Recontextualization in Intertextual Translation

—A Case Study of *Hong Lou Meng*

互文翻译的语境重构

——以《红楼梦》英译为例

向红 著

Recontextualization in Intertextual Translation
—A Case Study of *Hong Lou Meng*

互文翻译的语境重构
——以《红楼梦》英译为例

向红 著

湖南师范大学出版社

前　言

　　互文性涉及到此文本与彼文本及和相关语境之间的关系,其概念可以追溯到柏拉图和亚里士多德或索绪尔语言学和巴赫金批评论,但作为术语的"互文性"是由 Julia Kristeva 在 20 世纪 60 年代创造的。之后,Barthes、Genette、Riffaterre 等学者从不同研究兴趣出发对其进行了发展。在 20 世纪 70 年代,互文性这一用于文学批评的认识论和方法论被引入翻译研究。Littau、Federici、Venuti 等从不同角度论及了互文性翻译,但 Hatim 和 Mason 贡献更大,他们吸纳篇章语言学、功能语言学、结构语言学、心理语言学、批评语言学、语用学、符号学等学科的研究成果,把互文性理论引入翻译研究,并系统性地提出了互文性翻译理论。其理论有可取之处,但由于基本上由语言学理论组合而成,而且构成琐碎,在翻译实践中存在一定操作难度。

　　在西方翻译界,互文性研究已成热点。但在国内,互文性研究是近二十年来的事,是前沿性研究,起初主要用于文艺学研究,后来扩展到语言学、翻译学等领域。杨衍松(1994)是首位论及俄汉翻译里的互文指涉的,随后一些学者也出产了一些关于互文性翻译的论著,如罗选民(2006)的博士论文《互文性与翻译》。罗选民尝试从互文性理论建立翻译研究的途径,以便指导翻译实践和理论研究,并提出了"互文翻译的语境化",但并未对其进行理论阐述。据初步统计,过去 20 年里论及互文性文章仅有 20％左右是讨论互文性翻

译的,不到全部翻译论文的 0.4％,而且国内翻译界的互文性理论研究无论在深度和广度上都非常不足,同翻译教学的结合也不够紧密,简单模仿和重复太多。

翻译离不开语境,因为语境对翻译有制约和限制作用。互文翻译更是离不开语境,因为互文是语境中的互文。这就需要结合语境理论,尤其是动态语境理论。Sperber 和 Wilson 在关联理论中提出了认知语境论,Verschuren 在顺应理论中提出了语境顺应论,这些都是动态语境理论。我国学者朱永生、何兆熊等也提出了动态语境理论。这些动态语境理论与翻译理论及实践相结合,有利于翻译语境重构的理论阐释及其实践应用。许多学者从不同角度来研究语境与翻译的关系,如 Hatim、Mason 和 Newmark 从系统功能语言学视角,Verschueren 从语用学视角,Nida 从文化视角,以及 Toury 从篇章与文化的视角来探讨语境与翻译的关系。国内学者研究翻译语境的主要有朱文振、郑诗鼎、李运兴、刘宓庆、程永生、彭利元等。根据动态语境理论,翻译是一个过程,翻译语境与源文语境、源语语境及译语语境都不一样,不是预先就存在了的,而是通过译者的努力在翻译过程中构建出来的。换言之,译者是翻译过程中的中心,语境重构是在译者翻译过程中实现的。

从互文性视角看来,翻译本身就是互文性活动,译文的产生即是源文语境在翻译过程中的解构和重构的结果。之所以被称为语境重构,是因为构建出来的这个翻译语境必须同源文语境在互文性方面保持最大一致。本书以前人对互文性理论、互文性翻译、翻译语境及语境重构的相关研究为理论背景,将互文性理论和语境理论结合于翻译研究之中,从互文翻译的语境重构视角探究译者如何在译文中构建翻译语境,该语境同源文语境在显性互文性和成构互文性方面又如何保持最大一致。而通过研究译者的翻译过程,可以解释翻译过程的方方面面,进而指导互文翻译的语境重构。

本书的理论框架是在修改 Hatim 和 Mason 的互文翻译理论框架(互文性符号识别和转换模式)的基础上建成的,即把互文性、翻译过程与语境重构有机融合在一起,并认为互文翻译就是翻译过程中互文性符号从源语到目的语的充分转换。具体而言,互文翻译过程可分为三个阶段:源文中互文符号识别阶段、源文理解阶段(理解互文性符号)和译语表达阶段(选择合适的译语表达互文性符号)。互文翻译的语境重构过程大致就是如此:首先在互文符号识别阶段,译者利用源语语境知识识别语篇中各个层次的互文性符号;其次在理解阶段追踪特定文化中的有关前文,利用源语语境知识来理解作者利用该互文符号所传达

的意图;最后是在表达阶段,基于这些符号的信息和意图,并利用目的语之语境知识来选择特定策略,以转换这些互文性符号。此外,本书从翻译批评角度提出译者和翻译研究者的语境视野模式,这将有助于解释译者和翻译研究者的语境重构过程。

从对以往的有关研究中发现,不少学者将互文性的分类与其表现形式混为一谈。与 Hatim 和 Mason 的互文性表现形式分类不同,本书采取 Fairclough 的互文性术语,将互文性的各种表现形式依其特征明确分为显性互文性和成构互文性两大类。但在互文性的具体表现形式上,本书与 Fairclough 的分类也不尽相同,即将显性互文性分为引用、典故、俗语和诠释,而将成构互文性分为文类、主题、结构和功能。

本书还从汉英对比角度出发,将汉语里的"明引"归入引用互文性,无论引文出处还是自我引用,只要交代引用来源的,都可纳入引用互文性范畴。同时,将"暗引"归入典故互文性。本书采用典故而非文学典故这个术语,因为有些典故来源不只是限于文学,还有历史人物和历史事件。由于汉语俗语可包括陈词滥调、惯用语、谚语以及歇后语,故本书以俗语这个术语来涵盖前面提到的几种互文性表现形式。诠释作为一种叙事方式,在汉语中体现形式多样,如《红楼梦》里就以作者自云、说书人的套话及石头自白或作为隐身作者等出现。依照文体学定义,本书解释了文类互文性之概念。更重要的是,本书以多个语料例证分析了翻译过程中如何进行语境重构来实现源文意图,使译文语境同源文语境在文类、主题、结构和功能等方面保持最大一致。

本书指出,在互文性翻译中,职业译者使用的不同方法实际上是受关联原则支配的。在互文翻译语境重构里,关联准则同作者的意图及读者的期待相关,同译文的语言风格相关,还同作者、译者和读者的主体间性相关。同时,本研究还探讨了十种具体翻译方法(直译、释译、扩译、省译、注译、合译、代替、视角转换、泛化和创译),并指出这十种具体方法实际上就是关联准则的具体应用。

本书语料主要源于《红楼梦》汉英平行语料库以及其他文学作品,兼及学生翻译实践中常犯错误之个案。通过有关互文性翻译、翻译语境和语境重构的理论研究,以及对《红楼梦》两个英文全译本(分别为杨氏夫妇合译的《红楼梦》和霍克斯翻译的《石头记》)等的佐证分析,笔者发现同一个互文符号可以被作者用来传递不同的意图,只有正确理解了源文作者使用这些互文符号的意图后才

能得出正确的译文。由于同一个互文所指在不同语境下可以具有不同含义,所以其翻译须依译文语境进行调整。因此,本书最后指出,合格的翻译其实就是在翻译过程中尽量保持译文与源文的互文性,在目的语中实现语境重构。

本书在五个方面进行了建设性探索:(1)翻译过程实际上就是语境重构的过程;(2)互文翻译语境重构过程不同于传统的翻译过程;(3)互文语境重构就是译者努力在译文中构建一个翻译语境,该语境同源文语境在显性互文性与成构互文性方面尽量一致;(4)译者的不同翻译策略实际上受关联原则影响;(5)将互文性与语境重构有机结合在一起进行翻译研究,这是翻译研究的一个新视角。

本书的创新性体现在三个方面:首先,研究视角上有所创新。本书将互文性理论与语境重构理论有机结合进行翻译研究,研究译者动态的翻译过程,而非简单比较静态的译作。其次,理论构建上有所创新。本书构建了互文翻译语境重构理论框架。第三,研究方法上有所创新。本书运用语料库统计方法来收集语料,对《红楼梦》两个英文全译本进行佐证分析。

这些创新性成果无疑有着较大的理论意义和实践意义。在理论上,本书:(1)有利于翻译研究视角的进一步拓展和研究方法的更加科学化;(2)有利于互文性理论和语境理论及其对翻译理论影响的深入研究;(3)有利于促进翻译批评尤其是文学翻译批评理论的审视和发展。在实践方面,本书:(1)将互文翻译的语境重构理论应用于翻译教学,有利于学生更好地理解翻译过程;(2)有利于学生和译员了解并掌握互文翻译的语境重构理论,进而更好地进行翻译实践;(3)以互文翻译的语境重构理论个案分析《红楼梦》英译本,有利于《红楼梦》翻译及其研究的进一步深入与完善。

当然,由于水平和时间所限,书中不足之处在所难免,恳请学界同仁不吝指正。

向　红

2014 年 6 月于长沙岳麓山下

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

For a long time, translation studies have focused largely on the product-oriented studies which have been prescriptive rather than descriptive or empirical. In the product-oriented studies little attention has been directed to translators' actual performance or to the process in which a translation is produced, and consequently the ignorance of the translating process would make "translation theories far away from the translators, thus cause the result of the translators keeping their distance from the translation theories" (方梦之 1996:5)[①], which is harmful to translation studies. Hence, it is of necessity to study the translating process.

According to *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, "Translation refers globally to the transfer of message from source language to a target language or receptor language whether the language is in written or oral form" (Bright 1992: 177). But the case is not so simple as it seems to be. According to literary theorists, "translation can be seen as the transfer of message not only from one language to another, but also from a given source to a given set of receptors, each with a given background and culture" (ibid. : 179). That is to say, on the one hand, translation should reproduce the message of the original on the linguistic level; on the other hand, it should fulfill the task of communicating extra-linguistic messages. In other words, translating is a complicated process which involves such multi-activities as cross-linguistic, cross-cultural, and cross-social communicative processes.

---

① The original sentence is "翻译理论脱离译者,译者当然也远离翻译理论", and the English translation is mine. Henceforth, the English translations made by the writer of the book will not be pointed out unless necessary.

The intertextuality theory undermines the author's authority, which provides a new space for readers to join in the interpretation and production of the text's meaning where intertextuality theory intersects with translation studies. In other words, intertextuality can be applied to the study of the phases of understanding and expressing in the translating process.

The dynamic context view regards translation as a process. And it is widely agreed that context plays an important role in translation. A lot of researches on the relation between context and translation have been done from different angles. The previous related studies include Catford (1965), Hatim and Mason (1990), Bell (1991), Newmark (1988), Baker (1992, 2005,2006) from the viewpoint of systemic functional linguistics, Verschueren (1999) from the viewpoint of pragmatics, Shaw (1987), Nida (2001), from the viewpoint of culture, and Toury (1995,2001), from the viewpoint of text and culture.

In China, translating context has been studied by some scholars (朱文振 1987;郑诗鼎 1988;李运兴 2001, 2010;刘宓庆 2001;程永生 2001;彭利元 2005, 2007, 2008). But few made the study on recontextualization in translating process from the perspective of intertextuality, which is what the present study is aiming at.

The present research is centered on the relationship between intertextual translation and recontextualization. Intertextuality, Translation Context, Recontextualization, Intertextual translation and Recontextualization in Intertextual translation are the key concepts in the present research, which are defined in Chapter Four of the book.

This chapter aims to examine intertextuality and translating process, recontextualization and translating process, and to give a global idea of the interrelation between intertextuality and recontextualization in translating process. What is more, it presents the aspects involved in the present research including the research rationale, the research objectives and questions, the research methods, the research data and the organization of the book.

1.2　Research Rationale

Intertextuality theory can be applied to explaining the whole translating

process which can be roughly divided into two phases: understanding phase and expressing phase[①]. The source text (ST for short) has the intertextual relation to the target text (TT for short), for the latter is "an absorption and transformation" (Kristeva 1969: 146) of the former. Put it in another way, there exists an intertextual relationship between literature creating and literature translation. In the translating process, the translator is the reader and interpreter of the ST at the understanding phase, and he is the writer of the TT as well at the expressing phase. Hence, intertextuality theory is of significance for us to know the translating process and help readers understand the meaning of the source text.

1. 2. 1　Necessity of Recontextualization in Intertextual Translation in Translation Studies

It is of necessity to study the intertextual translation in that the intertextual perspective leads to a relatively new approach to the methodology of translation studies. Intertextual translation needs further study in the translation study field in China, and the term **Recontextualization in Intertextual Translation** is a novel term which needs more elaboration in translation studies.

1. 2. 1. 1　An Approach Supplementary to the Methodology of Translation Studies

The writer of this study has long been puzzled with such problems as: what factors affect a translator's expressing phase in his translating process? Why do so many target texts of a source text (especially a piece of famous literary work) appear successively one after another? What is the relationship between the translated versions and the original version? What factors cause the retranslation? In short, it seems that all these questions are concerned with the relationships between the target texts and their corresponding source texts, which was first conveniently defined as equivalence, but the concept of equivalence itself has been rendered less and less reliable, for

---

① "文学翻译的实践过程一般划分为理解和表达两个阶段"(张今,张宁 2005:14)。

[a]cknowledging[1] the role of the reader/translator as an active agent of interpretation led to acknowledging the plurality and diversity of an unlimited number of potentially possible target versions of a source text"[2] (Farahzad 2008: 126). These questions aroused the writer of this study's interest in intertextual translation and recontextualization in translation, which have been chosen as the subject of this study, for "Intertextuality is a key concept for target-text production" (Nord 2007). The writer of this study hopes it can provide us with a new perspective in looking at the translation theory and practice.

The writer of this study chooses the intertextual perspective for the reason that it leads to an approach supplementary to the methodology of translation studies, which starts from the interpretation of the term "text". Unlike the structural linguistic view which regards text as a self-contained product accommodating everything in itself, including meaning, message, author's intention, coherence, cohesion, etc. with a single meaning, waiting to be decoded and extracted by the passive and non-interactive reader, intertextual perspective looks at texts in relation to other texts, and regards translation as an intertextual activity where language, culture and literature intertextualize with each other. Under the influence of the structural linguistics, as Farahzard concluded that—"this notion of text became central to translation studies, where speaking of the meaning of a text became common practice, with the implication that since every source text element has a single meaning, there is only one correct translation of it in any target language" (Farahzad 2008: 125).

Compared with the traditional studies of translation, the intertextual translation study has its advantages. For example, Qin Wenhua (秦文华

---

② Equivalence in translation has been described by Hermans that it is a "troubled notion"(1995: 217). Furthermore, it is in practice impossible to use the term with the level of precision assumed by some writers like Catford whose view of equivalence as something essentially quantifiable—and of translation as simply a matter of replacing each SL item with the most suitable TL equivalent—has been described as "an allegory of the limitations of linguistics at that time" (de Beaugrande 1978: 11). Snell-Hornby also attacked such a view that it "presupposes a degree of symmetry between languages" (1988/1995: 16) and even "distorts the basic problems of translation" (ibid.: 22), for it reduces the translation process to a mere linguistic exercise, ignoring cultural, textual and other situational factors, which it is now agreed play an essential role in translation. (quoted in Shuttleworth & Cowie 2004: 49, 50)

2006: 38) listed the following:

First, intertextual translation study makes a breakthrough that the source text should not be the only study centre, for intertextual translation study combines source text, target text, author, translator, culture, context and other ingredients of translation with one another.

Second, intertextual translation study is concerned not only with the linear relationship between texts which regards the source text as the only source of the target text, but also with the inter-references between texts which can combine the synchronic factors and diachronic factors.

Third, intertextual translation study evaluates more objectively such issues as originality, translation criterion, retranslating phenomenon and translated texts, and it denies the existence of the ultimate meaning, acknowledging the later target text's surpassing the previous target texts, so texts are always in the dynamic process of the open and changing producing process.

Finally, intertextual translation study breaks the closed mode of the traditional translation study, and changes the translation study from the operation level of language to the multidimensional discourse space, which expands the range and horizon of translation studies.

Translation is regarded as language transformation by collaborating reading action and interpreting action, both of which are by themselves intertextual activities. In the process of translation, the translator is always having dialogues with the author and the text, and sometimes even with the reader. The translator, the author, and the reader, jointly carry out dialogues with one another and with any other textual voices, spanning in both time and place. The translator has to be more guarded by the intertextual network of the source text and that of the target text, by target text readers and by the purpose of translating and so on. As a result, translation ultimately depends on dynamic intertextual reading, and understanding of a source text. So the translator has to take the intertextual network of the source text into careful consideration to dig out all possible meanings of the source text before he transforms them into the target one.

1.2.1.2 A Field Needing Further Research in China

It is of necessity to study intertextual translation, for it needs further study in the translation study field in China. The table below is about the

papers on intertextuality and intertextual translation published in most of the Chinese Journals from 1991 to 2010. This is the search result on March 4, 2011 from the Chinese Journal Full-text Database (www.cnki.net). The *title name* and *fuzziness* method are adopted in the searching process.

Table 1-1 **Comparison between the papers on intertextuality, intertextual translation and translation published in the Chinese Journals**

Title / Data / Year	Paper		Intertextual Translation	Percentage of Intertextual Translation	
	Intertextuality	Translation	Intertextual Translation	Comparison with Intertextual Studies	Comparison with Translation Studies
1991—1995	6	2583	1	16.67	0.04
1996—2000	16	3902	4	25	0.1
2001—2005	131	10116	29	22.14	0.29
2006	85	4055	17	20	0.42
2007	102	5370	22	21.57	0.41
2008	173	6384	44	25.43	0.69
2009	155	6829	35	22.58	0.51
2010	166	6413	24	14.46	0.37
Total	834	45652	176	21.1	0.39

The above data (mainly from the search of CNKI) show that although substantial research has been done on intertextual theory and it was constantly related to translation studies in the West, it failed to attract enough academic attention in China until in the 1990s. Yang Yansong (杨衍松 1994) is the first scholar to touch upon this issue in 1994 in his paper which dealt with intertextual references in Russian/Chinese translation. Following his initiative, some other scholars, to name just a few, Xin Bin (辛斌 1999, 2000), Li Jianbo (李建波 2001), Li Yuping (李玉平 2003), Qin Wenhua (秦文华 2005, 2006), Liu Jinming (刘金明 2006), Wu Jianguo (武建国 2006), Yang Rufu (杨汝福 2007), Yang Zengcheng (杨增成 2008), and Duan Huimin (段慧敏 2009) have made further investigations on intertextuality in their doctoral dissertations. The nine doctoral dissertations concerning