

当代外国语言文学学术文库

Checking, Integration and Resistance
— A Study of Translations by the *Xueheng* School

制衡·融合·阻抗

——学衡派翻译研究

■ 王雪明 著



对外经济贸易大学出版社

University of International Business and Economics Press

当代外国语言文学学术文库

制衡·融合·阻抗

——学衡派翻译研究

Checking, Integration and Resistance

—A Study of Translations by the
Xueheng School

王雪明 著

对外经济贸易大学出版社

中国·北京

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

制衡·融合·阻抗: 学衡派翻译研究 / 王雪明著

· 一北京: 对外经济贸易大学出版社, 2014

(当代外国语言文学学术文库)

ISBN 978-7-5663-1077-4

I. ①制… II. ①王… III. ①学衡派-文学翻译-研究 IV. ①I209.6

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2014) 第 141122 号

© 2014 年 对外经济贸易大学出版社出版发行

版权所有 翻印必究

制衡·融合·阻抗

——学衡派翻译研究

Checking, Integration and Resistance

—A Study of Translations by the Xueheng School

王雪明 著

责任编辑: 胡小平 闫振华

对外经济贸易大学出版社

北京市朝阳区惠新东街 10 号 邮政编码: 100029

邮购电话: 010-64492338 发行部电话: 010-64492342

网址: <http://www.uibep.com> E-mail: uibep@126.com

大恒数码印刷 (北京) 有限公司印装 新华书店北京发行所发行

成品尺寸: 170mm×230mm 12.5 印张 231 千字

2014 年 8 月北京第 1 版 2014 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-5663-1077-4

定价: 46.00 元

本书得到对外经济贸易大学英语学院
学术专著出版资助

当代外国语言文学学术文库

顾问：胡壮麟 吴元迈

专家编委会

主任：王立非 金 莉 许 钧

委员：（以姓氏笔画为序）

王立弟	王 宁	王守仁	王克非	王初明
牛保义	文 旭	文秋芳	石 坚	申 丹
冉永平	宁一中	朱永生	朱 刚	仲伟合
刘世生	刘象愚	许德金	严辰松	杨永林
杨金才	杨信彰	李 力	束定芳	何其莘
辛 斌	沈 弘	张 冲	张克定	张绍杰
张春柏	张德禄	陈建平	罗选民	周流溪
姚小平	顾曰国	徐 珺	黄国文	盛 宁
韩宝成	程晓堂	程朝翔	虞建华	谭载喜
熊学亮	潘文国	穆 雷	戴曼纯	

总策划：刘 军

总 序

对外经济贸易大学出版社最新推出了大型外语学术专著系列——《当代外国语言文学学术文库》，邀请我为文库写序。借此机会，谈谈我个人对外国语言文学研究的一些认识和感受。

综观 21 世纪的外国语言文学研究，就语言学研究而言，形式语言学理论和功能语言学理论继续对抗和对话，认知语言学理论和社会文化理论发展迅速，各种语言学的理论思潮试图从不同的角度解释语言事实；在应用方面，语言学更加广泛地与多学科交叉，运用和借鉴包括数理逻辑、计算机科学、心理学、神经科学、认知科学、生态科学、经济学等各学科在内的研究成果和方法，不断凸显出语言学作为人文科学和自然科学交叉学科的地位。就文学研究而言，英美文学研究受经济全球化浪潮的冲击，文学及文论研究都关注文化全球化与本土性的关系。文化全球化的研究引发了文学现代性、后现代性和后殖民性的思考，文学和语言学研究的相互影响和交融日益明显，文学研究越来越多地引入语言学研究的方法，如话语分析等，反之亦然。我国的外国语言文学研究在全球化和中国入世以后与国际学术界的交流更加密切，发展更加迅速。

同时，我们仍清楚地看到，国内的外国语言文学研究依然存在“三张皮”现象：第一张皮是“汉语与外语”研究的合作与交流不够；第二张皮是“语言与文学”研究的沟通与对话不够；第三张皮是“英语与其他外语”研究的来往和交叉不够。这“三张皮”极大地阻碍着外国语言文学学科的发展。

这套文库的设计体现了兼收并蓄、博采众长、学科融通的思想，是一个开放

和创新的学术平台，是各种研究的阵地，各位学者的家园，进入文库的研究成果都经过精心挑选，出自学有专长的博士和学者。我衷心地祝愿这朵“原创的小花”在繁花似锦的学术花园里开得绚丽灿烂，愿更多的学者关心和呵护它。

对外经济贸易大学英语学院

教授、博士生导师

王立非

2013年6月1日于北京望京花园

摘 要

本文着重考察了五四运动后期学衡派的翻译活动。该派是中国五四时期翻译高潮中一支重要的力量,但因不合新文化运动主流以及同时代和后世对该派的片面认知,使其在翻译方面的贡献被长期遮蔽了。通过对典型文本的分析,本文对学衡派翻译活动的译介背景、选材、策略运用、译文特点等方面进行深入细致的探讨,从而揭示出学衡派翻译活动在五四新文化运动的地位和作用,以及该学派通过翻译西学所意欲传达的理念和期望达到的目的。本文的最终目的在于探求学衡派翻译活动在翻译学方面的理论价值。

论文共分六章。第一章绪论主要涉及三个方面。首先阐明学衡派翻译活动在翻译史上长期受遮蔽的原因,提出在其他学科“反思五四”的今天,学衡派的翻译活动应该引起翻译史与翻译研究领域的认识;然后对国内现有的有关学衡派研究进行了多方位的综述,并由此指出学衡派翻译研究在各类研究中的缺失,从而阐明论文的选题意义;最后对本论文研究的视角和范围进行了界定,明确了研究中所使用的理论工具,以及预期达到的写作目的。

正文从宏观和微观对学衡派的翻译活动展开研究。第二章从描写翻译学的角度对学衡派的翻译活动在整个五四时期翻译活动中的地位 and 作用进行了细致的描述,尤其是从多元系统论的主流与边缘之间对立斗争的视角对学衡派与新文化倡导者二者之间的互动关系作了详细的说明,并借此凸显学衡派翻译活动的主要特征和内容。最后,在对学衡派翻译活动整体描述的基础上,提出多元系统论边缘系统对中心系统的制衡机制,并以学衡派为例阐明制衡机制的作用和对多元系统的产生的效果,来补充多元系统论中对边缘系统描述不充分的不足。

第三~五章深入到《学衡》杂志发表的各类译文展开分析研究。第三章主要以赛义德的理论旅行和姚斯的接受理论为框架分析学衡派留学成员服膺的白璧德新人文主义思想在中国的接受情况。本章首先指明目前学界对白璧德在中国五四语境下的接受存在着“对话观”和“误读观”两种相向的认识。前者普遍将《学衡》杂志上发表的译文认同为白璧德的理论原型,而后者则认为学衡派以儒家思想归化了新人文主义思想,以服务于同新文化倡导者展开论战的目的。通过

对白璧德思想的体系性阅读和原文与译文之间的比较分析,本文认为学衡派翻译白璧德新人文主义思想采取的是一种“融合”的路径。在翻译过程中,儒家思想和新人文主义思想在译者的“文化阐释”中通过义理关联得到沟通,二者相互渗透,彼此沾染了对方,结果是二者都发生了变化。在此认识基础上,本章提出跨文化旅行的翻译模式理论,以突出译者和“文化阐释”在翻译过程的作用。

第四章和第五章为学衡派的文学翻译研究,各选取有代表性的个案进行分析。第四章将当前热门的叙事学基本理论应用到小说译本《钮康氏家传》的研究中。通过分析原本与译本在叙事者、叙事视角、叙事声音和叙事时间几个方面的异同来检验译本与原本的对应情况,从而客观地判定该个案所运用的翻译策略。在运用叙事学理论时,文章希望提请注意的是原文和译文之间的叙事结构对比分析过程中源语叙事传统、译入语叙事传统、故事、原文叙事和译文叙事五个层面对应的复杂性。此外,在小说翻译过程中,对翻译产生直接影响的是叙述的话语层而非故事层,因为作者是通过叙述话语来塑造人物、反映生活的,对译者而言,作者所采用的任何语言手段都是他创造性再现的对象,因而可以说故事是完全独立于作家的写作风格的,同样的故事可以以不同的方式来讲述。

第五章主要对《学衡》一作多译这样一个特殊的现象进行研究,借助文化学派的相关理论分析一作多译形成背后各种操纵的因素。通过对各个译作与原作从诗歌形式到意象的分析,揭示译者在归化原文过程中传承古典诗歌文化的理念。最后,通过对异化和归化概念内涵的认识,指出学衡派归化翻译在五四异化为主流的特殊语境下所发挥的是一种阻抗功能,是学衡派彰显自我文化身份的一种行为方式。因此,阻抗性并非只是异化翻译策略的主要特征,在特殊的文化语境下,归化翻译同样可以具有阻抗性。

第六章为结论部分,对学衡派翻译活动这个特殊的现象进行性质判定,并提出本论文的理论意义与不足,以及该研究引反的现实思考。结论指出,学衡派的翻译活动兼具古代与现代双重性质。它的古代性在于,在白话文已确立为书面语通行全国的19世纪20年代,《学衡》上的译文同其他文章一样,依然用文言,许多译文在手法上接近严复和林纾的翻译,而与现代翻译主流不符;它的现代性则在它的翻译目的与新文化倡导者一样,都是借助西方的新思想新理念构建新文化和新文学的一种尝试,其意义是依附于新文化运动而存在的。

关键词: 学衡派 新文化运动 多元系统论 归化 异化

Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the *Xueheng* School's translation activities in the 1920s when the May 4th Movement in China was in full swing after its preliminary success throughout the nation. A significant group who has participated earnestly in the cultural and literary debates in the 1920s, the *Xueheng* School has for a long time been left marginal in the research of modern Chinese intellectual history and literary history due to its objection to the main trends of the times. For this reason, their contributions to modern translated literature also sink into oblivion. By reviewing its members' achievements in introducing foreign ideas and literature during the May 4th Movement, the dissertation holds that it is high time that we gave the *Xueheng* School's its due place in the overall translation activities of the May 4th Movement. Representative translated texts are selected from diverse columns of the school's major magazine titled *Xueheng* in Chinese (*The Critical Review* in English) in order to present the characteristics of the school's translation activities. By finding out the contextual factors for its members' involvement in translation, the guiding principles for its translators' selection of the materials to be translated and use of translating strategy as well as the characteristics of the translated texts, this dissertation endeavors to pinpoint the status of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities in the much broader scope of translation at the time of the May 4th Movement. It argues that only by placing the *Xueheng* School's translation activities against the overall picture of the modern transformation of Chinese culture can we fully recognize the connecting role their translations played not only between the foreign and Chinese cultures but also between the traditional and the modern Chinese culture. The ultimate objective of this dissertation is to explore the theoretical significances that the *Xueheng* School's translation activities have for Translation Studies.

The dissertation consists of 6 chapters. The first chapter, the introduction, starts with stating the reasons for the *Xueheng* school's long absence in the writing of

translation history and points out that when academic studies in such fields as history, literature, and intellect have started to re-examine the May 4th Movement in terms of its radicalism and rediscover the role of the *Xueheng* School, Translation Studies (TS), especially the field of translated history, cannot afford to overlook again the *Xueheng* School's translation activities. Then, a literature review of previous researches related with the *Xueheng* School is provided. It is found out in the review that most of the literature deals with the *Xueheng* School in terms of its thinking, view of cultural evolution, education, literary criticism and historical studies, and little, if any, has been done from the perspective of TS. This long absence of systemic research into its translation activities in various *Xueheng* School-related studies indicates consequently the immediacy and significance of the present study. The last section of this chapter offers a statement of the study perspective, scope, objectives and methodology of the research.

In the main part of the dissertation, macro and micro investigations of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities are carried out. By "macro" it is meant to place the *Xueheng* School's translation activities in the cultural context in which it occurred and thus to observe the interaction between the *Xueheng* School's translations as a system and translations by other schools and groups, especially those representing the dominant values of the New Culture Movement, while by "micro" it is meant to make a detailed analysis of translated texts so as to reveal the specific translating process.

Chapter Two presents, from the perspective of the Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), a comprehensive description of the position the *Xueheng* School's translation activities hold and the role they play in the whole translation endeavor during the May 4th period. Concentrated efforts are devoted especially to the elucidation of the interaction between *Xueheng*'s translation activities and predominant translation activities at that time within the framework of Polysystem Theory proposed by Israeli theorist Itmar Even-Zohar. As the first of its kind to view translations from a macro perspective, Polysystem Theory views translation not as the linguistic equivalence of the source text, but as a result of the struggles of competing subsystems for the dominant position within the larger socio-cultural polysystem. In the literary polysystem he puts forward three pairs of binary oppositions as the internal working mechanism: canonized and un-canonized products, central and peripheral position,

and primary and secondary models. He believes that these three pairs of binary oppositions constitute the driving forces for a literature. The systemic view of social or cultural phenomena and the idea of binary opposition are employed in the present research. Two adjustments are made to the theory before its application to the present research: one is the determination of the size of the polysystem and the other is the matter of static or dynamic view of the polysystem. In the present study the whole translation activities of the 1920s are viewed as a polysystem and translation activities engaged into by various schools and groups are its integral parts (systems). This polysystem is a static as a whole since it has just gone through a drastic revolution and is about to enter a relatively stabilized period, although inside the polysystem various systems are still in a permanent opposition and struggle. The Polysystem theory proves to be very effective after minor modifications in that the idea of opposition and that of center vs. periphery make it possible not only to account adequately for the relationship between various translation systems represented by different interests in foreign works in the translation polysystem, but also to reveal the contents and characteristics of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities. In the May 4th translation polysystem, the center is occupied by the translation of western ideas with scientism and pragmatism as the main trend in the intellectual circle and realism and romanticism in foreign literature. As a peripheral and weak entity in that polysystem, the *Xueheng* School has the wish to rebel the newly-established May 4th translation tradition. In *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*) the members voice their theoretical protest against the New Culture School and put their ideas into the translating practice. Although they can never move to the center of the translation polysystem, their translations are an indispensable part of entire translation polysystem during the May 4th Movement and have their influence upon the Chinese ideology and literature.

On the basis of a complete description of the counter-action of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities, a checking mechanism is proposed as a supplement to the Polysystem Theory for the following reasons: First, a polysystem acts as an ecological field in which each member has a place and plays a role in the direction of its advancement. Second, a polysystem would lose vitality for being excessively exploited if the system in the central position were only allowed to exist and function. The research argues that it is the checking ability of the systems in the peripheral position that keeps the balanced and healthy development of a

polysystem. In Zohar's work, focus is mainly laid on the evolution of a polysystem and consequently on the system taking (or to be taking) the central position while the counter-force of the systems in periphery has been totally neglected. Therefore, the role of the peripheral systems has to be described and the checking mechanism in the polysystem has to be proposed so as to present a comprehensive picture of the operation of a polysystem.

Chapter Three, Four and Five proceed with the research by going internally into the analysis of various translations published in *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*). Chapter Three deals with the reception issue of Irving Babbitt and his New Humanist ideas within the framework of both the idea of theory traveling and mutation initiated by American post-colonial Critic Edward W. Said and Reception Theory proposed by German literary theorist and esthetician H. R. Jauss. It is pointed out firstly that two diverging opinions exist as to the reception issue of Babbitt and his ideas: one regards the translated ideas in *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*) as the original ones articulated by American New Humanists themselves and pays no heed to the modification done by the translators for the purpose of domestic debate. The other rejects the aforementioned opinion by pointing out the fact that there is a deliberate understanding on the part of the translators, and as a consequence American New Humanistic ideas have been acculturated with analogical Confucian teachings to serve the *Xueheng* School's purpose of reviving the value of Confucianism which has already been dethroned from the predominant ideology of Chinese people in the sweeping May 4th Movement. While admitting the reasonable elements in both opinions, the study also points out their inadequacies. On the one hand, it should be noticed that importing foreign new ideas to revolutionize Chinese stagnant ideology is the major trend at that time and the *Xueheng* School is of no exception but joins the dominant schools and groups in this endeavor instead of sticking to the tradition only. This is most outstanding distinction between the *Xueheng* School and other conservative schools. Therefore, the *Xueheng* School can be classified as a different branch of the New Culture camp in the aspect of importing foreign ideas. It is in the sense of relying on the foreign knowledge that we can say American New Humanism (partially) is transmitted to Chinese cultural context via translation by the *Xueheng* School. On the other hand, however, *Xueheng* is different from the New Culture School in that it refuses to abandon wholly the tradition, especially the Confucianism and insists on the

fundamental values of the Confucian teaching as permanently valid throughout time. It is because of this difference that the *Xueheng* School has a strong intention of reviving Confucianism in its translation. But the *Xueheng* School knows clearly that to restore Confucianism from its dethronement a new method has to be devised. This new method is to establish teaching correlatives between American New Humanism and Confucianism. The study finds out that in the translating process the mechanism of “cultural interpretation” operates when the translators correlate the two ideologies produced in different cultural contexts. For illustration, by extracting three pairs of corresponding core concepts such as “decorum vs. 礼”, “higher/lower wills vs. 理/欲”, and “inner check vs. 以理制欲” from source text (ST) and translated text (TT) respectively, the study shows convincingly that these three pairs of concepts have all taken on a new connotation respectively in this “cultural interpretation”. The result of the “cultural interpretation” is that two ideologies have both changed: the New Humanism is tinted with a Confucian touch and the Confucianism is transformed by getting rid of its invalid parts. The method of teaching correlative proves to be very effective in debate since the *Xueheng* is regarded as toughest opponent of all conservative schools in the May 4th Movement. Based upon the analysis of the reception of New Humanism in China, the chapter proposes a model for idea’s cross-cultural travel via translation. In this model the role of the translator is emphasized since he is the key in wielding his power of “cultural interpretation”. It is believed that teaching correlative can also be found in other ideas’ cross-cultural transmission by focusing on the “cultural interpretation” of the media. Misunderstanding is not the only means to interpretate what happens in the cross-cultural understanding.

Both chapter Four and Five address the *Xueheng* School’s translation activities in the aspect of literary works, based on representative case studies. Chapter Four focuses on the analysis of the characteristics of the fiction translation in the magazine of *Xueheng* through an intensive discussion of a particular case-the translation of *The Newcomes* by British novelist William Makepeace Thackeray. The selection of this novel as the subject for case study arises from the complexity of Thackeray’s being accepted by the translator into his translation agenda. Thackeray, a member belonging with realistic writers’ camp, seems to meet in every way the requirements of the prevailing translation trend and thus a suitable candidate for translation by the New Culture School. It is also known that the *Xueheng* School would by no means follow

the lead of the prevailing literary values and engage in translation by resorting to the same foreign resources. Therefore, it can be safely inferred that the translator selects Thackeray in line with his consistent stance and as a result appropriates and manipulates the foreign writer to satisfy his own need in a totally different way from his opponents. Fundamentally speaking, the decision of incorporating Thackeray into the translator's agenda lies in the fact that Thackeray comes closer to *Xueheng* scholars than to the camp of the New Culture for he attaches much importance to the preaching of permanent moral and spiritual values as an essential function of fiction. Then, some fundamental methods of narratology are employed in the comparative analysis of the original and translated texts in terms of narrator, narrative angle of view, narrator's voice and time sequence of the narration. By examining the similarities and differences in the narrative structures between the original and translated texts the translating strategy employed is scientifically defined. It is can be seen that use of narratology in doing text analysis adds an important dimension to the traditional methods in which the evaluation of equivalence is established only in terms of the comparative analysis of the content since the general cognition is to regard a piece of fiction as consisting of transferable material content only. One point that should be mentioned, however, is that more complex elements are involved when the theory is used in parallel analysis of ST and TT. The research discovers that the comparison is in effect done in the following five aspects: the narrative tradition of the SL, the narrative structure of the ST, story itself, the narrative structure of the TT, and the narrative tradition of the TL. An inter-textual comparison between the ST and the TT is not sufficient to define the translating strategy because it has to be determined whether and to what extent that the TT deviates from the narrative tradition of the TL to the ST and the narrative tradition of the SL. It is also found that in the process of translating a novel, it is the discourse rather than the story that exerts a direct influence on translating because for the translator, the discursive means the author uses in the ST are the object to be creatively represented in the TT. Story, therefore, can be said independent of the writer's writing style. A same story can be expressed in various ways.

Chapter 5 focuses mainly on a special reoccurring translation phenomenon in *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*), that is, one work with multiple versions published simultaneously. Selecting eight versions of one poem by William Wordsworth as the representative case for study, this chapter starts with a thorough analysis of the form

and image in translations as compared with the ST. It is found that the ST is transformed by its translators to various extents into Chinese poems with the original poetic form replaced by Chinese regular classic form and original poetic images giving way to Chinese ones frequently used in Chinese prosody. In a word, all exotic traits of the original poem have been totally lost in every translation and all the translations look like Chinese original classical poems. The fact that the same strategy is used in all eight versions unanimously contributes to a possible understanding that all the translators are manipulated to infuse a philosophy of cultural inheritance (of classical poetry in the case under study) in their view of translation. Therefore investigation is made on the formation of this special translation phenomenon by referring to the Manipulation Theory proposed by Andre Lefevere. Interestingly the domesticating strategy used in poetry translation, in effect in all translations in *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*) as a whole, sheds a new light on the present understanding of Venuti's distinction between foreignization and domestication. In his discussion Venuti proposes the foreignizing translation in order to resist the dominant literary values at home by registering exotic features both in languages and cultures. Therefore, foreignizing translation is hold to be a resistant action by the peripheral values against the fate of being dominated by the prevailing values and a means of signifying their cultural identity. Thus domesticating translation can be understood perfectly in the same way as being resistant since in the May 4th New Cultural-Literary Movement the dominant language being used for translating is the vernacular Chinese instead of the classical Chinese and the translation is more ST-oriented than TT-oriented for the purpose of establishing Chinese new literature on foreign literary models. Compared with the prevalent foreignizing translation, the domesticating translation enhances the identity of the *Xueheng* translators as an opponent to the dominant translating trend in a more noticeable fashion, attracting not only readers' attention to the content of STs represented, but also the way how the translators represent. In other words, this strategy is *Xueheng* scholars' cultural behavior of making clear their cultural stance as preserving culture in translation and building bridge between foreign and Chinese cultures. The *Xueheng* School's domesticating strategy is same as Venuti's proposal of foreignizing strategy in their pursuit of visibility in the domestic culture. The difference in terms of resistance between them is that Venuti achieves it by retaining foreign linguistic and cultural traits in the TTs and the *Xueheng* School achieves it by finding

cultural similarity with domestic tradition.

The fifth chapter forms the concluding part of the dissertation which offers an evaluation of the nature of the *Xueheng* school's translation activities, a statement of the theoretical significance and some limitations of the present study, and reflections on present situation of Translation Studies aroused by this study. It is concluded that the *Xueheng* School's translation activities bear a dual nature of antiquity and modernity. The former lies, most obviously, in the adherence to classical Chinese as its translating language in *Xueheng* (*The Critical Review*) when vernacular Chinese has already been established as the nationwide official language in the twenties of the 20th century. Many other obsolete translating techniques, as shown in the study, move the *Xueheng* School's translation closer to those of Yan Fu and Lin Shu in appearance, but deviant from the dominant translating trend of the May 4th Movement. The modernity of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities is best manifested in the goal of translating. Like the New Culture School, the *Xueheng* School also represents an active attempt of constructing Chinese new culture and new literature on the basis of importing foreign new ideas and new literature. As a pair of co-existing contradictory values, the *Xueheng* School's translation activities acquire a clear and complete understanding only in the presence of the New Culture School, and vice versa. In a word, the modernity of the *Xueheng* School's translation activities owes its significance to the modern New Culture Movement.

Key words: The *Xueheng* School The New Culture Movement Polysystem Theory Domesticating translation Foreignizing translation