopin opened the door of the country to the outside world. In order to activate research on technical and specialized translation, an academic journal, *China Technical Translation,* was launched in 1992. Up to now, more than 500 essays, with valuable perspectives on technical and specialized translation, have been published in *China Technical Translation.* Those essays will no doubt become the main components of Chinese technical translation theory.

Further important evidence of progress in the field of translation studies in China during this period is the establishment of "translation studies" as an independent subject in China. although translation has a 3000-year long history in China, it has never been regarded as an independent subject. There is no entry for "translation studies" in the authoritative Chinese Encyclopedia. The publication of the first book entitled *"Translotology,"* a discussion on establishing "translation studies" as an independent subject, was followed by heated discussions. Experts fell over each other to contribute to *China Translators' Journal* on how to establish translation studies as an independent subject in China, what kind of translation studies there should be and so on. The discussions led to an agreement that it is necessary to establish translation studies as an independent subject with Chinese characteristics. Considering the special characteristics of the Chinese language and culture, we should distinguish translation studies from translation by acknowledging that the first is science while the second is practice.

2.3.3. Representative Translators of This Period and Their Translation Principles

2.3.3.1 Fu Lei

Fu Lei (1908-1966), another great translator, shared Zhu Shenghao's views on translating. He saw:

> "differences between two languages in lexicon and syntactic structure, in grammar and idiomatic usage, in rhetorical devices and sayings--all these differences reflect dissimilarities in the modes of thinking of people of different nations, in the range of their perceptions, in their points of view, in their customs and habits, in their social backgrounds, and in their means of expression." (Editorial Board, 1984: 80)

Because of these differences, Fu concluded that it was impossible "to capture the linguistic features of a foreign language, without disrupting the syntactic structures and linguistic peculiarities of the mother tongue" However, in his *Letter to Lin Yiliang on Translating Novels* (1951), Fu clarified his point by saying "Not that we can ignore the syntax of the original altogether. What I mean is that we can keep the original syntax as best we can; however, the translation, though appearing novel in grammar, should still be intelligible Chinese."

The next significant point Fu Lei raised concerned the style of a translation. He thought the style of a translation had much to do with the language it used. The style of a translation would often seem unsatisfactory because the language used in the text was "false" or "artificial". Here Fu returned to the issue of whether translators should use classic or vernacular Chinese--*baihua* which is the earlier version of today's *putonghua*, or the

standard dialect used throughout China. In Fu's opinion, vernacular Chinese is not an ideal medium for translating foreign languages rich in vocabulary and diversified in syntax. He claimed that classic Chinese had an advantage over the vernacular. In this respect, Fu agreed with Zhou Zuoren (1885-1967), Lu Xun's brother, who argued,

> "By using *pianwen*--couplet form which is subject to poetic regulations intermingled with *sanwen*--prose form which is not constrained by such regulations), it is easier to produce a work of translation of satisfactory quality--the translation appears intelligible and does not depart from the original text too far in conveying the meaning." (Editorial Board, 1984: 83)

Fu elaborated on Zhou's argument, saying,

> "Classic Chinese has a long established system, with accepted rules of composition and a rich vocabulary as well; whereas vernacular Chinese, having been just brought over from the folk tongue, has no system nor rules whatsoever to speak of--each and every writer is groping his own way; the result is a shambles." (Editorial Board, 1984: 83)

Fu Lei, a connoisseur of fine arts, drew an analogy between translating and painting: "What is desired is not formal but spiritual resemblance" The focus should be on conveying what has given life to the model being painted on the one hand, and to the original text on the other, rather than mechanically imitating every single detail while losing sight of the sparks of life. Many translators of a younger generation take Fu Lei as their model.

Fu's theory of "spiritual resemblance" has since become the predominant guideline for most translators in contemporary China.

2.3.3.2. Qian Zhongshu

Qian Zhongshu (1910-), a preeminent scholar and writer and also a member of the cultural elite in present-day China, though not a professional translator, brought the discussion to a climax by tracing the etymology of "译" (yi), the Chinese word for "translate, translation" to an ancient form made up of "口" (wei) and "化" (hua), with the latter being placed inside the former like this " "; this word means "translate" that is "translate the alien tongues from countries on four horizons and the speeches of birds and animals as well." According to Xu Shen (58?-147?), the lexicologist of the East Han Dynasty (25-211), "化" and " " were the same word; and therefore "译" (yi) and "化" (hua) were closely related. By relating the word "译" (yi) to the word "化" (hua), Qian found the supreme criterion for translation, which is "化" (hua) i.e. "transforming the words of a work written in one language into the words of another country, without the slightest trace of rigid, awkward translation arising from discrepancies in speech habits or linguistic peculiarities, while at the same time keeping the stylistic flavor of the original". If a translator can turn out a work of translation of such excellence, he is considered to have reached the "consummate realm of transmigration".

In 1964, Qian Zhongshu put forward his "transmigration theory" for literary translation. "Transmigration" in Buddhism means the process by which the soul, spirit, or some other seat of personality, vacates the body it has been occupying and enters another body or object. Qian borrowed the Buddhist term in summarizing his theory of literary translation: "A literary

translation is like the act of transmigration in which the soul, the spirit of the original text remain in the target text even although the carrier of them, the language, has changed." and"The translation should be so faithful to the original that it does not read like a translation." Qian's requirement for literary translation was so high that he himself had to admit that it was impossible to transmigrate everything of the original text to the target language, and that perfect transmigration of the original text into the target language was just an ideal, since this "transmigration of souls" demands a new body, and difference from or distortion of the original to the various degrees is unavoidable.

He also pointed out that in cultural exchange the function of translation was like a mediating agent who recommends to others that they should acquaint themselves with foreign literature or who lures others to love foreign literature. "Like a go-between, he contributes to the establishment of the relations between countries by literary marriage." While Qian's point that a translation of literary appeals lures the reader to go further and read the original, whereas a bad translation will destroy the original in effect betrays his preference for literariness, he reveals one simple but generally neglected truth: a translation is, after all, a translation, which is not and can not be a substitute for the original. In a period when "equivalence" was a pet form for translation theorists, Qian's understanding of the function of translation and of its limitations is simple and apt.

Chapter Three   Traditional Principles of Translation in

Ancient Times of the West

3.1.   A Brief Introduction of Translation Practices During this Period
3.1.1 From 300 B.C to 500 AD

There has been no doubt that translation is an age-old communicative activity of human beings both in the east and in the west. In the long history of development, language translation is almost as old as language itself. China has a long history of translation, so does the West. The recorded translation activity in history can be traced back to the end of 4th century B.C or the mid 3rd century B.C. It is generally believed by western scholars that the first translation work was *the Old Testament of the Bible* or *Septuagint*(《圣经·旧约》 which was translated by 72 Judaic scholars in 3rd century B.C., while some other scholars holds that the first translation work of the West is Homer's epic *Odyssey* which was translated into Latin by Androicus in the 3rd century B.C.. Although there are some discrepancies, the mutual point is that the historically recorded translation activity in the West has enjoyed a history of two thousand years already.

In the 3rd century B.C, there appeared three great founders of Roman literature and translation. They are Livius Andronicus (里维乌斯·安德罗尼柯 284B.C—204B.C), Gnaeus Naevius (涅维乌斯 270B.C—200B.C) and Quintus Ennius (恩尼乌斯 239B.C—169B.C). Livius Andronicus is a Roman translator and founder of Roman epic and plays.   In order to help his teaching, he translated *Odyssey* from Greek into Latin in the form of Italian

Saturnius numerus (意大利萨图尼乌斯诗体) and meanwhile translated Greek plays including 9 tragedies by Aischulos (埃斯库罗斯), Sophokles (索福克勒斯) and Euripides (欧里庇得斯) and 3 comedies by Menandros (米南德). His level of translation was low and inferior from the angle of literature tranlation, but he was the first person to introduce ancient Greek epics and dramas to Roman Society and made Greek poetical forms and rhyme mixed with latin language. His translation works brought about great influence in the development of European dramas. Gnaeus Naevius created a lot of historical dramas, comedies and tragedies, and translated many Greek dramas into Latin. Quintus Ennius was a great poet of Latin. He was called as the Father of Roman Literature. He knew Oscan Language (Italian 奥斯康语), Greek and Latin. He created lots of poems in different languages and translated Numerous poems.

the translation of *The Old Testament* was regarded as the first and most important works in ancient times of the West. *The Old Testament* was originally written in Hebrew Language. In order to meet the needs of Jews, the Bishop of Jerusalem organized 72 Jewish scholars to translate *The Old Testament* from Hebrew language to Greek according to the requirement of the King of Egypt. During the period between 285B.C and 249B.C, the 72 Jewish scholars gathered in the library of Alexandria and Began to translate *The Old Testament* . they came from 12 Israeli tribes and each tribe including 6 scholars was divided into 3 groups, each group 2 members, totally 36 groups. They began their translation work separately. At last 36 translation texts were finished after 4 years. They cheked and compared the 36 translation texts each other and decided the last edition called *Septuagint* in

Chinese 《七十子希腊文本圣经》.

The translation of Septuagint opened up the beginning of collective cooperation for the translation world and was regarded as the first translation works recorded in the Western translation history. It also opened up the beginning of Bible translation. With the coming out of *The New Testament*, the Bible translation activities came in a stream. Representatives of this translation tide included *Editio Vulgata or Vulgate* (《通俗拉丁文本圣经》) and *Vetus Latina* (《拉丁圣经》). At the same time a lot of expert translators of the Bible appeared, including Philo Judaeus (斐洛 · 犹达欧斯 20B.C—50AD), St. Jerome (哲罗姆 347—420AD) and St. Augustine (奥古斯丁 354—432 AD). Philo Judaeus was one of the earliest translators of the Bible and also a philosopher of Jewish mysticism. He not only translated the Bible but also attempted to combine the Bible with Greek philosophy and put forward his translation theory that only theologians (people with professinal knowledge) had the right to translate the Holy Bible and only could they obtain inspiration from God. St. Jerome was one of the four great theologians of the western Christianity in the early times, and also a scholar, an expert translator and translation theorist. He translated *The Church History of Christianity* (《基督教教会史》 and other works but the most famous was *Editio Vulgata* (《通俗拉丁文本圣经》)which ended the chaotic phenomenon in translation of the Holy Bible. His translation text was regarded as the only standard Latin text by Roman Catholic Church and the original one by later ages. Besides he put forward a series of translation principles, which brought about great influence in the translation world. St. Augustine was a Christian theologian, philosopher, translator an translation theorist. His famous works

included *De Civitate Dei* (《上帝之城》), *Confessioines* (《忏悔录》) *and De Doctrina Christiana* 取(《论基督教育》). In these books he issued a series of very important views on translation principles and theory which give full play to later ages of the translation world, especially in the West.

3.1.2. Translation of the Western Middle Ages

The Middle Ages began from 500AD (collapse of Roman Empire) and ended in the 15th century (the Renaissance). During the period there are three important marks: expert translator Mnlius Boethius (曼里乌·波伊提马达 80—525AD) as representative of translation world at the beginning, school of translation (or college of translators) in the middle period and the translation of national languages by the end of Middle Ages.

Famous expert translators during this period included Cassiodorus (卡西奥多鲁 480—575?), Manlius Boethius, and Aelfric (阿尔弗里克 955—?). Cassiodorus was an Italian scholar and translator whose main contributions were his setting up of Vivarium (猎园寺), a non-government translation organization which was a forerunner for all kinds of translation units of later ages. Manlius Boethius was the most important theologian, philosopher and expert translator during this period. He translated and introduced a lot of philosophical works of Aristotle (亚里士多德) to Europe including *De Consolatione Philosophae* (《哲学的慰籍》). Besides he issued his translation theory in *In isagogen Prophyrii* (《波菲利作品译文序言》). Aelfric was an influential expert translator and theorist and translated lots of works from Latin into English such as *Bible • Genesis* (《圣经•创世纪》), *Catholic Homilies* (《天主教布道辞》), *Lives of the Saints* (《圣徒传》 and so on.

With the independence of ethnical groups, they needed translation texts of their national languages. Therefore the large-scale translation activities

around the Holy Bible began in these newly-founded countries. Originally the Holy Bible was translated from Hebrew language just into Greek, Latin and Italian but it was translated into English, German, French, Russian and other languages. At the beginning such translation activities were criticized and opposed by Church but the translation went on and formed a new translation high tide of the Holy Bible.

3.1.3. Translation During the Renaissance

The Renaissance between the 15th century and the 16th century was not only a reform movement of the thought and literatur • but also a big development in the western translation history. During this period translation activities reached a newly high tide. Large numbers of expert translators and excellent translation works sprang up.

In Germany, the mainstream of translation lay in classic literature and religious works. Among them, Sebastian Brant (塞巴斯蒂安 • 布兰特 1457—1521), who was a German poet and expert translator. He mainly translated poems of Cato (an ancient Roman poet) from Latin into German. His translation of poems was deeply welcome by German people. Another one was Johannes Reuchlin (约翰 • 赖希林 1455—1522), a famous writer of humanism, whose main translation works included *Batrachomyomachia* (《蛙鼠之战》) and *Septem Psalmos Poenitentiales* (《苦行赎罪诗》). And Martin Luther (马丁 • 路德 1483—1546), a famous leader of religious reform and expert translator. He translated the New Testament from Greek into German in 1522 and The Old Testament from Hebrew language into German in 1534. Besides, he translated the famous *Aesop's Fables* (《伊索寓言》).

In France, during the Renaissance French translation activities began later than other European countries and the key point of translation turned to

Greek and Latin classic literature. Among them, Jacques Amyot (雅克·阿米欧 1513—1593), a French linguist, writer, professor, expert translator and translation theorist. He was regarded by many as the translation king of France. The first works he translated was *Aethiopica* (《埃塞俄比传奇》) and then he translated Bibliotheca *Historica* (《历史丛书》) and *Moralia* (《道德论》) from Greek into French. *Vies des hommes illustrus* (《希腊·罗马名人比较列传》) which he translated in 1559 established his reputation in the translation world. He also put forward a series of important principles and criteria of translation. The other one was Etienne Dolet (艾蒂安多雷 1509—1546). He was a French linguist, translation theorist and atheist. His main contribution to translation field lay in establishing translation theory in France. He issued his famous paper on translation *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en autre* (《论如何出色地翻译》)in 1540.

During the Renaissance, Britain was in its period of full bloom—the Elizabeth Age. With the development of industrial production and academic research, translation enterprise was fully developed. Expert translators and excellent translations sprang up like mushrooms. Among them, Nicholas Udall (尼古拉斯·尤德尔 1505—1556) translated *Apophthegmes* (《箴言录》) written by Desiderius Erasmus and *Luke's Gospel* (《路加福音》). Thomas North (托马斯·诺斯 1535—1601) translated *Diall of Princes* (《王子的计时器》) in 1557 from Spanish. In 1579, he translated *Parallel Lives of Illustrious Greeks and Romans* (《希腊·罗马名人比较列传》), which soon became the most important and famous epoch-making English translation works. John Florio (约翰·弗洛里德 1553—1625) became famous due to his translating of *Essays* (《散文集》) in 1603. Philemon Holland (菲尔蒙·荷

兰德 1552—1637) was regarded as the most outstanding translator and translator general in the 16th century in Britain, translating *Romane Historie* (《罗马史》) in 1600, *Natural Historie* (《博物学》) and *The Historie of the Twelve Caesars* (《十二凯撒》) and so on. George Chapman (乔治·查普曼 1559—1634), a famous British poet and translator, translated *Iliad* (《伊利亚特》) in 1598 and *Odyssey* (《奥德赛》) in 1616. His greatest contribution was that his translations formed a connecting between the 16th century and the 17th century in British translation world. During the Renaissance in Britain, translation of the Holy Bible was fully developed and from 1525 to 1611 about 9 English translation texts were published. Among the 9 editions, translation text by William Tyndale （威廉·廷代尔） was the most authoritative.

3.2. Representative Translators and Their Principles

3.2.1. Marcys Tullius Cicero (106—43 B.C)

Marcys Tullius Cicero was not only a politician, philosopher and elocutionist, but also a translator and translation theorist. His main contribution was to make the Greek philosophical idea popular among its people. Besides, he translated Odyssey by Homer and a lot of famous works by well-known philosophers of ancient Greek such as Plato(柏拉图), Xenophon (色诺芬) and Aratus(阿拉图斯). He was also one of the earliest translation theorist in western translation history and showed incisive understanding towards translation. His expound elaboration on translation mainly showed in his famous *De optimo genere pratorum* (《论最优秀的演说家》) and *De finibus bonorum et malorum* (《论善与恶之定义》). Cicero

inherited the artistic view of Plato about "figures of thought", but didn't use it to guide the imitation in translation and thus damaged the original style". In his *De optimo genere oratorum*, he said:

"And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the 'figures' of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language. For I did not think I ought to count them out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight, as it were."

Cicero proposed that a translator must pay attention to the language habit of the readers of the translated text and use language that conformed to the target reader to move the reader; therefore, free translation must be adopted. Literal translation or word for word translation was the exhibition of lack of technique He also thought that what a translation had to convey was the meaning and spirit of the original text and not the language form. The translation of literary works was recreation itself, therefore, the translators of literary works must have literary gift or quality. Since the original text and the translated piece were all human language, so they must have similar rhetorical means. He said that he himself had "preserved the general style and force of language.", so it was possible to be "stylistic equivalent" in translation.

3.2.2. Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65—8 B.C)

Horace was a famous poet and art critic of the old Roman Empire. His representative works was *Ars Poetica* (《论诗艺》). Horace was deeply influence by Cicero in his literary criticism and translation theories. He persisted that translation should be free translation and strongly objected hard

translation, word for word translation and mechanical translation in disregard of specific conditions. He supported sense for sense translation. At the same time, Horace proposed that routinism should be abandoned both in creation and translation and new words and foreign words could be introduced whenever it was necessary in order to enrich the national language and reinnforce the expressive force. In his *Ars Poetica*, he said:

"Material in the public domain will never become your private property if you do not waste your time going around in worn-out circles, and do not be a literal translator, faithfully rendering word for word from the Greek, and do not be merely an imitator thereby getting yourself into a hole from which either good conscience, or the laws of the work itself, will forbid you to climb out."

His idea that a faithful translator was not suitable for word for word translation was always cited by translators as a logion for free translators to criticize literal or word for word translators.

3.2.3. St. Jerome (347—420 A.D)

St. Jerome was regarded as one of the four authoritative theologists of the West. He was also a scholar, expert translator and translation theorist. He translated The Old Testament of The Holy Bible from Hebrew language into Latin and The New Testament from Greek into Latin. The translated piece was called *Editio Vulgata* (《通俗拉丁文本圣经》) which ended the chaotic phenomenon in translation of Holy Bible. His translation text was regarded as the only standard Latin text by the Roman Catholic Church and as the original text by later generations. Besides, he put forward a series of superlative and practical translation principles, which had great impact on later generations.

The translation principles elaborated by Jerome can be classified as follows:

1) Since languages differ in forms, word usages, grammar and content etc., word for word translation should be avoided and flexible measures should be taken. If the translation was to be faithful to the original, the deviation of language forms and the alteration of vocabulary was not only permitted, but also necessary. Jerome also thought that the translator could mix his own character into the translated piece to make it as graceful as the original, especially for those works that could be "suitably adopted". Just as what he said in *de optimo genere interpretandi* (《致帕马丘书》) "Like a conqueror he led away captive into his own language the meaning of his originals..."

2) Translation approach should change according to the original text. Literary translation and religious translation should be treated differently. In religious translation such as the translation of the Bible, literal translation should be adopted, because in the Bible, "the arrangement of word order was a kind of mystery". The original syntactic structure of the Bible should by no means be altered, otherwise the "profound connotation" in it will be damaged and the value of translation will be reduced. However, in literary translation, free translation should be adopted. The translator could and should adopt a style easy for understanding to convey the meaning of the original.

3) Accurate translation depended on accurate understanding. He denied that in the translation of the Bible, there existed "the

impelling force from God". He said that he could only translate those that he could understand and sentences could be understood and translated relying on the extensive knowledge and skillful mastering of language.

3.2.4. Martin Luther (1483—1546)

Martin Luther was a famous leader of religious reform and expert translator. He translated *The New Testament* from Greek into German in 1522 and *The Old Testament* from Hebrew language into German in 1543. His German translation of the Bible became the model of German, and affected the development of the national language of Germany unprecedentedly. His translation of The Aesop's Fables also had high literary value. His contributions to translation theories mainly lied in:

1) He proposed that popular and intelligible languages that could be accepted by the public should be adopted in translation. He persisted in humanistic view of language and thought that complete equivalence in structure and vocabulary could not be pursued among different languages. Since that the readers of the Bible were mainly the people, then in translation idiomatic German must be adopted instead of Latinized German. So in his translation, he escaped the traditional bondage of translating only in Latin, but made the prophets of *The Old Testament* to speak in natural German.

2) Martin Luther thought that only free translation could in a certain degree reproduce the original form, style and spirit of the original text.

3) The translator should respect and conform to the original text.

The spirit and essence of the original must be grasped and the traditional interpretation of church priest should not be readily believed. To reproduce the original spirit and essence, the translator could add meaning that might not exist in the literal form but unfolded between the lines.

4) Translation could depend on the congregated wisdom.

5) He proposed seven principles to follow in translation: word order could be altered; modal auxiliary words could be used; conjunctions could be added; omission could be adopted; phrases could be used in place of singe word; figurative expression could be changed into non-figurative expression and vice versa; attention should be paid to the variation of wordage and the accuracy of translation.

Chapter Four　Translation Principles of the West in the Modern Times and the Contemporary Times

4.1.　Translation Principles of the West in the Modern Times

4.1.1.　A Brief introduction of Translation Practices During This Period

Western translation promoted by the Renaissance continued its development from the 17th century to the beginning of the 20th century. During this period, the subjects of translation ranged from classic works and literary works to religious works. The development of translation in Britain and France reached their real high tides. During this period of a little more than three-hundred years, a great number of excellent translators emerged in various countries of the West. They published remarkable translation works of literature and humanistic science. This period was also called "the unprecedented golden age" in the aspect of translation theories. Translation theorists began to walk out their narrow research field and widen their vision. They put forward a more comprehensive, more systematic and more popularized mode of translation. John Dryden's (约翰·德莱顿 1631—1700) systematic study on translation, Alexander Fraser Tytler's (亚历山大·泰特勒 1747—1814) publishing of Essay on the Principles of Translation, the debate between Matthew Arnold (马修·阿诺德 1822—1888) and Francis W. Newman (弗兰希斯·纽曼 1805—1897) centering on translating the poetry of Homer, Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe (约翰·沃尔夫冈·歌德 1749—1632), Friedrich Schleiermacher (施莱尔马赫 1768—1834) and

Wilhelm von Humboldt's (威廉·洪堡 1767--1735) profound research in translation from the linguistic and literary point of view and the literary views of Russia in translation activities and translation theory study all highly promoted the multi-leveled and multi-angled research of translation and paved an entirely new and scientific way for translation studies.

In France, the development of translation theories was basically the debate between the ancient and the contemporary and between accuracy and freedom centering on Perrot d' Ablancourt's (德·阿伯兰库)translation principle an approach. Perrot d' Ablancourt translated *Chronicle* (《遍年史》) by (塔西陀) and was a representative of free translation. He proposed that the translation should cater for the native readers' taste. He emphasized the readability of literature, and thus allowed random omission and reversion and even elaboration. He paid no special attention to the faithfulness of the translation and was named "representative of free translation school". While translation theorist Bachet de Meziriac (德·梅西里阿克) who persisted in accurate translation thought that translations that deviated from the original meaning was not translation but betrayal. He proposed that no personal things should be squeezed into the original works and no random omission and reversion that affected the original meaning should be allowed. Daniel Huet (于埃), Jacques de Tourrei (德·图雷尔) proposed eclectic view of translation. The debate lasted until the middle of 18th century. The 18th and 19th century was called the "Golden Age" of translation activities with almost all the eminent writers of this age acting as outstanding translators such as Francois Victor Hugo (弗朗索瓦-维克多·雨果 1828—1873) and his son P. Hugo, Francoise Rene' de Chateaubriand (夏多布里昂 1768—1868) and Charles

baudelare (波德莱尔 1821—1867) and so on. However, the one that made the greatest contribution to translation theories was Charles Batteux (查里斯·巴托 1713—1780).

Russia saw much progress in its translation practice and translation theories. M. V. Lomonosov (罗蒙诺索夫 1711—1765) abandoned the bad habit of imitating the forms of foreign languages and proposed the adoption of native literary languages that was close to spoken language. A. Pushkin (普希金 1799—1832) proposed that the translator should have independent sight when choosing materials to be translated and enjoy enough freedom when dealing with the original works. He maintained free translation and objected literal translation. He even permitted omission and reversion of the original works with an aim to make the translation surpass the original works in aesthetic feeling and artistic value. However, he thought that the translation should maintain the unique features of the original works. V. A. Zhukovsky (茹科夫斯基 1783—1852) abandoned the earlier "cultural translation" approach, which was the arbitrary reversion of the original time and places and even changed the foreign names into Russian names to adjust to the Russian readers' tastes. He thought that in poem translation and prose translation the translators were very different in status. The translators of poems were actually the competitors and enemies of the original writer, whereas those of the prose were the slaves of the original writer who could only follow the steps of the original writer and do imitational work; therefore, in the translation of poems the translators enjoyed more creativity and freedom. In the 19th century, V. G. Belinsky (别林斯基 1811—1848) also proposed similar viewpoint, that was: first, the works to be translated must be

excellent classic literatures; secondly, translation must be faithful to the spirit of the original works; thirdly, the translators of art works must be artists themselves. From all the above, we can see that the special features of Russian translation theories were that special attention was paid to the thought and content of the original works, emphasis was laid on the unity of content and form and importance was attached to the readers.

In the modern history of translation theories in Britain, the most distinctive events were the translation and publishing of *The Authorized Version of the Holy Bible* (《圣经钦定本》), the birth of John Dryden's translation theory, the publishing of Alexander Fraser Tytle's three principles of translation and the debate between Matthew Arnold and Francis W. Newman centering on translation principles. In the 17th century, the translation and publishing of *The Authorized Version of the Holy Bible* opened a new page for the western translation history. It was the collective work of 47 university scholars divided into 6 groups. In the translation process, the translators referred to a lot of books and absorbed the advantages of different versions and the fruit of academic study on the Bible at that time; therefore, it surpassed the preceding English translations in faithfulness and technicality. Besides, the translators observed strict rules for translation, which efficiently excluded personal opinions and random omissions. 93% of the vocabulary in *The Authorized Version of the Holy Bible* came from the native English language. The language used was popular, plain and beautiful, which had a great impact on the Britain religion, culture and literature thereafter.

In Germany, the most distinguished translation theorists in the modern

times should be Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe, Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt. Goethe, an outstanding writer and translator, had translated many Spanish plays and French works such as *Neveu de Rameau* (《拉摩的侄儿》). Besides he issued a series of monographs on translation theory such as *West-Ostlicher Divan* (《西东合集》), Letter to Carlyle (《致卡来尔书简》) and so on. Humboldt was a German linguist, philosopher, reformer of education and translation theorist. He translated *Agamemmon* (《阿伽门农》) and other Greek dramas but he made the greatest contribution to translation theory. He issued many important monographs on translation research and put forward the famous *Dualism of Linguistics* (《两言论》) which brought about a great influence in the linguistic world in the 20th century.

4.1.2. Representative Translators and Their Principles

4.1.2.1. Charles Batteux (1713—1780)

Charles Batteux was a scholar and had compiled translation collections. He wrote the famous *Principles de literature* (《论文学原则》). The book was divided into six parts. In the fifth part, he devoted a considerable length to illustrate the problems of translation.

Batteux was an outstanding translation theorist. His theory bore the feature of discussing literature and translation from a linguistic point of view, mainly exploring translation principles from the angle of language skills instead of literary creation. The key of his discussion is the disposal of word order in translation. He thought that there existed a natural word order in language and this natural word order depended on human characteristics; the universal factor of languages was not grammar but word order. Grammatical structure was dominated by sentence order; thus, if there appeared an conflict,

grammatical structure should make place for sentence order. The principles raised by him was as follows: 1) The original word order should be maintained as much as possible; 2) the precedence of the expressed meaning should be kept; 3) sentences of the translation should be of the same length of the original ones; 4) reproduce the conjunctions; 5) free translation should be avoided; 6) reversions could be made when it was necessary, however, the equivalence in forms must be emphasized.

Batteux also elaborated on the role of translators in details and pointed out that when using one kind of language to express the things, thoughts, wording and style no adding or subtracting should be made and no changing of the original meaning. In thought, the translation should keep the hue, degree and subtle distinction of the original works; in style, the enthusiasm, humor and vitality of the original should be maintained. In wording, the translation should be natural, visual and persuasive; rich, graceful and elegant expressions should be chosen. The original writer was the absolute "master" of thoughts and wording who could write freely with his natural gift and materials collected, whereas the translator was only the "servant" of the original writer who had to follow the original writer in all respects and faithfully reflect the thought and style of the original writer. Otherwise, the translator was no longer a translator but a writer.

The theories of Batteux which stressed on forms and ignored content partial in some aspects, however, its grammatical rules had certain influence not only on France but also on the translation world in other countries of west Europe.

4.1.2.2 John Dryden (1631—1700)

John Dryden was the founder of the English classicalism, a poet laureate and the greatest translator of the 17th century.

Dryden's contribution to translation surpassed his predecessors and contemporaries. He possessed a large quantity of translation works and systematic theories as well. His main translations included *Parallel Lives of Illustrious Greeks and Romans* (《名人传》), *Fables Ancient and Modern* (《今古寓言集》), Homers epic *Iliad* (《伊利亚特》), and *De Arte Graphica* (《绘画艺术》) and so on. He also issued monographs on translation theory in his *Essays of John Dryden* (《德莱顿文集》). Dryden was an outstanding master of language, who was good at converting the ancient prose into idiomatic English. His translation style altered according to the original writing he translated, using plain and fluent language. He played a significant role in the literary and translation world of the 17the century.

Dryden was an extraordinary translation theorist who had given earnest study of translation theories and wrote a lot of essays and prefaces on translation. In these essays and prefaces, he elaborated his views on translation profoundly and comprehensively and proposed the translation principles in an explicit and systematic way. All of these were included in his famous *Essays of John Dryden* which was published in 1900. In the book, he proposed his translation principles from the following aspects:

1) Translation was an art. The translator must possess the artistic disposition of acute artistic percipient and rich expressive force to grasp and reproduce the artistic feature of the original works. Translation could be compared to painting; there existed two kinds of similarity. One was esthetical resemblance, the other

was miscreated resemblance. An excellent translator must be good at the art of poetizing and rhyming to make the original piece attractive in the precondition of keeping the characteristics of the original writers and without distortion, which was the so-called esthetical resemblance. Dryden explicitly pointed out that translation was an art and elaborated on it. He was the first one to do this in English translation history.

2) The translator must take the target reader into consideration. In the translation of dialect, the criteria should be whether the reader could accept or understand. Borrowing of foreign words was permitted, but should be careful and limited.

3) The translator must submit to the original writing. The translator could have some freedom in the wording, but was strictly restricted in meaning. Dryden compared the translator as a slave, who could only work in the garden of the landlord, doing top dressing and training work, while the wine brewed belonged to the landlord.

4) Translation could be roughly divided into three categories which were metaphrase (逐字译), paraphrase (意译) and imitation (拟作). He thought that metaphrase emphasized the correspondence of words and was restricted by the rhyme of the original works, which made the translator a slave of rhyme. In translation, it was impossible for the translator to take care of every word and at the same time make good translations, which was like dancing with shackles on a rope; the dancer could be very careful not to

fall off the rope, but you could not expect him to be graceful in every move. On the other hand, Dryden didn't approve of going to another extreme of translation with imitation. He thought that in a certain sense, imitation was not translation but creation. Thus, Dryden thought metaphrase and imitation were two extremes of translation and should be avoided. He made a compromise between them and advocated paraphrase. According to Dryden, emphasis was laid on the meaning instead of form in paraphrase. The translation could not be freewheeling. He could not be formalistic, either. This trichotomy of translation broke through the restriction of the traditional dichotomy, which was metaphrase and paraphrase. This was a great progress in the western history of translation and brought about great inspirations to the translation study in Britain in the 18th, 19th and even the 20th century.

4.1.2.3. Alexander Fraser Tytler (1747—1814)

Alexander Fraser Tytler was an expert translator, translation theorist and professor of Edinburgh University. His translation theory and thought could be seen in his famous *Essay on the Principle of Translation*. This book was the first monograph on translation theory in the west. In this book, Tytler advocated "the three principles of translation" and elaborated them with plenty of examples. At first, he described what "a good translation" was to be:

"That, in which the merit of the original wok is so completely transfused into another language, s to be as distinctly apprehended, and as

strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work."

And based on this description, he deduced three laws to follow in translation:

I. That the translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.

II. That the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.

III. That the translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

At first, Tytler thought that to give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work, the translator must master the source language and be quite familiar with the material to be translated. In the course of translation, the translator had the freedom to add and subtract; however, what to be added must be absolutely necessary to the original idea and even something that could strengthen the original idea, while what to be subtracted must be those unwanted things or things that injured the original idea.

According to the second law, the translator should be capable of perceiving the style and the manner of the original and imagine how would the original writer express himself in the target language. Therefore, the translator could make his translation comply to the original style and manner. If the translator lacked this ability and could not reproduce the style and manner, even if he knew well the meaning of the original, he could only produce a translation that distorted the image of the original.

The third law that must be followed by the translator was the hardest one in translation work. Tytler compared the translator to a painter. They all

did imitation work. However, the translator could not copy the technique of writing and use the same color as the painter did. He must use his own technique to reproduce the soul of the original in another language, that is, he must speak with his own speech organs in the original writer's soul.

After proposing the three laws of translation, Tytler went on to explain their comparative importance. He pointed out that if the translation was faithful to the original idea, it usually deviated from the style of the original. But whatever the cases were, there shouldn't be deviation from the original idea because of the style. Neither should there be sacrifices of the original idea and style because of the ease of the writing.

Besides the three principles of translation, Tytler also advocated that poem could only translated in the forms of poems; the translation of idiomatic expressions could not adopt metaphrase; the only way out was to translate them into plain and easy to understand languages, and in a sense, idiomatic expressions was not translatable. He specially discussed about the criteria for a good translator. A good translator must enable the reader to appreciate the merit of the original writing, and get "the same strong feelings".

In a word, Tytler's translation theories were comparatively comprehensive and systematic. His three principles of translation became tenet to follow for later translators and had a great impact on the 19th and 20th translation theories. They were not only landmarks of the British history of translation but also the whole western history of translation.

4.1.2.4. The Dispute Between Francis W. Newman (1805—1897) and Matthew Arnold (1822—1888)

In the last half century of the 19th century, there appeared a famous dispute on the translation of Homer's epics in the circle of literature and arts. This dispute had two distinctive features: one was that it evolved between two scholars; they mutually expressed severe criticism and disproval towards each other which happened for the first time in translation history. The other was that the dispute not only involved the translation of Homer's epics but also clarified many common principles in translations; it also raised two entirely different viewpoints and influenced the translation study of the 20th century. In the 1850's, the Latin professor of London University Francis Newman translated and published *Iliad*. In 1861, poet and critic Mathew Arnold wrote a lengthy article *On Translating Homer* to criticize Newman's translation. Newman belittled him by writing back a long essay named *Homeric Translation in Theory and Practice: A Reply to Matthew Arnold*. Arnold didn't give in either and published another essay *Last Words on Translating Homer: A Reply to Francis W. Newman* to further criticize Newman.

The two articles of Arnold both bore much weight. The problem discussed were not only limited to the translation of Homer but also the art of translating poems and in many aspects his elaboration on translating poems was much explicit than Dryden. Arnold mainly proposed his views around the following six aspects:

1) In translating Homer, one must fully understand Homer's characteristics. He criticized that Newman's understanding to Homer's style was mostly wrong. Arnold pointed out that Homer possessed four characteristics. They are brisk style, plain

languages, simple ideas and lofty manners. If these four characteristics were grasped, one could accurately understand and reproduce Homer.

2)   The basic features of Homer should be kept. To achieve this, Arnold thought that a translator must sacrifice the literal faithfulness to the original work and shouldn't metaphrase Homer.

3)   When translating poems, the translator must have the insight of a poet. If the translator didn't possess this quality, he may copy the original without thinking and finally destroyed the meaning by words.

4)   Poems must be translated like poems. He thought that Newman's translation was not like Homer's original work, and should be translated again.

5)   The translation must have the same appealing power as the original work. The duty of the translator was to reproduce the appealing power of the original to provide the reader with the same feeling as the reader of the original when reading the original work.

6)   The one who tested whether the translation had the same appealing power as the original was not the readers but the scholars. The translator must satisfy the higher-leveled readers, that is, the scholars. To make them have almost the same feelings to the translation as to the original was the only way to prove whether the translation was accurate or not.

Towards this Newman strongly retorted. His main points were:

1) Since Homer was the ancient, the translation must reproduce his image as an ancient. In translation, ancient wording should be employed to translate ancient works. Maintaining all the features of the original work was being faithful.

2) The criteria for a translation was mainly the readers and not the scholars. Importance should be attached to the response of the readers not the scholars.

3) Translation was a kind of compromise. The more outstanding the original was, the more incomparable the translation was. Therefore, the criteria for translators should not be what kind of translators were the perfect ones but who were those with the fewest defects. The fairest way to test a translation was to compare different versions of translation in possible cases and see which version was better.

The dispute between Arnold and Newman was not centering on generic translation technique and linguistic knowledge. Their main difference lay in their own translation principles, approaches and standpoint. Thus, it was fair to say there was no relative superiority or inferiority of their respective theories. However, their dispute played an active role in animating academic atmosphere and promoting the study of translation theories from a multi-angled point of view.

4.1.2.5. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768—1834)

Friedrich Schleiermacher was a German philosopher, thologist and classical linguist. He was good at Greek and Latin and translated works of

Plato in 1796. On June 24th, 1813, he read a thirty pages long essay *Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersezens* (《论翻译的方法》) at the academic forum of Berlin Royal Academy, which elaborated on the principles and approach of translation and influenced the translation theory circle of Germany. The essay mainly have the following aspects:

1) Translation was divided into written translation and oral interpretation. Schleiermacher was the first one in western translation to divide translation and expound on it. He pointed out that interpreters mainly engaged in commercial translation, while written translators in scientific and artistic translation. The written form of language was suitable for recording of science and arts because only written language could preserve them. The oral interpretation was a kind of mechanical work, while written translation was creative work.

2) Translation was divided into real translation and mechanical translation, which was closely related to the first point. The former was written translation of literature and arts and natural science, which needed the independent thinking and creation of the translator and required strong comprehensive and expressive capability, while the latter was oral interpretation that dealt with commerce and business that anyone who could grasp two languages would be competent for. It didn't require high quality because what was involved was something concrete and with explicit definition.

3) In translation, one must correctly understood the dialectical

relationship between language and thought. On the one hand, everyone was restricted by the language he used; on the other hand, everyone who had free thought and independent intelligence could create language.

4) There were only two approaches of translation. "Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or the leaves the reader the reader in peace, as much as possible, and move the author towards him." In the first case, the aim was to move the reader towards the author and what the translator needed to do was to fill in the language blank of the reader, that was, metaphrase was adopted to let the reader try to understand the original work; in the second case, the aim was to let the author speak in the voice of the target language and communicate directly with the reader; paraphrase was adopted and it was easy for the reader to understand the original work.

Although Schleiermacher was the first theorist to distinguish written translation and oral interpretation, his viewpoint towards oral interpretation was wrong. Nevertheless, his theories brought great impact in the19th century, and even is of great significance at the present time.

4.1.2.6. Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767—1853)

Wilhelm von Humboldt was a German linguist, philosopher, education reformer and translation theorist. He translated *Agamemmon* (《阿伽门农》) and other Greek dramas but he made the greatest contribution to translation theory. He issued two important monographs on translation research: *Uber das vergleichende*

Sprachenstudium in Beziehung auf die verschieden Epochen der Sprachentwicklung (《按语言发展的不同时期论语言的比较研究》) and *Uber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einflub auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts* (《论人类语言结构的差异及其对于人类精神发展的影响》). In these works, Humboldt gave a profound elaboration of the linguistic problems with a new perspective. His contributions to translation theories were mainly embodied in these linguistic views. They were:

1)   Language determined thought and culture. The distinction of languages was not the distinction of sounds and symbols but the distinction of world views. Language could be said to be the outer covering of spirits of various peoples. The language of every people was their spirit; and their spirit was their language. In one word, human thoughts depended on their languages.

2)   The gap between languages was so big that they were intranslatable. Humboldt proposed that every language involved a certain world view related to it. Since the world views differed in thousands of ways, there lay essential differences between languages. These differences dominated the translatability and intranslatability of translation. Since there was no commonness between languages, whatever measures the translator took, the translation would be different to the original. This view was separated with the traditional views.

3)   The relationship between translatability and in translatability was dialectical. Because of the differences between languages, the translator was in a dilemma. He either got to close to the original and lost the charm of his native language, or stuck to his native language and sacrificed the

style of the original. However, there was nothing that could not be expressed by language. Every language owned a key to the understanding of other languages.

The biggest contribution of Humboldt was that he proposed a dialectical view of language. This view caused a big sensation in the 20th century. In the linguistic world, there appeared in sequence dichotomy linguistic views of modern linguists such as de Saussure (索绪尔), Walter Porzig (帕尔西格), Alan Gardiner (加丁纳) and Noam Chomsky (乔姆斯基). In the translation circle, the translatability and in translatability of languages once again became the heated topic of discussion by translation theorists.

4.1.2.7. A. Pushkin (1799—1832) and V. G. Belinsky (1811—1848)

A. Pushkin was the greatest poet of the people in Russia an the distinctive representative of Russian literary world. As a translator, he translated a lot of poems of ancient Rome and Greek, France and Italy. His translations had high artistic value and his incisive sight in translation greatly promoted the development of the translation career in Russia. His contribution to translation was of epoch-making significance in Russian history of translation. His views towards translation could be summed up as follows:

1) Translator must have his own decision in the choosing of his materials and mustn't be dominated by others.

2) When dealing with the original work, the translator should enjoy sufficient freedom. In general, Pushkin belonged to the free translation school. He particularly objected to the literal translation that simply pursued apparent accuracy and ignored the artistic quality of the translation. He thought that word for word translation could never be faithful. Every language had its own diction, fixed vocabulary in rhetoric

and fixed expressions which had no match when translated into another language.

3) The translator must try to keep the unique features of the original as much as possible. Pushkin thought that when translating great poets, a translator shouldn't totally reject their respective stylistic features, local features and historical features; instead, he should convey those features accurately. The conveying could either be keeping the particular form of the original paying special attention to the original linguistic features. His language norm was that the wording must be clear, accurate, simple and natural.

Belinsky was the greatest literary critics his views towards translation theories were mainly published in his critical articles on translation works. His views were as follows:

1) Either the original work or the translated work must have substantial content. Belinsky thought that the first task for a translator to do was to choose the works with substantial content to translate, such as excellent classical works.

2) Being faithful to the original lay in being faithful to the original spirit, not the literal form. Just as Pushkin, he objected to literal translation too. He thought that, word for word translation appeared to be faithful and accurate, but actually, it was far different from the original and was the most unfaithful and inaccurate translation. However, the translator shouldn't develop his translation at will. He emphasized that an ideal translation should be like: no arbitrary omissions and reversions of the original, keeping the original features as much as possible and even its defects, replacing the original work to enable the reader to understand the foreign works without any discrepancy and make accurate appreciation and

commentary.

3)   The translator had to be an artist himself when translating works of art.

4.2.   Translation Principles of the West in the Contemporary Times

4.2.1.   A Brief introduction of Translation Practices During this period

The 20th century was considered "the translation age". During this period, the translation activity and the study of translation theory underwent unparalleled change. Peter Newmark has summed up the enormous change in translation field as follows:

1)   The translation in the 20th century has the characteristics of being faithful to the reader and the communicative environment and emphasizing the naturalness and fluency of comprehension.

2)   The range of translation has been expanded from the works of religion, literature and science to almost every subject including technology, trade, current affairs and advertising.

3)   Text forms increased ranging from books (including dramas and poems) to articles, essays, contract, treaty, laws and decrees, notice, advertisement, report, prescription, document, letters and so on.

4)   The standardization of terminology.

5)   The foundation of translation organizations.

6)   Subject such as linguistics, social linguistics, together with translation theories actively promoted translation activity.

7)   Translation became a tool to pass on knowledge, deepen the understanding of various peoples and social groups and transmit cultures.

In order to adapt to the new situation of translation activity, the teaching of translation around the world flourished; translation association, organization and publications emerged by large quantity; special schools for the training of translation talents appeared. Along with the emergence of machine translation, new subjects for translation theories were discussed. The extent and depth of the study of translation theories was unparalleled.

Translation theories in the 20th century can be generally divided into two stages by the ending of World War II. At the first stage, translation theories in the west centered on the traditional translation approach around the translation of classical literatures with little breakthroughs. Famous translation theorist at this stage included Benedetto Croce （克罗齐, 1866—1952) of Italy, Walter Benjamin (本杰明, 1892—1940) of Germany, J. P. Postgate (波斯盖特) of Britain and K. I. Chukovsky (楚科夫斯基, 1882—1969) of Russia.

The study of translation theories made a qualitative forward leap after World War II. Influential translation theorist emerged one after another and the field of study became broader and broader: the influence and contribution of translation towards the native language, the general character and difference of different languages, the scientific ground of translatability and untranslatability, the objective of translation and the relationship between text type and translation approach all became the center of concern of translation theories. Along with the mutual transfusion of related subjects, psychology, apart from linguistics, literature and aesthetics, sociology, intercultural communication, information theory, machine translation and human and machine interlocution became new angle of view for the study and

exploration of translation by translation theorist. Translation schools and thoughts rose one after another, which brought the last half of the 20th century into a situation of unparalleled development of translation theories, emergence of various thoughts and schools one after another. There are basically five schools of translation theories in the West. They are the Prague School, the London School, American Structuralism School, Communicative Theory School and Russian Literary School and Linguistic School of Translation Theory.

4.2.2. Translation Principles Before World War II

At the traditional stage, the study of translation theories including the range of study, the issues concerned and the approach taken was basically same as the situation in the previous period. The only difference was that people involved in and enthusiastic in the discussion about translation theories increased in number. The center of discussion was still concentrated on the issue of recreation, effect, faithfulness and wording of literary translation, however, in the elaboration of these issues, there contained some correct and penetrating views, which showed that translation theories underwent rapid development.

4.2.2.1 Benedetto Croce (1866—1952)

The Italian esthetician and literary critic Benedetto Croce proposed some incisive views towards translation in his famous *Estetica* (《美学原理》):

1)   The translation can not perfectly reproduce the original. Every speech act was unprecedent and innovative, that is, there seldom are sentences that can be repeated. The object of translation was to resolve the contradiction of no repetition of

speech, which was dominated by the internal rules of language and can not reach perfection.

2)   Literary translation was the reproduction of literatures. The translation can't be equivalent as the original and must bear the style of the translator. An ideal translation should be like this: after reading the original, the translator should put it back into the furnace, that is, his own thoughts, and melt it with his own thoughts, and then created a new form of expression.

3)   Literary translation and specialized translation has substantial distinctions. The former should be close to the original instead of being too free and the latter should be fluent and natural instead of being too restricted.

Croce discussed translation from aesthetic point of view, which substantially inherited and developed Dantin's theory of "literature was untranslatable". Because of Croce's important status in aesthetics, philosophy and literature, his views on translation enjoyed special value and deeply influenced the trend of development of translation theory at the beginning of the 20th century.

4.2.2.2. Walter Benjamin (1892—1940)

Walter Benjamin was the most influential writer, literary critic and philosophy of the first half of 20th century in Germany. His translation views were mainly disposed in a essay published in 1932 *Die Aufgabe des Ubersetzens* (《翻译的课题》). His views were innovative and unique, and bore distinctive genostic ("灵知")or mysticism color, which could be classified into three points:

1) The translatability and untranslatability of the original depended on whether the original was deserved to be translated. For a certain work, although people could not translate it, it could not be asserted that it was untranslatable. The question must be asked was whether this work need translation or if there was something substantial that deserved translation in this work.

2) Translation was not the translation of meaning but of forms. Translation should not be based on the original meaning, but should reproduce the forms of meaning in details. A translator only need to deal with the original writer and needn't worry about the readers' special requirement. The translation and the original work should exist in a continuum rather than being two independent bodies. In another word, the translation should be transparent, which wouldn't conceal the original and block its glory, but instead, it should make the original more glorious by strengthen the approach of translation.

3) The ideal way of translation should be the literal translation. This viewpoint was closely related with the previous one. The reproduce the original form, literal translation must be adopted. Below the surface of two languages, the translator could pry into something mutual, that is pure language.

The viewpoints of Benjamin mentioned above reflected his idealistic linguistic view. He mixed his mystic intuitionism, aesthetic and philosophic views with translation theories, and therefore brought about the theory of untranslatability and mysticism in translation study, which was contrary to

the development of contemporary translation theories. However, Benjamin's theory represented a branch of translation study. Its historic and practical significance was worthy of exploration from various aspects.

4.2.2.3. J. P. Postgate

J. P. Postgate was a famous British translation theorist. He mastered many kinds of languages including Greek, Latin , French and German and had practical translation experience of fifty years. Postgate was not only a litterateur and translator, but also a literary critic and translation theorist. In 1922, his published a monograph *Translation and Translations* (《译论与译文》) which reflected his translation views and approach concentratively:

1) Translation could be divided into retrospective translation ("后观式翻译") and prospective translation ("前观式翻译"). The respect of prospective translation was the translation and the target reader. Its objective was to enable the reader to understand the meaning of the translation without any difficulty. The focus of the translator was how to express himself and the approaches to take was flexible. The respect of retrospective translation was the original writer. Its objective was to faithfully reflect the spirit of the original. The translator needn't be innovative. He only need to be close to the original and needn't consider whether the reader could understand the translation. Classic literatures should adopt retrospective translation

2) The effect of the translation should be judged by experts and scholars. Whether the translation could reproduce the real aspects of the original should be judged by a native expert of

translation who mastered the language of the original instead of ordinary readers. It can be easily detected that this viewpoint of Postgate inherited and developed Arnold's view.

3) Faithfulness the highest criteria to measure a translation. The faithfulness criteria for prospective translation was the reflection of the readers, while that for the retrospective translation was the text style of the original.

4.2.2.4. K. I. Chukovsky (1882—1969)

K. I. Chukovsky was a famous writer, translator and translation theorist in Russia. He translated a lot of works by English and American writers, but what made him well-known in the translation circle was not his translations but his contribution in translation theories. He was the main founder of Russian Literary School. In 1919, he published his monograph of translation theories *Translation Principles on Literary Works* (《文艺作品的翻译原则》). Later, he wrote a book The Art of Translation (《翻译的艺术》), which concentrated his theoretical understanding about literary translation and was his major works on translation. In this book, Chukovsky cited a lot of examples, criticized all kinds of mistaken translation principles, proposed a lot of thought-provoking issues and laid emphasis on his thought that translation was an art. His main points were:

1) Translation was a lofty art. Chukovsky compared translation as performing art and thought that both were creative works based on certain original manuscript. The achievement of a performer didn't lie in separating himself from the will of the playwright, but completely permeating his will and perform within the range

of the content of the play. Similarly, a translators achievement lay in completely permeating the will of the original writer. Moreover, when the actor performed, he must choose a role that match his own character; in translation, the translator must choose an original writer that matched his own character and choose the works to be translated according to his own character. Only when the translator had the same disposition with the writer of the original works can a satisfactory translation be produced.

2) The success or failure of a translation couldn't be measured by occasional mistakes. The central task of translation was to reproduce the thought, features, literary skills and writing styles, namely, the artistic individuality constructed by the whole style of writing. If this could not be achieved, the translation was by no means an excellent translation. On the contrary, if this could be achieved, even though there were mistakes, it could still be called a valuable translation.

3) Understanding the original text from the original standpoint was an important condition for accurate translation. Although it was difficult for a translator not to reflect a bit of his own worldview and artistic view in translation, a translator must learn to restrain his own mood, habit and views and objectively analyze the special features in thought and style of the original work, so that he could reveal the self-portrait of the original writer rather than forced him with the mask made by the translator himself.

4) A translator must grasp a large vocabulary. A fatal weakness of the translator was lack of vocabulary. Because of this, his translation was dull and lifeless. To overcome this, a translator must read widely to enlarge his vocabulary.

Chukovsky was the Russian litterateur who study translation theories at an earlier time and wrote the most. Therefore, he was the most influential ones in the translation circles of Russia before World War II.

4.2.3 Translation Principles After World War II

4.2.3.1. The Prague School and Roman Jakobson (雅可布逊, 1896—1982)

The founders of the Prague School were Vilem Mathesius (马西休斯, 1882—1946) and two Russian immigrants Nikolay S. Trubetskoy (特鲁贝茨考伊, 1896—1982) and Roman Jakobson. Later, the Prague School became a broad name and referred to those scholars who agree with the viewpoint of Trubetskoy and Jakobson, including scholars of the other western countries such as French and Germany.

The primary members of the Prague School like Jakobson, Jiri Levy (列维), George Mounin(穆南) and Alfred Malblanc (马尔勃兰克) were all important translation theorist. The primary argument of this school were:

1) The various functions of language must be taken into consideration in translation such as cognitive function, expressive function, and so on.

2) Emphasis must be laid upon the comparison of languages in translation such as comparison in semantics, grammar, sound and linguistic styles.

The most influential translation theorist of the Prague School was Roman Jakobson whose main contribution to translation theories was

90

presented in his article *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (《论翻译的语言学问题》), which gave incisive exposition of the relationship between language and translation, the importance of translation and ubiquitous problems from the linguistic point of view. Since its publishing in 1959, it has been recognized as one of the classical works of translation studies.

The exposition of Jakobson on translation theories could be classified into five points:

1)   Translation could be classified into three categories: intralingual translation (语内翻译), interlingual translation (语际翻译) and intersemiotic translation (符际翻译). "Intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems." These three types of translation existed very early, but it was Jakobson who sum them up to a high degree.

2)   The understanding of word meaning was decided by translation. The objective of Jakobson in generalizing translation into three categories was to illustrate that translation played a crucial role in the learning and understanding of languages. He thought that people's understanding to word meaning or to the whole language was not determined by their life experiences or knowledge of the world, but at first language itself and the

translation of language.

3)   Accurate translation was determined by message equivalence. "The intralingual translation of a word uses either another synonymous word or resorts to a circumlocution. Yet, synonymy, as a rule, is not complete equivalence....Likewise, on the level of iterlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, while messages may serve as adequate interpretations alien code-units or messages. Most frequently, however, translation from one language into another substitutes messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language. ...Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes."

4)   All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language.

5)   The category as grammar was the most complicated one in translation.

4.2.3.2. London School and John Catford (约翰 · 卡特福德)

London School was a linguistic school that possesses British characteristics. Its central concept was that the meaning of languages was determined by the social context of situation. When this was reflected into the translation field, it became the main property of the British school. That is to say, whether the choosing of words in the translation was same to the original was determined by the fact that whether they were used in the same social context of situation.

John Catford was a linguist and translation theorist. In 1965, he published a book named *A Linguistic Theory of Translation—A Essay in*

Applied Linguistics (《翻译的语言学理论》), which was a work to exploit new approaches in the study of translation theories and got enormous echoes in the linguistic field and translation theories field in the West.

Catford pointed out that his theory was called "descriptive" translation theory. He elaborated on "what is translation" from the nature, types, equivalence, restriction of translation.

1) The nature of translation. According to Catford, translation was "the replacement of textual material in one language (source language) by equivalent textual material in another language (target language)." The term "equivalent" is clearly a key term, because the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalent. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence.

2) The types or categories of translation. In terms of extent, it could be divided into full and partial translation; in terms of levels of language involved in translation, it could be divided into total and restricted translation; in terms of ranks, it could be divided into rank-bound and unbounded translation.

3) Translation equivalence. This was the center of study and must be illustrated in two aspects: on the one side, translation equivalence was based on experience and

was found out by comparing two languages. On the other side, the appearance of equivalence was determined by the fact that if there were same or partially same substantial features between the translation and the original. Two concepts must be distinguished to illustrate the above—textual equivalence and formal correspondence.

4)   Translation shifts. Translation shifts naturally occurred in translation, which referred to the depatures from formal correspondence in the process of translation. It had two major types: level shifts and category shifts

5)   The limits of translatability. There were two types of untranslatability in translation: one was linguistic untranslatability which occurred typically in cases where and ambiguity arose; the other was cultural untranslatability which occurred because of non-linguistic factors such as different social customs and different period of time.

4.2.3.3. American Structuralism School

In a certain sense, the modern linguistic study in America was on the front in the West. Based on the linguistic theories of American Structuralism Linguistic School, many tried to advocate new translation concepts and study approach. These could be called by a general name which was the American Structuralism School of translation theories. The most famous of them included C. F. Voegelin (沃吉林, 1906—   ), Dwight Bolinger (博林杰) and

W. V. Quine (奎恩)

C. F. Voegelin was a human linguist. He published a series of essays, including two pieces on translation issues: *Multiple Stage Translation* (《多步式翻译》) and *Anthropological Linguistics and Translation* (《人类语言学和翻译》) in 1967.

Voegelin's greatest contribution lay in his proposal of a kind of multi-stepped translation approach. He thought that translation should take five steps as follows:

1) Word for word translation;

2) Arrange the literal translation into sentences conforming to the criterion of the target language;

3) Cut off linguistic elements that were unwanted and unmatched to other words in the sentences;

4) Add linguistic elements that didn't exist in the original text but were needed by the translation;

5) Make further linguistic processing to make the translation fluent and acceptable by the readers.

Voegelin called this "forward translation" to distinguish it from "back-checking translation"

The other theorists also elaborated on translation issues from different point of views. Bolinger proposed a structural translation concept corresponding to words translation in his essay *Transformulation: Structural Translation* (《论结构翻译》). Quine elaborated on some basic problems in translation in his *Meaning and Translation* (《语义与翻译》) and *Word and Object* (《词与物体》)

It must be pointed out that the theories of the above persons were abstract and theoretical, but they were of little instructive significance to practical translation.

4.2.3.4. Communicative Theory School and Eugene A. Nida (尤金·奈达, 1914—)

One biggest progress in the translation study of the 20th century was the application of linguistic communication concept into translation theories. Not only did advertising agents, politicians and businessmen attached importance to the intelligibility of language, scholars, writers, editors and translators also recognized that information was valueless if it couldn't play the part of communication. Therefore, in translation field, various names and views such as "communicative translation", "functional translation", "equivalent reaction theory", "equivalent effect theory" and "equivalent function theory" sprang up like mushrooms and emerged one after another. In a sense, this situation just proved that the communicative theory was distinctive.

The typical representative of communicative translation was Eugene A. Nida. Nida has been engaged in the translation work of the Bible over a long period of time. Since 1945 to 1986, he had published 200 articles and 30 works of which 16 monograph on translation and linguistics. Two most important works on translation theories were: *Toward a Science of Translating* (《翻译科学探索》) and *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (《翻译理论与实践》), published in 1964 and 1969 respectively.

The translation theories of Nida could be summed up in the following six aspects:

1) Theories and principles. Just like Jacobson, Nida emphasized the general character of languages. He thought that all languages

96

in the world had the same expressive force, which enabled the native people speaking the language to express their thoughts, describe the world and conduct social communications. Nida also thought that the primary task of translation was to be clear about the translation. That is to say, the style or manner of translating should be natural and fluent, so that the target reader could understand without knowledge about the cultural background of the source language. This required that in translation as less as possible borrowed words should be used and expressions belonging to the target language should be used as much as possible.

2) The nature of translation. According to Nida, "Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style." There were three key points: one was being "natural", that is, the translation should avoid "translationese"—formal fidelity, with resulting unfaithfulness to the content and the impact of message. The second was "closest", that is, choosing the closest in meaning to the original translation. The third was "equivalent", which is the core. There was no absolute "equivalent", but the translator should try his best to find "the closest natural equivalent". Therefore, the translation must reach four criteria: the first was conveying the meaning; the second was reproducing the styles; the third was being natural and fluent in diction; the fourth was

similar reactions of the readers. It was clear that to achieve these, some contradictions between the content and the form may occur. Sometimes, the form had to make place for content; or visa versa. Generally, in order to keep the original content, the form must be changed.

3) The functions of translation. Nida thought that translation must take the reader as the central object. The translation must be judged in terms of the way people respond to it. If the receptors of the message in the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language, the translation could be regarded as successful. The communicative functions of languages were versatile, mainly: expressive function, cognitive function, interpersonal function, informative function, imperative function, performative function, emotive function, aesthetic function or poetic function. Nida pointed out that in practical use, these functions always occurred simultaneously.

4) Correct translation. Whether the translation was correct depended on to what degree the reader could understand the translation correctly. The task of the translator was not only to enable the readers to understand the translation, but to ensure that no misunderstanding should arise. Fromm this point, "correct" understanding was more than one kind.

5) Semantic analysis. A important process of translation was to give semantic analysis of the original text. There were three

types of meanings: grammatical meaning, reference meaning and connotative meaning. Generally speaking, phrases and sentences of the same structure might have same or similar grammatical meaning, but not all those that with same grammatical structures had same grammatical meaning. Although grammatical meaning was important, compared with reference meaning and connotative meaning, the latter was still the key of semantic analysis

6) Translation procedures and approaches. The most effective and scientific translation approach was to adopt a three-stage transformation: a. find out a simplest and clearest in meaning core sentence in structure from one original sentence; b. translate the core sentence from the original language; c. produce the superficial sentence of the target language according to the translated core sentence. The whole translation procedure was divided into four steps: a. analysis b. interpretation c. reorganizing d. testing. Actually, Nida's theories was developed around these four steps.

In the 1980s, the translation theories of Nida began to take big changes. He raised a lot of new points in his works, which were:

1) Translation was not a science but a technology. It was related to such subjects such as literature, linguistics, sociology, psychology and philosophy, but couldn't be studied as an independent subject like mathematics, physics and chemistry.

2) Translation was inherent.

3) Translation was not only a kind of linguistic communication, but also a sociosemiotic interaction. In translation, the meaning of languages must be put into a sociosemiotic frame to be considered. Nida stressed that specific sociosemiotic signs was meaningful only in specific social context; whether the meaning could be correctly conveyed depended on whether the functions of languages were equivalent, which was the key to follow by a translator. Therefore, Nida claimed that the theory he proposed at present was a sociosemiotic theory of translation, which was more scientific than the previous communicative translation theory.

4.2.3.5. Russian Literary School and Linguistic School of Translation Theories

After World War II, the translation field of Russia was particularly active. The literary school of translation theories formed at the beginning of its foundation made greater development. At the same time, pushed by modern linguistics, the linguistic school of translation theories grew rapidly. With the passage of time, the linguistic school took distinctive advantages, however, the literary school still kept strong lineup in translation study. Thus, the two schools unwind heated debate. This debate formed up the most distinguished features of the study of translation theories in contemporary times.

In general, the debate was triggered by 费道罗夫. In 1953, 费道罗夫 published *Outline of Translation Theories* (《翻译理论概要》) and was the first one to systematically explore translation theory from linguistic point of view. He pointed out that translation theory was a branch of linguistics and the issue of translation could only be solved inside language. In 1954, 安托

科尔斯基 and some others protested that 费道罗夫's works didn't mention the aesthetic problems in literary translation, which was the core of literary translation theories. They thought that translation was an art, therefore, it should be studied from literary point of view rather than linguistic point of view.

Those belonging to the literary school were mostly writers and translators, and those belonging to the linguistic school were mostly linguistics and teachers of translation. The basic viewpoints of the literary school were: literary translation was a form of literary creation and belonged to aesthetic domain. Its task was to look for the artistic correspondence rather than linguistic correspondence. The unit of translation was impression, emotion and images; and the objective was to reproduce the artistic reality of the original from the whole. The basic points of the linguistic school were: translation was a speech act, which depended on the comparative study of two languages. Its task was to look for the correspondence in languages. The unit of translation was sentences, paragraphs and discourse; and the objective was to reproduce the linguistic function of the original from the whole.

The most distinguished representative of Russian translation theory field was 费道罗夫 who belonged to the linguistic school. He was a scholar who was engaged in the study of literature, linguistics and translation theories for a long time. In 1953, he published *Outline of Translation Theories,* which was an epoch-making monograph on translation theories. It marked a breakthrough in Russian study of translation theories. One important feature of the work was that the writer was guided by Marxism-Leninism from the beginning to the end while exploring the issues of translation. Its main points

could be summed up as follows:

1) The process of translating was the process of using languages. Translation was a language creation activity. The role of language in translation was the role it always played in social life. The process of translating could not be separated from the expression of language. In translation, a translator must at first understand the language of the original, and then try to find out proper expressive form of language in the target language. Therefore, in translation, the issue of language should be put at the most importance place.

2) Translation theories belonged to the range of linguistic study. Language was the basis of translation, without it, all the functions of translation including its social-political function, cultural-knowledge function and aesthetic-artistic function could not be realized. Only by adopting the linguistic study approach could the rules and natures of translation be disclosed scientifically.

3) Translation theories were made up of three parts. They were translation history, translation theory general and translation theory specific. 费道罗夫 pointed out that any subject was not tenable if not using past experiences. Translation theories was also like this. We must make use of materials in translation history to sum up all kinds of views about translation issues in history and propose new theoretical views based on this.

4) Translatability was the nature of languages. From the Marxist-Leninist Point view that language was the tool for communication of ideas, he pointed out that the content of ideas and the language forms to express

the ideas were indivisible unity. Every developed language had the ability to convey the thoughts expressed by another language. That was to say, language was translatable. Besides, the principle of translatability was not aimed at individual language phenomenon, but the whole of the original work. So long as the whole was not damaged, the objective of translation was achieved.

Conclusion

In this thesis, the author has made relatively profound research on the principles both in China and in the west and from the ancient times to the contemporary times. Through comparison between the principles of translation and studying the whole development of translation theory, we have deeper and better understanding of the principles of translation than before, and it is not difficult for us to explore and find out some fundamental points and rules keeping surprisingly unchanged. It is no doubt that there still exist the differences of translation principles between the ancient times and the modern times, and between China and the West, but this paper's purpose is to find out some rules and points in common through comparing the differences mentioned above. Besides, the author hopes that the reader of this paper get some elicitation from her research and exploration.

Therefore, it is concluded that the ideal translation will be accurate as to meaning and natural as to the receptor language forms used. An intended audience who is unfamiliar with the source text will readily understand it. The success of a translation is measured by how closely it measures up to the following ideals: 1) Accurate: reproducing as exactly as possible the meaning of the source text.2) Natural: using natural forms of the receptor language in a way that is appropriate to the kind of text being translated.3) Communicative: expressing all aspects of the meaning in a way that is readily understandable to the intended audience.

Translation is a process based on the theory that it is possible to abstract the meaning of a text from its forms and reproduce that meaning with the very different forms of a second language. Translation, then, consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context.

Works Cited

Arnold, M. "On Translating Homer". *The Complete Prose Works of M. A.*. R. H. Super. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1961, 24(6).

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 1980.

Brower, R. A. *On Translation*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth. *Translators Through History*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.

Dil, A. S. *"Introduction." Language Structure and Translation: Essays by Eugene A. Nida*. Standford: Standford University Press, 1991.

Gentzler, Edin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Gile, Danial. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.

Graham, Joseph F. "Theory for Translation." Marilyn Gaddis Rose. Ed. *Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice. Albany*: State University of New York Press, 1981.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language—Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Trans. Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press, 1988.

Hung Eva and Pollard David. "Chinese Tradition" Mona Baker Ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." Reuben A. Brower ed. *On Translation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Kelly, L. G. *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.

Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

Nida, Eugene A. *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

Nida, E. A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Nida, E. A. and J. de Warrd. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1986.

Nida, E. A. *Language, Culture and Translating.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press, 1993.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." *Translating literature: The German Trandition from Luther to Rosenzweig.* Trans. and Eds. Andre Lefevere. Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977, 15(8)

Snell, Mary. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.

Wilss Wolfram. *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

蔡毅 段京华 (编), 《苏联翻译理论》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 1999.

陈福康, 《中国译学理论史稿》, 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.

陈玉刚, 《中国翻译文学史稿》, 北京: 中国对外翻译出版社, 1989.

范仲英, 《实用翻译教程》, 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 1994.

郭建中 (编), 《当代美国翻译理论》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 1999.

郭延礼, 《中国近代翻译文学概论》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 1998.

梁启超, 《饮冰室合集》, 北京: 中华书局, 1932.

廖七一 (编), 《当代英国翻译理论》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 2000.

廖七一 (编), 《当代西方翻译理论探索》, 南京: 译林出版社, 2002.

刘宓庆, 《当代翻译理论》, 北京: 中国对外翻译出版公司, 1999.

吕俊, 候向群 (编), 《英汉翻译教程》, 上海: 上海教育出版社, 2001.

罗新章 (编), 《翻译论集》, 北京: 商务印书馆, 1984.

马祖毅, 《中国翻译简史》, 北京: 中国对外翻译出版公司, 1984.

钱钟书, 《旧文四篇》, 上海: 上海古籍出版社, 1994.

申雨平, 《西方翻译理论精选》, 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 1999.

孙致礼, 《翻译: 理论与实践探索》, 南京: 译林出版社, 1999.

谭载喜, 《西方翻译简史》, 北京: 商务印书馆, 2000.

王克非, 《翻译文化史论》, 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.

谢天振 (编), 《翻译研究新视野》, 青岛: 青岛出版社, 2002

杨自俭, 刘学云 (编), 《翻译新论》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 2003.

叶子南, 《高级英汉翻译理论与实践》, 北京: 清华大学出版社, 2003

周仪 罗平, 《翻译与批评》, 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 1999

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to my supervisor, Professor Du Yaowen, from his invaluable suggestion in the selection of the topic and in the preparation of this thesis. In spite of his being fully occupied, Professor Du devoted all his care to revising and commenting on this thesis. Without his strict guidance, constant encouragement and valuable suggestions, this thesis would never have come to the present stage.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all the teachers in the English Department, especially Professor Hao Mei, Professor Zhao Anyuan, Professor Hou Tao, Professor Guo Aiping and professor Yu Wansuo whose dedicating teaching and instructive lectures have benefited me immensely in the three-year graduate program.

I'm also grateful to all the authors of the books and magazines that I cited in my thesis, whose great works provide me with enlightenment and inspiration in finishing this thesis.

Finally, a very special thank-you goes to my mother, to whom I entrust my child and my husband whose encouragement gives me confidence and strength in finishing my thesis.

Papers Published During the Academic Years of
Post-graduate Study

张菁, 归化翻译与异化翻译在跨文化交际中的作用, 《太原理工大学学报》, 2004, 22(4)

张菁, 谈跨文化交际中的隐私问题, 《山西高等学校社会科学学报》, 2004, 16

杜耀文 张菁, 五台山佛教文化翻译规范化研究, 《太原理工大学学报》, 2005, 23(1)