

 中国书籍文库 | 汇集优秀原创学术论著  
China Books Library | 推动科研成果转化交流

# 文化观与翻译观

——鲁迅、林语堂文化翻译对比研究

Cultural Perspective and Philosophy of Translation:  
A Contrastive Study of Cultural Translation of Lu Xun and Lin Yutang

陶丽霞 著

 中国书籍出版社  
China Book Press

中国书籍文库 | 汇集优秀原创学术论著  
China Books Library | 推动科研成果转化交流

# 文化观与翻译观

——鲁迅、林语堂文化翻译对比研究

Cultural Perspective and Philosophy of Translation:  
A Contrastive Study of Cultural Translation of Lu Xun and Lin Yutang

陶丽霞 著



**图书在版编目(CIP)数据**

文化观与翻译观:鲁迅、林语堂文化翻译对比研究/陶丽霞著.

北京:中国书籍出版社,2012.9

ISBN 978-7-5068-3067-6

I. ①文… II. ①陶… III. ①鲁迅(1881~1936)—翻译理论—研究 ②林语堂(1895~1976)—翻译理论—研究 IV. ①I210.93  
②H059

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2012)第 203048 号

责任编辑/李立云

责任印制/孙马飞 张智勇

封面设计/中联学林

出版发行/中国书籍出版社

地 址:北京市丰台区三路居路 97 号(邮编:100073)

电 话:(010)52257143(总编室) (010)52257153(发行部)

电子邮箱:chinabp@vip.sina.com

经 销/全国新华书店

印 刷/三河市华东印刷有限公司

开 本/710 毫米×1000 毫米 1/16

印 张/13.5

字 数/243 千字

版 次/2013 年 1 月第 1 版 2013 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书 号/ISBN 978-7-5068-3067-6

定 价/39.00 元

版权所有 翻印必究

## 自序

本书原本是我的博士论文，写于2006年，此次出版，只在局部和文字上作了技术性的修改和加工。我想把这本书当作自己迄今为止对文化翻译的学习和研究的一次阶段性总结。同时，这本书也记录了自己在翻译研究与实践之路上长期的艰难跋涉和用心探索。

在中国现代翻译史上，鲁迅和林语堂都是理论探索和翻译实践成就卓著的大师级人物。不仅如此，鲁迅是中国现代文学的奠基人，以改造国民性为宗旨的伟大的启蒙思想家，林语堂则对中西文化交流，特别是向世界传播中国优秀传统文化，做出了巨大的贡献。出于个性，我一向敬重鲁迅，而更喜欢林语堂，书中自然融进了自己对林语堂大师的仰慕之情和追寻之心。林语堂是我的人生导航者。他的人生理念和快乐哲学，一直是我的生命坐标。因此，能在本书中与他的翻译理论和翻译作品相遇和相知，让我倍感亲切。作为一位矢志于翻译理论研究与翻译实践教学的专业教师，驻足于“文化观与翻译观”之下的“鲁迅、林语堂文化翻译对比研究”，旨在有效地提升自己的学术水准和强化自己的研究能力。而且，在理论与实践的层面上将鲁迅与林语堂的文化翻译进行一次较为深入的探究和对比，也是自己多年以来的心愿。虽然，由于自己在文化翻译研究之深度与广度上的种种局限，尚未能以一种完全和完善的方式将其展现出来。但令我欣慰的是，借助这本小书的游历和穿越，这个

心愿可以说是得以实现了，并希望能与同行朋友们分享。

本书的主要不足之处，在于主题探讨和对比研究的广度和深度十分不够，突出表现在对鲁迅和林语堂的论述不平衡。显而易见的是，关于林语堂的材料较为全面翔实，且笔锋常带感情，而关于鲁迅的翻译作品偏重于早期，语言也颇嫌平稳。由于资料的欠缺和时间的仓促，尤其是由于自身知识和水平的局限性，这些不足已经存在，并不得不呈现于读到这本书的您的面前，更不能不诚心诚意地期待您的批评和指正了。自知本书存有诸多不尽人意之处，因此无法给自己轻松的感觉。在严格意义上讲，本书并没有完成，我还将继续修改它、完善它；在对林语堂和鲁迅的文化翻译的对比研究上，我还将继续走下去。

在本书付梓之际，我要由衷地感谢我的两位导师——四川外语学院的廖七一教授和上海外国语大学的冯庆华教授，是他们的专业指导与悉心提携，才使本书得以成型。我还要对广东肇庆学院文学学院的王福湘教授表示深深的谢意，他不断的鼓励和亲切的支持，给了我温暖和信心，并让我自豪，让我铭记！

本书虽然是一只“丑小鸭”，但我依然珍爱它。因为，它凝聚的，不仅有自己的心力和爱，而且，还有我的亲人们和挚友们的心力和爱！

陶丽霞

## 前 言

自人类开始翻译活动，尤其是文字翻译活动以来，对翻译的研究便从未中断过。翻译活动的高潮每兴起一次，翻译研究便更深入一步，翻译研究中的争论也就愈加激烈。翻译研究作为当前一个崭新的学术领域，正在经历一次洗礼般的转向。翻译研究与文化研究已成为一种互动转向的关系。翻译研究的文化转向，使翻译研究的范式从纯语言层面走向探讨文化层面的相互影响上。“文化转向”将翻译研究从语言层次的规定性研究转向文化观照下的描述性研究。这种翻译理论不再把翻译仅仅看成是一种简单的两种语言符号的转换，或是一种单纯两种语言文本的交互，而是把翻译放在一个大文化的视野空间里予以探讨和研究。

笔者就是将本书建筑于这样一个立体空间里来加以阐述和论证的。本书以文化为经，翻译为纬，论述了文化观的形成和发展与翻译观的建立和运用是息息相关、相辅相成的关系。

本书由七章组成。以翻译研究的“文化转向”（第一章）导出对鲁迅、林语堂不同文化观的探源性研究（第二章），从而为鲁迅、林语堂各自的创作取向理顺理论依据并加以印证（第三章）。在第四章，笔者将鲁迅、林语堂的文化观作为天平，自然延伸到译品题材的选择上。到此（第五章），二者的翻译观便在他们各自文化观的映照下应运而生，并与之并行不悖、相得益彰。在不同

翻译观的指引下，鲁迅、林语堂提出了不同的翻译主张，在各自的翻译作品中顺理成章地采用了不同的翻译策略（第六章）。第七章为结语，将全文归结于此。

笔者注意到，在翻译史研究领域，尤其是最近几年里，对某一历史时期的翻译事件的梳理和对翻译家的研究逐渐增多，对具体史实的考证也越来越精细入微，但对这些翻译事件和翻译家在历史上所产生的作用与影响，却缺乏宏观的把握。我们见到的事实是，那样的具体梳理和微观研究远离了一种宏大的文化视野，既未能从翻译家所根植的文化出发来探究其源，也未能从跨文化交流的高度去研究其人其作，忽略了如翻译选择、文化立场、价值重构等问题的存在。这种“见树不见林”的研究方法，遮蔽了人们对翻译的文化特质的认识。虽然翻译研究包含对翻译技巧、语言转换等的微观研究，但比重不能过大，否则将导致对翻译的其他重要方面研究的轻视或忽视，从而忽略对翻译活动的文化本质的认识和把握。翻译文化意识的日益觉醒与翻译文化观的逐步建立，将翻译理论研究推向了新的高度和深度，形成了翻译理论研究发展过程中具有深远意义的“文化转向”。这种与“文化转向”同步而至的翻译研究文化观，为我们研究鲁迅、林语堂的文化观与翻译观及其互动、交错和并行的关系，提供了可靠而较为充分的理论依据，并将引导我们去获得一些新的发现。这便是本书的发端。

从对鲁迅、林语堂早年所接受的内环境和外环境的陶冶、熏染和铸塑的探源研究我们发现，鲁迅、林语堂这两位文学家和翻译家，虽共处于同一历史语境，却有着相去甚远的文化观。在以后的文学创作中，他们将各自的文化观顺其自然地“导入”到自己的文学创作中，并以此框定了自己的创作取向。鲁迅致力于启蒙文学，坚持为改良人生而艺术的文学理念，林语堂则倾情于闲适文学，崇尚为

享受人生而艺术的文学理念。同时，笔者发现，鲁迅、林语堂除在文学创作中充分体现了各自的文化观以外，在选择译介的作品题材上，也遵从了文化观的导向。鲁迅比较注重原作者在政治上是否反对人吃人、人压迫人，是否反对一个民族压迫另一个民族的鲜明态度，因此，他所选读的外国作品，大都也是处于半封建、半殖民地的当时中国所需要的作品。而林语堂在翻译题材上则倾向于选择能传达“超然独我”和优情养性的作品。这与林语堂一直崇尚并追求的闲适、自然，崇尚本真、近情的人生理想是一脉相承的。

鲁迅和林语堂翻译主张和实践的异同比较是本书的重点。与传统翻译研究所不同的是，本书并不是着力从语言学的角度进行文本分析，评析翻译技巧和翻译质量，而是力图摆脱传统的从文本出发的固定研究模式，从近代特殊的社会背景着眼，探讨中国近代特殊历史文化状况及鲁迅和林语堂对这一文化状况所持的不同文化态度对其翻译策略选择的影响。

从广义上讲，人类的一切活动都是文化活动。翻译自然也是一种文化活动，它是不同语言间文化交流的一个重要组成部分，而不同民族间的文化交流从来就是不平等的。根据埃文·佐哈的多元系统假说，在强势文学系统内，译者往往会采用归化的策略；而在弱势文学系统内，则采用异化式翻译策略。他认为，一个民族的文学、文化地位决定了翻译文学在文学多元系统内的地位，或起主要作用，或起次要作用。而翻译文学的不同的文化地位反过来也会在很大程度上影响译者的翻译策略。根据多元系统理论，如果某一文学多元系统十分强大，从而使翻译文学处于一个次要的地位，以这一多元系统为目标系统的译者往往会采用归化式的翻译方法；而如果翻译文学在某一文学多元系统中处于主要地位，译者则多采用异化式的翻译方法。应该指出的是，多元系统理论在涉及主流翻译策略的取向时，其观点具有高度概括性。但例外



总是有的。通过对比鲁迅和林语堂的翻译主张和实践我们发现，译者的翻译策略的选择与定位，或多或少地受到翻译文学的文化地位的高与低、强与弱之影响，而译者本人对这一客观文化地位的主观认同与否，是决定其翻译策略的主要因素。假如译者的主观认定与某一文化的客观地位相向不悖，那么，该译者的翻译策略便如多元系统假说所推论的那样；假如译者的主观判断与客观状况相背而去，译者的翻译策略便会不同于多元系统假说的推论。与此同时，不同的译者对翻译本质的认识也会持有不同观点，这也势必对其翻译产生方向性的影响。

本书通过对鲁迅和林语堂文化态度的考察，主要包括他们对中国儒家思想、中国古典文学和近代文学革命的不同态度的考察，指出虽然他们身处相同的社会文化背景之下，但他们早年成长经历和教育经历等方面的巨大差异形成了他们各自不同的文学观和翻译主张。鲁迅由于对中国封建传统文化有着深刻的忧患意识，敢于面对已经落后的文化地位，强调文学的社会改良功能，极力主张通过引进外国文学来输入新思想和新的表现方式，因而他的翻译策略自然有着强烈的异化倾向。与之相反的是，林语堂由于深受西方文化的浸染和他对中国传统文化的独特认识，他选择了向西方介绍中国传统文化，而为了适应西方读者的期待视野，他更倾向于采用归化的翻译策略。这一差异表明，在一定的客观文化环境中，译者对该文化的主观态度并非是一致的，因而在翻译实践中，必然导致两种不同的策略取向。

由此可见，翻译策略的决定因素最终还是译者本人。翻译策略的选择实际上是一个主观的过程。多元系统理论虽然对主流翻译策略的选择具有一定的解释力，但这种解释力具有局限性，因为这一理论只考虑了制约翻译策略选择的客观文化因素，而忽视了作为翻译主体的译者的主观能动性。通过译者对中国文化和翻译文学在中

国文学多元体系中地位的不同认识的考察，本书试图说明不同译者各自独特的文化态度在他们的翻译策略的选择上起着非常重要的作用，从而也解释了为何身处相同的社会文化环境下，林语堂更倾向于采用归化的翻译策略，而鲁迅则主张异化的翻译策略。

本书旨在研究鲁迅和林语堂的文化观与翻译观并对其进行异同比较。通过对鲁迅和林语堂文化观与翻译观的对比研究，我们可以得出结论：翻译文学的文化地位是否能影响译者的翻译策略的选择，取决于译者对这一客观文化地位的主观认同与否。当某一文化的客观地位与译者对它的主观认定相符时，译者的翻译策略便如多元系统假说所推论的那样。然而当主客观两方面不符时，译者的翻译策略便会有所改变。此外，译者对翻译本质的不同认识也会对其翻译产生重大的影响。

作 者

## ABSTRACT

Translation studies have always been carried out since the very beginning of the translation activities in history, especially of the translation in written form. Whenever translation activities came to a high tide, it would push translation studies a leap forward, always followed by more and more severe debates concerned. Today, as a brand-new academic area, translation studies have been undergoing a remarkable turn, establishing an interactive and interlapping relationship with cultural studies. The cultural turn from studies on cultures has successfully realized the paradigm shift from studies on pure languages to the studies on cultures and created the interactive relations between languages and cultures. Cultural Turn has transformed translation studies from the prescriptive studies concerning languages to descriptive studies in terms of cultures. With this translation theory, translation no longer means the sheer conversion of the symbols of two languages, but is placed in the prospective of broad cultures for studies and discussion.

Just in such a new prospective is this book expounded and demonstrated. In the book, the author, taken cultures as longitude, translation as latitude, has reasoned and expounded the interlocking and intertwined relationship between the views on culture and the philosophy of translation.

The book is made up of seven chapters. Starting from Cultural Turn (Chapter One), it moves to the exploration of and studies on Lu Xun's and Lin Yutang's different views on cultures (Chapter Two) so as to work out the theoretic basis for their different orientations of literary creation as well as to try to prove them (Chapter Three) with evidence. In Chapter Four, the author has taken Lu Xun's and Lin Yutang's views on culture as a scale for judgement, which is logically applied to the subjective selection of works for translation carried out by both Lu Xun and Lin Yutang. Up to Chapter Five, Lu Xun's and Lin Yutang's philosophy of translation have come into being with the influence of their views on culture and both keep in the same line and same tone in harmony. Due to the different philosophies of translation, they advocated different translation theories and put forward different translation principles, which, accordingly, lead to their different translation strategies that they actually applied in their translation practice (Chapter Six). The conclusion is made in Chapter Seven, which serves as the upshot of the book.

The author has noticed that in the area of translation history study, especially in recent years, ever-increasing efforts have been made in the combing of and the studies on the translation events and the translators in a certain historic period. More and more detailed textual research has been made on the historical evidences concerned. However, the roles which the translation events and the translators ever played and the influences which they ever made in history have rarely been discussed and taken into consideration in a macroscopical manner. Due to the fact that the detailed combing and the micro studies of translation events have been proved far away from the macroprospective of culture, they have failed to help explore the sources of culture from which the translators came from, nor help make

studies on the translators and their translation works in the point of view of cross-culture communication. Such issues as selection of translation works, the standpoint of culture and the reconstruction of values have been neglected. Obviously, the research methodology is something like seeing trees without seeing the wood, which prevents people from realizing the cultural traits in translation activities. Though translation studies involve some microstudies on translation skills and language conversion and so on, they are not expected to account for too much in the overall translation studies. Otherwise, some more important aspects in translation studies would be given insufficient attention or even a complete neglect. As a result, the cultural nature in translation activities would not be properly realized and grasped.

With the ever-increasing awareness of cultural recognition in translation and the set-up of the views on both culture and translation, translation studies have been greatly upgraded and deepened to a new level, characterized by Cultural Turn with profound significance in the development process of translation studies. Along with the Cultural Turn came the views of culture being applied in translation studies, which provide us with the workable and reliable basis for the studies on Lu Xun's and Lin Yutang's views on culture and philosophy of translation as well as the interactive and intertwined relationship between them. Meanwhile we are encouraged and guided to explore even more valuable findings. So far, it is the opening part of the book.

From the extensive survey of and the in-depth studies on the gradual and profound influences made respectively upon Lu Xun and Lin Yutang by the interior and exterior environments where they devoted themselves both physically and spiritually in their early years, the author has noticed that Lu

Xun and Lin Yutang, although sharing the same historic background, held totally different views on culture. With the different views on culture, Lu Xun and Lin Yutang set apart by naturally applying their own distinctive views on culture in their literary creation of all types, which further shaped their everlasting orientations of literary creation. With their different orientation of literary creation, Lu Xun stuck to “Art for Life” as his concept of literature while Lin Yutang expressed his pursuit of literature for leisure as “Art for Art” and adhered to it in his whole life. At the same time, the author has also noticed that the works for translation carried out by both Lu Xun and Lin Yutang were carefully selected by them and their selections were totally oriented by their own views on culture. Lu Xun tended to take those with distinctive orientation of political or national struggle and revolution while Lin Yutang was interested in translating those works delivering quietness, gracefulness, humanity, self-cultivation as well as leisure and relaxation. Obviously all his choice resulted from his pursuit of life.

This book also intended to make a contrastive study of Lu Xun’s and Lin Yutang’s translation principles. Different from the traditional translation studies, the present book is not intended to make an evaluative study of translation skills and techniques on the textual level. On the contrary, it tries to investigate both objective socio-cultural factors—particularly social and cultural position of the early 1920’s China and the subjective cultural attitudes taken by Lu Xun and Lin Yutang towards it in order to find out how these factors influenced their choices of translation strategies.

In a broad sense, all human activities can be regarded as cultural activities. Translation activity forms an important part of cultural exchange between different languages. But the cultural exchange between different nations has never been on an equal stage. According to the polysystem hy-

pothesis proposed by Even-Zohar, translators in a strong literary polysystem tend to apply domesticating strategy and thus produce translations characterized by superficial fluency, while in a weak culture, foreignizing strategy prevails. He believed that the cultural status in literature of a nation decides the “primary” or “secondary” position of translated literature in the polysystem and in turn it will to a large extent determine translators’ translation strategies. It’s necessary to point out that the polysystem hypothesis can explain the determining effect of objective socio-cultural factors on the prevalent translation strategies employed by most translators during certain period of time. But exception exists. Through the contrastive study of Lu Xun and Lin Yutang’s translation principles and practice, we find that whether the objective cultural position of translated literature can influence translators’ translation strategies is largely due to whether the translators’ subjective identification is in accordance with the objective cultural position of a nation. Besides, translators’ different understandings of the nature of translation also exert great influence upon translators’ translation strategies.

Through the detailed investigation of Lu Xun and Lin Yutang’s cultural attitudes, which mainly include the investigations of their attitudes towards Confucianism, attitudes towards Chinese classical literature and attitudes towards the literary revolution in modern China, the book tries to point out that different early-life experiences and educational experiences between Lu Xun and Lin Yutang lead to their different formation of literary conception and translation principles as well, although they lived in almost the same social and cultural background. Lu Xun, who was regarded as the indomitable fighter, dared to look reality in the face. He saw the Chinese culture as “backward” and thus emphasized the social function of lit-

erature. He advocated foreignizing strategy in translation in order to import both new ideas and new ways of expressions for the reform of decaying Chinese culture and the overthrow of the Qing government. On the contrary, Lin Yutang chose to take a completely opposite direction to that of Lu Xun's. From the early age, Lin Yutang began to get influenced by the Western culture and he became somehow more familiar with the Western culture than with the Chinese culture. And he formed a unique understanding of the Chinese culture that divorced from the dominant trend of his time. Thus he chose to introduce the Chinese culture by translating Chinese literary works including novels, essays, poetry and the like and by doing creative writing in English as well. In order to appeal to the Western readers' expectation, Lin Yutang was more willing to employ domesticating strategy in translation.

From this we can see that it is the translator's subjective choice that plays the decisive role in choosing translation strategies. Although the polysystem hypothesis has taken the objective social-cultural factors into consideration, it neglects the subjective identification of translators. By taking into account the translators' cultural attitudes towards the Chinese culture and translated literature in the Chinese literary polysystem, this book argues that individual translators' cultural attitudes play an important part in their selection of translation strategies. This finding explains why Lin Yutang tends to apply domesticating strategy while Lu Xun prefers foreignizing strategy although they lived in the same social cultural environment.

The book focuses on the studies in contrast on Lu Xun and Lin Yutang's views on culture and philosophy of translation, based on which, we come to the conclusion that the cultural position enjoyed by translated



literature can make influence on the selections of translation principles and strategies adopted by the translators. This is determined by whether the translator has subjective agreement or disagreement with the objective cultural position. When the objective position enjoyed by a certain culture conforms with the subjective agreement held by the translator, the translation principles and strategies applied by the translator will be like what the polysystem theory reasons. However, when the subjective agreement contradicts with the objective position of the culture involved, the translation strategies adopted by the translator will change. In addition, the translators' different recognition of the nature of translation makes remarkable difference in their translation delivery.

**Key Words:** cultural turn, views on culture, philosophy of translation, orientation of literary creation, translation strategy