



国家出版基金项目  
NATIONAL PUBLICATION FOUNDATION

中华民族典籍翻译研究

主编 王宏印

藏族

# 典籍翻译研究

——雪域文学与高原文化的  
域内外传播

王治国/著



大连海事大学出版社



国家出版基金项目  
NATIONAL PUBLICATION FOUNDATION

中华民族典籍翻译研究

主编 王宏印

藏族

# 典籍翻译研究

——雪域文学与高原文化的  
域内外传播

王治国/著



大连海事大学出版社

© 王治国 2016

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

藏族典籍翻译研究：雪域文学与高原文化的域内外  
传播 / 王治国著. — 大连：大连海事大学出版社，  
2016. 1

(中华民族典籍翻译研究 / 王宏印主编)

国家出版基金项目

ISBN 978-7-5632-3290-1

I. ①藏… II. ①王… III. ①藏族—少数民族文学—  
文学翻译—研究—中国 IV. ①I207.914

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2016)第027690号

大连海事大学出版社出版

地址：大连市凌海路1号 邮编：116026 电话：0411-84728394

传真：0411-84727996

<http://www.dmupress.com> E-mail: cbs@dmupress.com

大连住友彩色印刷有限公司印装

大连海事大学出版社发行

---

2016年1月第1版

2016年1月第1次印刷

幅面尺寸：145 mm×210 mm

印数：1~3000册

印张：9.875

字数：259千

---

出版人：徐华东

责任编辑：林晓阳 史云霞

责任校对：陈 亮

装帧设计：孟 冀 王 艳 解瑶瑶

---

ISBN 978-7-5632-3290-1

定价：39.00元

# 民族典籍，大有可为： 努力建设多元共生的翻译互动模式

中华民族是一个多元共生的民族大家庭。在其漫长的历史发展中形成了多元一体的灿烂文化。总的说来，可以将黄河流域的小麦稻米文化作为汉族文化的生产与生活的形态学基础，同时也是精神世界和文化心理积累的肥沃土壤。北方雪域高原和林牧业草原上的民族迁徙与部落征战，则是孕育英雄史诗的广阔天地。还有南方，这个多义的色彩斑斓的盆地与高原、海滨与江湖、横断山脉与怒江滇池之间，民族荟萃，传说频仍的地区，也有自己的特产和文物。虽然我们可以简化为以古老中原为核心的汉族汉文化，和以边疆地带为侧翼的少数民族文化，也可以说，在总体上，这两种文化相互竞争又相互融合，呈现为中华民族百花园中万紫千红的灿烂景色，但毕竟是难免简单化的夏夷之辩的遗风流韵。

如果在传统上，我们把汉族汉语汉文书写的文化典籍称为“汉族典籍”，那么，除此以外的众多少数民族用多种语言文字所书写的文化典籍就可以称为“民族典籍”了。如果说，前者以四书五经儒家经典、老庄哲学道家经典以及由印度梵文译成汉文的佛家经典为核心内容的话，那么，汉族以外的满、蒙古、回、藏等少数民族的经典，例如开天辟地创世神话、三大



民族史诗、《蒙古秘史》、《福乐智慧》以及其他长篇叙事诗等以各种语言文字大量存在的典籍文献，则属于“民族典籍”的范围了。其中，佛典的传入和翻译经过了由天竺梵语、西域胡语转入中原华语的过程（且不说南传佛教的传播路线和影响地区），而《蒙古秘史》则经过了蒙古畏兀儿语创作、汉语翻译以及近世蒙古现代语翻译的“古本复原”阶段。由此，也许可以得到一个简单的推论：汉族典籍和少数民族典籍，不仅各自经过了复杂的翻译转换过程，而且在某种条件下也有可能经过了共同的地域和语言文字的载体，因而难以绝然区分你我。

近世以来，随着西方列强的入侵和西方文化渗透的西学东渐，伴随着中国半殖民地半封建社会的缓慢发展和民族独立、文化自强的现代化运动，我们在接受和解释西学的同时，便将固有的中国学问赋予“国学”的传统根基和传承意义。这样，在我们将国学概括为“考据、辞章、经世、义理”之学的基础上，汉族的文学也以经史、诗词、小说、戏剧的形式，得到了强调。当然，这一过程伴随着甲骨、汉简以及大量地下金石与简帛文献的发现，构成20世纪中国学术的新的生长点，使之具有了知识考古学的意义。与此同时，随着敦煌文献的发现、藏学与蒙古学的进展、突厥学与秘史学的开掘，还有三大史诗的翻译与传播研究，“民族典籍”的概念也进一步牢固地树立起来了。更由于这些学问，从一开始或者迟至晚近，便与国际学术界发生着不可分割的联系，以至于我们不得不在“海外汉学”之外，寻求一个新的更具包容性的名称——“海外中国学”，或者“国际中国研究”，以便能够容纳汉族文化典籍之外的庞大领域和丰富资料，容纳大量的中国多民族的文化典籍资料和学术研究成果。

在研究方法上，如果说，传统的汉学注重的是经典和文本注释，属于语文学的领域，以小学为基础对经典加以解释和注释（和西方以希腊罗马文献为主的古典学Classics适成对照），那么，新的民族典籍则需要民族学的基础，在珍贵的以口传文



学为源头的书面文献的基础上，特别注重人类学的田野工作和民俗学研究，以及把地下资料的发掘作为二重证据法，再加上国际上相关学科的比照，才能完成王国维所谓的三重证据法的构想和实施。在这个意义上，民族典籍是民族学、古典学与翻译学三个学科的结合与综合研究，舍去其中的任何一个，都是不完全的，也是不可能付诸操作和最后完成的。毫无疑问，在这一方面，在将汉族典籍与其他民族典籍进行比照的时候，我们发现其中存在着四种落差：时间与时代落差、文明与文化落差、文学与文本落差、翻译与传播落差。即便如此，这些落差也具有相对的性质，有重新考察的必要性。由此建立我们多元历法与纪实续统的思考、人类文明史及其文明形态重新排序的可能性、知识考古与文学姻缘的风云际会，以及经典重塑与重新经典化的翻译机制的基本线索追溯。而且这四个面相和层级，无论如何都不是截然分开的，而是交相辉映的整体运作和信息处理机制。

另一方面，当我们循着历史的脚步，重新审视前辈先贤的脚步的时候，我们发现，近世以来，我们的知识先辈们已经走过了三大步，那就是“五四”以来以及西南联大时期民间文学（特别是民歌）的搜集和研究，新中国成立初期即五六十年代的民族民间文学整理与翻译活动，以及改革开放以来即新时期的民族典籍重建与翻译工程。这不仅给我们提出继承前人传统，百尺竿头更进一步的继承性任务，以及加强专业训练和专门化研究的专业眼光与先进手段的要求，而且要求我们一开始就站在国际化和国际中国学的视野里，审视问题和形势，占有资料和领域，开拓和加深新的民族典籍翻译与研究课题，力争超越前人，进入国内和国际研究前沿，为中华民族的文化复兴做出新的贡献。在这一方面，我们不仅重新审视了“五四”传统的成就和偏差，而且深刻理解了近代以来中国社会的变动轨迹和动力所在，那就是民国以来，几代志士仁人都把目光投向下层和基层，不断地民间化和平民化，不断地下移重心和贴近



现实，寻求民族的真相和救国的真理。当我们以此观点审视当下的翻译形势和我们面临的民族典籍翻译的具体任务时，我们发现：这其中不仅显示出特定的民族性和民族精神，而且体现了现代意识和后现代的学术倾向与价值所系。

当然，我们的一切努力都是立足于翻译和翻译学建设的。这就要求我们把重心放在资料收集和文献学解释上，就像当年陈寅恪在欧洲留学期间直接受到文献学传统的熏陶和专业整理与分析的训练一样，没有新的资料和新的发现，一切学术思考都是空中楼阁，或者徒然地armchair上的玄思与假设。当然，这里的文献不是封闭的、僵死的和一成不变的，而是专业的、课题的和时代前沿的眼光注视下的活化石。专题式和专题史的研究是一种可能性，模式化是另一种抽象的可能。例如，就三大史诗而言，任何一个都是独特的个案，诸如《格萨尔》关于藏学与蒙古学的关系，由海外向国内转译回来产生影响的契机和过程，以及汉译综合后再度发出的对外翻译的可能性，对于《江格尔》和《玛纳斯》不一定适合。同样，《蒙古秘史》的成书经过和“古本复原”的理论假设，伴随着中华一统的历史大势与元代的辉煌追忆，也是独一无二和不可复制的。在此基础上寻求模式，虽然必要，甚或在理论上有可能，但并非总能找到。

不过我们坚信：只要立足稳定，方向正确，持续不断地追溯就有可能使我们找到某种规律性的东西，或曰“模式”。例如，关于三大史诗的翻译，特别是活态史诗的翻译模式和理想范型，在我们对《格萨尔》和《玛纳斯》做了重点研究，并且使得《江格尔》可以连为一片的时候，一种关于中国活态史诗的翻译理论就基本找到了，或者说成熟了。这里不仅改变了我们对于传统翻译的理论认识，从而更新了翻译理论，而且找到了“源本”与“原本”的区别、本体与变异的联系、“语际翻译”与“语内转写”的规则，并且基于“程式”与“程式结构”的认识，运用“故事范型”与“典型场景”“重复主题”

的机制，复制史诗的话语。这样，就有可能结合民族志诗学、深度描写（深厚翻译）以及影像文化志等手段，表现出活态史诗的基本样态和艺术魅力。毫无疑问，这样的实践和理论，是不可能在传统汉学或单一的汉译外的理论认识中获得的。新的领域和类型，使得我们有可能发现新的翻译问题、新的思维模式、新的工作状态。

这一发现坚定了我们的信心和希望。虽然我们知道，在学术研究的生涯中，不应贸然进入不熟悉的领域，而且感觉到仅仅依靠个人的力量要完成无限丰富的我国民族典籍的翻译研究，是以有限之存在求无涯之知识，然而，只要我们抱定坚实的科学信念，采取脚踏实地的研究态度，加上正确的方法和必要的付出，就一定能够取得希冀的成绩。即便我们的成果是有限的，受时间的限制、精力的限制、资料的限制、资历的限制以及其他条件的限制，但是，只要我们密切配合，信守承诺，抱定必胜的决心，就一定能够完成既定的任务。

两年前，我们在十分有限的条件下，在几乎是薄弱的研究基础之上，和大连海事大学出版社一道，成功地申报了国家出版基金资助项目“中华民族典籍翻译研究”（共五卷）。这个动议，也是因为国内《大中华文库》已出版有汉族典籍百余部，但不包括少数民族典籍，所以我们的工作，确实是要另外开辟一个领域，去研究一系列新的更为复杂的翻译问题。此外，我主编的“民族典籍翻译研究丛书”（民族出版社）是一套博士论文基础上的研究专著，已出版了《〈福乐智慧〉英译研究》（李宁）、《〈阿诗玛〉英译研究》（崔晓霞），《〈玛纳斯〉翻译传播研究》（梁真惠）正在进行中，其他例如仓央嘉措情歌、格萨尔等翻译研究，也在准备中，计划陆续出版。但这套丛书偏重研究，而迄今为止，还没有一套民族典籍翻译研究概论一类的书，能涵盖主要的民族地区与民族典籍，以及民族典籍的翻译情况和翻译特点等。因此，我们希望本套丛书把重点放在面上，放在普及上，也希望有更加广泛的



读者，引起更大的社会反响。

我们当时制定了这样的编写原则：

学术研究，文学样式；资料翔实，文笔流畅；  
图文并茂，主体突出；宏观论述，微观落实；  
文化开路，翻译压脚；论述为主，兼顾分析；  
形式多样，协调统一；专家参考，大众爱读。

我们希望本套丛书可以起到以下的作用：

1. 对于重写中国少数民族文学史和翻译文学史，将提供最基本的和最新的研究成果；
2. 对于文化研究、民族研究以及典籍翻译研究，将形成综合的交叉研究领域和课题；
3. 对于相关的民族教育和民间文学教学，将提供最必需的参考书，并为编写综合性教材打好基础。

为达此目的，我和我的博士生们组成了一个团队，计划经过几年的努力，完成本套丛书。我负责总体的设计和全部书稿的计划与监督实施，各卷内容与体例的制定以及写作分工安排，通阅并修改全部书稿，而且独立承担《中华民族典籍翻译研究概论》一书和丛书总序的写作。其他关于西藏地区、蒙古地区、新疆地区和西南地区诸民族的典籍翻译研究，则分配给王治国、邢力、李宁、刘雪芹等分头完成。在此过程中，师生合作，同学协助，体现了团队合作的可贵精神。崔晓霞完成了《阿诗玛》的有关章节，纳入刘雪芹的《西南诸民族典籍翻译研究》一书；张媛帮助邢力撰写了蒙古族当代诗人诗作的翻译一章；荣立宇协助王治国撰写了米拉日巴道歌、仓央嘉措诗歌的翻译等章节，并帮助我完成了“汉英对照中国民族文学典籍篇目”的翻译；王晓农帮助我翻译了本套丛书的总序。另外，潘帅英也为李宁撰写《维吾尔族（西域）典籍翻译研究》搜集资料，做出了积极的贡献。没有这种亲密无间的合作，在短时

期内要完成这样一套丛书是不可能的。在这一整个过程中，大家克服了教学工作繁重、家务拖累大，还有研究、写作的巨大压力，尤其是出版周期短和完成日期紧迫，终于完成了这一繁重的文化工程项目，令人感动。我要向诸位致以真诚的谢意。

至于大连海事大学出版社，尤其是社长徐华东，伴随着项目的申报审批、写作编辑、出版发行的全过程，一直是这一项目的推动者；副总编辑林晓阳，则集中精力在编辑出版过程中，和大家一起努力，为此项目的实施做出了自己的贡献。出版社的编辑和校对，以及其他参与此项工作的人员，上下合力、全力以赴，分工合作，讲究质量，以敬业的精神和精湛的业务，定能保证本套丛书顺利出版，也在感谢之列。

这是一项具有重大历史意义和现实意义的开拓性的工作，做好这项工作，对全面总结多民族中国文学发展的历史，增强民族团结、繁荣社会主义文化事业和建设社会主义精神文明都是十分重要的。（中宣发〔1985〕18号文件）

在举杯欢庆胜利的时刻，让我们重温中央文件的指示精神，坚持不懈地进行中华民族典籍翻译研究的伟大事业，为使中国文化走向世界，加强和世界各国人民的文化交流，促进世界和平和进步的伟大事业，努力奋斗吧！

王宏印（朱墨）  
于南开大学寓所  
2015年5月31日



## Foreword

### ***Chinese Ethnic Classics, a Promising Area: Towards an Interactive Translating Mode on a Symbiosis Basis***

The Chinese nation, a great family with ethnic symbiosis, has developed in its long history a glorious and magnificent culture of pluralistic integration. Historically, on the whole, the wheat and the rice cultures which came into being along the banks of the Yellow River and those of the Yangtze River respectively are the terrainian basis for the production mode and life style of the Han Chinese people, on which they have kept enriching themselves in their cultural connotation. The snow covered plateaus and the grasslands in the north, which saw incessant ethnic migrations and tribal wars in history, are the vast world where heroic epics were conceived and breded. And the south (a richly connotative expression in Chinese) with its colorful basins and highlands, its rivers, lakes and coasts, particularly the terrain ranging from the Hengduan Mountains to the Nujiang River and the Dianchi Lake, makes up an expansive region imbued with legends among its various ethnic peoples, who have formed their own cultures with local features. Though all these multifarious cultures can be categorized simply into the Han Chinese culture located in the ancient central plains and the non-Han Chinese culture in the border regions, which as a whole have both

competed with and merged into each other, presenting a splendid scene in the garden of the Chinese ethnic groups, it is, in the final analysis, a mere continuation of the unavoidably simplistic division of Xia (central-civilized people) and Yi (border-barbarous people) in Chinese history.

Traditionally, “Chinese classics” has been used to refer to the canonical cultural works written in the Han (Sinitic) script by the Han ethnic group, and thus, synonymous with “the Han Chinese classics”, it does not cover those cultural works written by the Chinese peoples of non-Han ethnicity in their own various scripts, which can be termed “the non-Han Chinese ethnic classics” or simply “Chinese ethnic classics”. If the former consists of the Confucian canon represented by the Four Books and Five Classics, the Daoist canon by the philosophical books of *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*, and the Buddhist canon rendered from Sanskrit into Chinese, then the latter is the canonical works written in various ethnic scripts by Chinese ethnic minorities such as the Manchus, the Mongol, the Hui, and the Tibetan, including the creation myths, the three great epics of *Gesar*, *Manas*, and *Jangar*, *The Secret History of the Mongols*, *Kutadgu Bilig*, as well as other long narrative poems. On the other hand, they share considerable common ground. For example, the introduction of Buddhist scriptures went through the process of rendering first from the Indian Sanskrit into the scripts used in the Western Regions and then into the Sinitic script in the central plains of China, and *The Secret History of the Mongols* underwent original creation in a variant of the Old Uyghur script used before the development of written Mongolian, translation into the Sinitic script, and then invention of a new Mongol version under Khubilai Khan’s reign, a rendering process which can be termed “textual restoration”. From the two cases, perhaps we can reach a simple conclusion: either the Chinese classics in the Sinitic script or the Chinese ethnic



classics, i.e. the non-Han Chinese classics in other ethnic scripts, came into being after a complicated translating process, and under certain conditions, they probably went through some shared regions and were written in the same system of scripts, and therefore, the two cultures in their intricate interaction can not be separated from each other.

The “modern times” means, to China, mainly a period of suffering invasions by the western powers and of the eastern transmission of the western learning, actually a process of western cultural infiltration. With the slow development in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal China and its modernization movement aimed at national independence and cultural self-strengthening, the Chinese scholars attempted to accept and interpret the western learning, and meanwhile, they stressed their roots in the so-called Sinology and entrusted it the significance of inheriting the traditional Chinese learning. Thus, on the basis of the categorization of the traditional Chinese learning into four major branches, i.e. “textual criticism”, “poetry and prose”, “governmental craft”, and “argumentative philosophy”, the written literature of the Han ethnic group, mainly in the forms of Confucian classics and historical records, poetry, fiction and drama, was emphasized. Actually, this categorization, together with the archeological discoveries of ancient oracle bones, bamboo slips and silks, and bronze and stone vessels with inscriptions, brought about fresh growth points for the Chinese scholarship in the twentieth century, making it significant in the sense of archaeology of knowledge. At the same time, with the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts, the progress in Tibetology, Mongolian Studies, the inception of Tujue Studies and of *The Secret History of the Mongols* Studies, as well as the studies conducted on the translation and communication of the three great epics, the concept of “Chinese ethnic classics” was thus established firmly. Thanks to all such



scholarly pursuits, from its very beginning or at least in early twentieth century, it was related with the international academia so closely that Chinese scholars had to look for a new term more inclusive than “Sinology”, for example, “Overseas Chinese Studies”, or “International Chinese Studies”, to cover the wide-ranging and exuberant materials of the Chinese multi-ethnic cultural classics.

Methodologically, as the traditional Sinology has attached importance to the Han Chinese classics and their textual annotations, it belongs mainly to the field of philology, for what it has practiced has been, on the basis of “Xiaoxue” (an ancient Chinese subject of phonology, script, and exegesis, and in this sense, a counterpart to “Classics” in the west, which concerns the ancient Greek and Roman literature), explaining and annotating the Han Chinese classics. By contrast, the new scholarly efforts for the study of the Chinese ethnic classics require a solid foundation in ethnology, and considering the origin of the written literatures in oral literary traditions, special emphasis should be laid on anthropological fieldwork and folkloric studies. Their achievements, together with the unearthed materials by archeological excavation, can provide evidences for dual verification, and further, if the relevant achievements of those disciplines on an international scale can be adopted, then we can bring into practice the triple verification conceived by Wang Guowei. In this sense, the Chinese ethnic classics constitute a converging area where ethnology, classical studies, and translation studies are conducted on an integrated basis, and therefore, absence of anyone of the three would make Chinese ethnic classics studies incomplete, that is, impossible to put it into practice and bring it to completion. In this respect, when comparing the Han Chinese classics and the non-Han Chinese classics, we can find between them there are four developmental gaps: the time and era when they were produced in terms of dynasty, calendar, etc; the

civilization and culture they represent; the literary and textual forms of poetry, fiction, etc; the spreading range indicated by the fact that the Han Chinese classics have been translated more frequently and communicated more widely than the non-Han Chinese classics. Of course, all these gaps are relative, and it is necessary to recognize them. That will lay the foundation for our considerations of the multiple calendars and recorded continuations, for our explorations into the human civilization history and the possibility of rearranging various civilization forms in their logical order, for our practicing of knowledge archaeology to seek the kaleidoscopic factors giving birth to literature, and for our tracing of the basic clues for the translation mechanism underlying reshaping classics and re-canonization of them. And at any rate, these four aspects and levels can not be separated entirely from one another, but rather they operate as a whole mechanism for information treatment in a mutually enhancing way.

Meanwhile, when we follow the path of history and re-inspect the footsteps of those predecessor-scholars, we find that in modern times, they accomplished three strides: the first was the collection and research of folklores (particularly folk songs) after the 1919 May Fourth Movement and in the Southwest Associated University period (1938–1946); then the rearrangement and translation of the Chinese ethnic literature and folklores in 1950s–60s after the founding of the People's Republic of China; and the third, the Chinese ethnic classics re-construction and translation project carried out in the new period after China introduced the reform and opening policy in 1978. This review not only sets before us a new task of inheriting the tradition established by our predecessors and thereby of making fresh progresses by strengthening professional training for mastering advanced expertise and methods to conduct specialized research, but also requires us to stand from the very beginning at the height of International Chinese Studies, and with an



international vision, to view issues and tendencies in our whole map. Only in this way can we possess detailed information and master the area, to expand and deepen our research efforts in Chinese ethnic classics translation and its studies, and to transcend our predecessors and enter the research fronts at home and abroad, thus making new contributions to the cultural rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. In this respect, we have taken a new look at the achievements and deviations of the tradition the May Fourth Movement set up, and had a deep understanding of the social changes of China in modern times and the dynamics driving them. What brought about those changes is that after the Revolution of 1911, pioneers with lofty ideals in China began turning their eyes to the substrata and the grassroots, and kept going downwards to the public and getting close to the national reality in their pursuit of the truth for saving the nation. When we, taking the same point of view, examine the current translation conditions and the concrete tasks before us in translating Chinese ethnic classics, we find that here in this area are not only displayed the unique national character and national spirit, but also embodied the modern consciousness and the post-modern academic trends and values.

All our efforts, of course, are based on translating, and aim at the construction of translation studies as a discipline. Therefore, one of our fundamental tasks at present is collection of data in a wide range and their philological interpretation for different purposes. As suggested by Chen Yinqué, who was nurtured in the European tradition of philology and well trained in specialized analysis method during his study in Europe in early 1910s, without new data and new discoveries, all academic thinking would be nothing but a castle in the air, or vain armchair planning. The literature in our possession is not something always closed, ossified, or unchangeable; rather, it is the living fossil to be examined by the specialized, project-relevant,



and forefront vision. Either special topic research or special subject history research is a possibility, while modeled research provides another possibility, yet abstract and speculative. For example, as far as the three great epics are concerned, any one of them makes a unique case for study. With regard to *Gesar*, the relevance and relation between Tibetology and the Mongolian Studies on the question of its origin, the opportunity for and the process of its rendering from the overseas version into the Sinitic version to have produced influence, and the possibility of re-translating its synthetic Sinitic version into foreign languages, all these do not necessarily apply to the cases of *Jangar* and *Manas*. Similarly, in the backdrop of the historical trend towards reunification of the Chinese nation, with the glorious reminiscence of the Yuan Dynasty, the creation process of *The Secret History of the Mongols* and the relevant theoretical hypothesis of “textual restoration” are also unique and can not be replicated. Therefore, the success in seeking a common model for their research, though necessary, or even possible in theory, is not always guaranteed.

However, we firmly believe that so long as we stick to our foothold steadily and keep exploring unremittingly in the right direction, it is possible for us to find some regularity someday, which may deserve to be called a “model”. For example, with regard to the translation of the three great epics, particularly the model and ideal pattern for translating living epics, when we have conducted focused research of *Gesar* and *Manas*, so that they can be connected with *Jangar* as a whole, then we will have found a basic, if not mature, theory on the translation of China’s living epics. It will not only change our theoretical knowledge of translation in the traditional sense and thereby renew our translation theory, but also clarify the difference between “source text” and “original text”, the link between the epic itself and its variants, and the rules over “inter-