

# 翻译论坛

Translation Forum



南京大学

4

2016

《中国学术期刊网络出版总库》与CNKI系列数据库全文收录

# 翻译论坛

Translation Forum

许 钧 主编

江苏省翻译协会 扬州大学外国语学院 编



南京大学出版社

4  
2016

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

翻译论坛. 2016. 4 / 许钧主编. -- 南京 : 南京大学出版社, 2016. 12

ISBN 978-7-305-17475-9

I. ①翻… II. ①许… III. ①翻译—教学研究—文集  
IV. ①H059-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2016)第 201201 号

出版发行 南京大学出版社

社 址 南京市汉口路 22 号 邮 编 210093

出 版 人 金鑫荣

书 名 翻译论坛(2016. 4)

主 编 许 钧

编 者 江苏省翻译协会 扬州大学外国语学院

责任编辑 杨 群 裴维维 编辑热线 025-83592123

照 排 南京新洲印刷有限公司

印 刷 南京新洲印刷有限公司

开 本 787×1092 1/16 印张 6.25 字数 194 千

版 次 2016 年 12 月第 1 版 2016 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-305-17475-9

定 价 20.00 元

网址: <http://www.njupco.com>

官方微博: <http://weibo.com/njupco>

官方微信号: njupress

销售咨询热线: (025)83594756

---

\* 版权所有, 侵权必究

\* 凡购买南大版图书, 如有印装质量问题, 请与所购  
图书销售部门联系调换

# 《翻译论坛》

顾问：张柏然

主编：许 钧

执行主编：吴文智 周领顺

## 编辑委员会

主任：俞洪亮

副主任：秦 旭 王金铨

编委(按姓氏音序排列)：

曹明伦 葛校琴 顾明栋 廖七一 罗选民

穆 雷 秦 旭 王 宁 王东风 王金铨

王克非 魏向清 吴文智 谢天振 许 钧

于建华 俞洪亮 仲伟合 周领顺

# 目 录

## 海外特稿

Translating China for Western Readers in the Context of Globalization (Part II)	Mingdong Gu	1
---	-------------	---

## 译论纵横

翻译地理学视域下的日本民族翻译文化研究	许建忠 鹿 彬	8
莫娜·贝克的叙事理论在翻译中的应用	黄 婷 黄 勤	15
从功能主义翻译目的论看林语堂的自译	张 欣 卞建华	19
从翻译的文化功能看中国典籍外译	王炎强	23

## 人才培养

论特色翻译教育的顶层设计及基层实践——MTI/BTI之旅游翻译与导译专业建设案例探索	陈 刚	28
基于案例教学法的翻译伦理探讨	李 平 许先文	36
社会建构主义视角下的法语翻译教学	陈 寒	41

## 批评鉴赏

《李有才板话》沙博理译本中板话英译探究	任东升 闫莉平	44
语用学视角下的乌克兰幽默文学翻译——以《维尼楚克的奇幻世界》为例	杨 靖	49
上古汉语称谓英译策略的生态翻译学解读——以《孟子》刘殿爵译本第一第二人称 名词性称谓为例	张 华	54
翻译美学视阈下文化负载词的翻译——以葛译《生死疲劳》为例	彭秀银	59

## 译者研究

陈荣捷朱子学译介研究惯习理论考察	蔡瑞珍	66
------------------	-----	----

## 学术争鸣

能以“three virtues”译“又用三德”之“三德”吗？	陆振慧	72
能说“翻译中国”吗？	张经浩	76

## 文化寻迹

原文与译文之间——俄克拉荷马大学中国文学翻译档案馆简介	许诗焱	80
韦努蒂翻译思想影响因素研究	冯 蕾 鲍德旺	83

## 图书评介

后现代主义语境下的词典理论研究范式——《当代词典范式演进的后现代主义精神》述评	陈丛梅	86
语料库翻译文体学研究的全新突破——《语料库翻译文体学》评介	秦 静	90

# Main Contents

Translating China for Western Readers in the Context of Globalization (Part II)	Mingdong Gu
A Study on Japanese Translation Culture from the Perspective of Translation Geography	Xu Jianzhong & Lu Bin
The Application of Mona Baker's Narrative Theory in Translation	Huang Ting & Huang Qin
The Self-Translation Works of Lin Yutang from the Perspective of Skopos Theory	Zhang Xin & Bian Jianhua
Cultural Function of Translation and Going Global of the Chinese Culture	Wang Yanqiang
On the Overarching Design and Infrastructure Practice of Specialized Translation	
Education—A Sampled Case for Tourism Translation and Guide-Interpreting	
as MTI/BTI	Chen Gang
A Case-Based Study on Ethics in the Translating Process	Li Ping, Xu Xianwen
A Probe into Sidney Shapiro's English Translation of the 13 Broad Speeches in <i>Rhymes of Li Youcai</i>	Ren Dongsheng & Yan Liping
On the Translation of Humor in Ukraine Literature from the Perspective of Pragmatics	
—A Case Study of <i>The Fantastic Worlds of Yuri Vynnychuk</i>	Yang Jing
Translation and Study of Zhuism by Wing-tsit Chan: A Habitus Perspective	Cai Ruizhen
Are They Right in Rendering the“三德” in “义用三德” into “three virtues”?	Lu Zhenhui
Between the Original and the Translated: Introduction to the Chinese Literature	
Translation Archive at the University of Oklahoma	Xu Shiyan
On the Study of the Influence of Venuti's Translation Theory	Feng Lei & Bao Dewang

## Translating China for Western Readers in the Context of Globalization (Part II)

The University of Texas at Dallas Mingdong Gu

A translation as the continued life of an original is not determined by the author, or even by the translator. In large measure, it is determined by the reader. To readers of the target language, neither the original text of the source language nor the author of the original text is a concern; only the translated final product matters. This is amply reflected in the translations of Chinese poetry undertaken by some Anglo-American modernist poets. T. S. Eliot once convincingly illustrated this point in his comments on Ezra Pound's translation of Chinese poetry: "... it must be pointed out that Pound is the inventor of Chinese poetry for our time."<sup>21</sup> Eliot's statement has been understood to mean that Pound's *Cathay* poems are not so much a translation of original Chinese poems as poems recreated out of the Chinese materials. This understanding, however, is not entirely adequate to Eliot's view. While recognizing Eliot's characterization of Pound as an "inventor of Chinese poetry," scholars tend to overlook his qualifying words, "for our time," and fail to grapple with Eliot's concern with the relationship between poetic creation and translation. In his comments, Eliot observes: "I suspect that every age has had, and will have, the same illusion concerning translations, an illusion which is not altogether an illusion either. When a foreign poet is successfully done into the idiom of our own lan-

guage and our own time, we believe that he has been 'translated'; we believe that through this translation we really at last get the original" (Ibid.). Then he goes on to enumerate some famous cases of translations from other languages into English: Chapman's translation of Homer and North's translation of Plutarch in the Elizabethan age. But because Eliot and his contemporaries are not Elizabethans, they do not have the illusion of successful translation; rather, they consider Chapman's and North's translation as creative writings. In the same way, if a modern Chapman or North appeared, English-speaking readers would believe that he was the real translator and they should give him the credit of doing a good job of translating a foreign text and achieving what Eliot called the "translucence" of translation. Eliot regarded the Tudor translations as "magnificent specimens of Tudor prose." In his opinion, the same can be said of Pound: "His translations seem to be—and that is the test of excellence—translucencies; we *think* we are closer to the Chinese than when we read, for instance, Legge. I doubt this; I predict that in three hundred years Pound's *Cathay* will be a 'Windsor Translation' as Chapman and North are now 'Tudor Translations'; it will be called (and justly) a 'magnificent specimen of XXth Century poetry' rather than a 'translation.' Each generation must

translate for itself.” Then in unequivocal terms, Eliot explains why he considers Pound an inventor of Chinese poetry: “This is as much as to say that Chinese poetry, as we know it today, is something invented by Ezra Pound” (Ibid. , xviii-ix).

Translation is a dynamic process of reciprocity which results in a paradoxical situation in which the text to be translated and the translator are mutually influenced by each other. Eliot’s comment on Pound’s translations from the Chinese and other languages touches upon this paradoxical situation: a translator is definitely influenced by what he translates; but he or she also exerts influence on the translated materials: “It is probable that the Chinese, as well as Provençals and the Italians and the Saxons, influenced Pound, for no one can work intelligently with a foreign matter without being affected by it; on the other hand, it is certain that Pound has influenced the Chinese and the Provençals and the Italians and the Saxons—not the matter *an sich*, which is unknowable, but the matter as we know it” (Ibid. ). Eliot’s statement can be understood to mean that a translator will put his own stamp on his translations, thereby transforming a foreign text into a hybrid text that integrates the cultural and linguistic baggage of the original text and all that pertains to the translator, his mother tongue, his native culture, his inborn talent, and his distinct personality.

There is a problem that often embarrasses Chinese translations: a Chinese text is faithfully translated into a Western language, but it does not fly, and certainly does not appeal to the Western reader.<sup>22</sup> As a consequence, we often notice, many “faithful” translations of Chinese texts are simply ignored, while less faithful translations like Pound’s translation of a Chinese poem have greater appeal to

the English reader. Eliot’s observation of the paradox and illusion of translation behooves us to give adequate consideration to the reader’s perspective in translation. From this perspective, a translator’s duty is not just simply to render into the target language a foreign text; he or she is obliged to take into account the question: “Does my translation read like a text of the target language?” This question is what Eliot had in mind and lies at the core of our decision to adopt the title, “Translating China for Western Readers.” It highlights the concerted efforts of all the essays in this volume “to turn a Chinese text into a text readily accessible to and recognized by the Western reader through the medium of translation.” Only when a Chinese text is naturalized and achieves a translucence in a Western language can one say that successful translation has been done. Such translations are more than mere transmissions of the content of the originals, whose life, as Benjamin puts it, “attains in them to their ever-renewed latest and most abundant flowering.”<sup>23</sup>

I have briefly covered the preferred theory of translation for this volume. Because of our concern with rendering Chinese texts for Western readers, our volume is based on a conceptual model of translation that emphasizes producing reader-friendly translations. Reader-friendliness will not only serve as the unifying theme but also provide an overall conceptual guideline for all the articles. With this theme and guideline, this volume does not attempt to address general issues in the theory and practice of Chinese-Western translations but will make it a priority to tackle the problems and difficulties in translating premodern and modern Chinese texts specifically for the Western reader.



## Scope and Content

The whole collection consists of twelve papers neatly divided into three sections. There are four papers in Part I. Despite their diverse interests and topics, they are concerned with such general issues as the nature, function, rationale, criteria, historical and conceptual values of translation. The first paper is Chung-Ying Cheng's "Hermeneutic Principles of Understanding as the Logical Foundation of Translation." In the article, Cheng adopts a conceptual approach to translation and explores the logical foundation of translation in terms of hermeneutical principles of human understanding. Based on the conceptual inquiry and analysis of some concrete examples, he proposes seven principles of translation to serve as the logical foundation of the possibility of translation and as practical criteria for appraising the adequacy of translations. Then, he puts the principles to test by analyzing some chosen examples of existing translations of classical Chinese texts like the *Zhouyi* (Book of Changes), *Lunyu* (Confucian Analects), and *Daode Jing* (The Way and Its Power), and offers his further insights.

The second paper is an essay by Martin Svensson Ekström. It explores the relationship between metaphor and translation in the translation of ancient Chinese texts into English. Ekström raises a simple question, "Does the Metaphor Translate?" and goes on to relate the concept of metaphor with that of translation in the specific context of Chinese poetry and the larger context of Western intellectual thought. Critically analyzing the metaphor of "flaw in the jade" and that of the "flaw in words" in a *Shijing* poem, he argues that translation from Chinese to Western languages carries over one whole set of cultural

and linguistic notions from one realm to another and heads towards two interrelated directions; while one is phenomenological and conceptual, the other is idiomatic, hermeneutic, and intercultural. Recalling the idea that *translatio* is the Latin "translation" of the Greek concept of *metaphora*, he suggests that translation and metaphor share a common ground in locating sensibility for the similar in the dissimilar, and vice versa. On the metaphorical ground, he believes, rest the premises for translating Chinese literature into Western languages.

Wang Ning's "Translating Chinese Literature: Decanonization and Recanonization" addresses the issues of canon formation and reformation through translation in the historical development of literature. He suggests that because canons are manipulated by certain power relations, translation has played an important role in reconstructing different literary canons in different languages and cultural backgrounds. Employing Walter Benjamin's view that translation endows a literary work with a "continued" life or an "afterlife," he makes an observation of how modern Chinese literature is translated into English and forms a unique modern Chinese literary canon, which differs significantly from that constructed by domestic literary historians. He draws the conclusion that translation can both "decanonize" an established literary canon and "recanonize" a new literary canon in a cross-cultural context. His essay offers an interesting study which shows how Western readers' reading plays a role in Chinese canon formation.

Using Anglo-American modernist poets' fascination with and translation of Chinese poetry as analytic data, Mingdong Gu's essay attempts to rethink the nature, function and criteria for assessment of translation in terms

of two newly formulated concepts: “readerly translation” and “writerly translation.” It argues that translation is not simply an act of rendering a source text into a target language; it is a complex hermeneutic act with the aim to produce a performative continuum in which the translator assumes multiple roles of reader, scholar, critic, thinker, and writer. The outcome of such a hermeneutic act is a multiple textual spectrum with readerly translation at one pole and writerly translation at the other. Drawing insights from the views and practice of some Anglo-American modernist poets’ translation of Chinese poetry, the essay suggests that an ideal translator is not merely a competent reader who has a mastery of both source and target languages, or a sensitive reader who is able to discover hidden connections in a source text, but one who should be a well-trained scholar who has intimate knowledge of source-text culture and target-text culture, a discerning critic who possesses a high literary sensitivity and can tell the strengths and weaknesses of a translated text, a practical thinker who can apply insights derived from reading, scholarship, and translation criticism, and a creative writer who is worthy of being ranked among first-rate authors.

Part II has four papers, which focus on the art and craft of translation and offer practical ways and tips. A common theme of this part is how to produce reader-friendly texts in translating classical Chinese thought and poetry into Western languages. As most papers in this part address the formal, stylistic, and technical aspects of translation, they show a distinct regard for the translation of poetry and thought as an art. Unlike most papers in this section, which discuss translations of literary works, Michael Nylan’s paper, “Translating Texts in Chinese History and

Philosophy,” focuses on frequently met problems in translating historical and philosophical works from early and middle-period China. As a senior scholar of early China, Nylan is also an experienced translator of early Chinese texts. In addition, she has served as an editor for a translation series on “Classics of Early Chinese Thought” and read numerous manuscripts of translations. With the aim to improve the sophistication of translations, she has pondered whether it would be possible to supply a list of comments and cautions relating to the craft of translation, which may serve as a practical guide for scholars and translators who work on translating classical Chinese texts into Western languages. Through a critical analysis of chosen examples, she identifies a series of pitfalls in translating classical texts, which include failures to convey a sense of the irony and sarcasm in the original, to have the translation reflect the usage of the time it was written, to alert the reader to the precise original context for the composition, to outline the history of the later reception of important writings, and to maintain the same level of ambiguity as in the original text. On the basis of analysis, she proposes practical ways to translate concepts, ideas, notions and practices peculiar to early China, and offers precious advice to specialists, translators and common readers of early Chinese texts. Her paper also discusses the contradictory desires nursed by translators of historical and philosophical works: they want to make the translation understandable to as wide an audience as possible and at the same time cherish the contrary desires to retain the air of strangeness of rhetorical features in the foreign texts that date back to a remote past.

Fusheng Wu’s paper discusses the textual and extra-textual prerequisites for translating medieval Chinese panegyric poetry. He

points out that in translating panegyric poetry, one encounters the common challenges in translating any classical Chinese poetry into English, but the challenges become serious issues because of the overtly political and sometimes grave contexts in which the panegyric poems were composed. English translations of this genre tend to overtly represent originally vague, indirect references or information, thereby causing the translated versions to lose their original subtlety and nuance. While one may choose to sacrifice English translation by keeping the original Chinese syntax, thereby foregrounding its foreignness, Wu advocates a middle path.

Liu Huawen's essay examines the Chinese-English translation of poetry in terms of a Chinese aesthetic principle, *jingjie*(境界), a category originating in Buddhism but assimilated into Chinese classical literary criticism. Initiated by the Chinese erudite Qian Zhongshu, it develops into a new concept, *huajing* (化境, transformation of realms), in the discourse on translation. This concept in translation posits two aesthetic realms which respectively exist in the target text and the source text. The transformation of one into the other realm in the English translation of Chinese poetry rests on the attainment of *jingjie* where the perceiving agent experiences an aesthetic immediacy of the images and the world. In actual practice of translation, one must address the problems arising from eventualization, a tendency in the translation from noun-dominated Chinese into verb-dominated English. Illustrating with examples, Liu discusses how to maintain the tension between the tendency to employ image in the Chinese poem and the event in the English version when translating Chinese classical poetry.

Richard John Lynn is an accomplished

translator as well as scholar of classical Chinese literature and thought. Over the many years of his scholarly career, he has accumulated a rich experience in translation, which he wishes to share with others. His paper, "Internet and Electronic Resources for Translation of Pre-Modern Chinese Texts and How to Use Them," is unique in this collection. It shows how internet resources have transformed procedures for translating premodern Chinese texts and offers practical ways of making full use of existing internet and electronic resources to facilitate the translation process. It extensively covers electronic and online dictionaries and encyclopedias; enormous databases of digital texts such as *Siku quanshu*, *Sibu congkan*, and *Gujin tushu jicheng*, as well as other database sites in Mainland China, Chinese Taiwan, Chinese Hong Kong, and Japan; online bibliographical, historical, philosophical, religious and literary resource reference and resource sites. In addition, Lynn summarizes practical tips on how to use them for translation. The summarized tips come in two categories: one for native speakers of English and one for native speakers of Chinese. They will help both Chinese and Western translators who engage in rendering premodern Chinese texts into Western languages.

Part III addresses critical assessments of translation policy, formal issues, and aesthetic issues in translation, and examines the interplay between the author and translator, the translator and the reader, the translator and his creative works, and translations and the market. Wolfgang Kubin is an accomplished writer of poetry, novels, and essays, as well as an experienced translator who has translated a large amount of Chinese literature into German. His essay, "Translators in Brackets or Random Thoughts about

Translation Work," is a deep reflection on some general issues involved in translating texts in modern and contemporary Chinese literature into Western languages, including: Why does one want to be a translator? What are the prerequisites for a translator? How should one select texts for translation? Why is a translated work well or ill received? Why does the reception of a translation differ from one country to another? What relationship should be maintained between a translator and a writer? What decides the interaction between the translator and the publisher and between translation and the market? His sharp observations afford a rare insight into how Chinese writings, especially fiction and poetry, are translated and received by readers in some Western nations.

The next two papers discuss translating classical Chinese poetry for Western readers with attention to form. Frederick Turner is an internationally renowned poet-scholar and translator. Although he does not know Chinese, he carried on the American tradition of collaborative translation initiated by Ernest Fenollosa and perfected by Ezra Pound and Amy Lowell and others, and brought out a volume of Tang poetry that integrates faithful rendition and poetic creation. Precisely because he does not know the Chinese language, he turned a disadvantage into an advantage by considering translating Chinese poetry from the perspective of the English reader. His paper addresses several prerequisites for a successful collaborative venture: the art of collaborative translation; the need to understand the social, political, spiritual, and philosophical context of the Tang poets; and the problem of translating the formal peculiarities and beauties of a body of very ancient, tonal, highly formal, and ideographic verse. In his own translation practice, he turns problems

that would seem individually insuperable into solutions. He makes metrical fidelity serve as a guide to preserving the tone and voice of the original Chinese poems. Employing ample examples of his own translation, he argues that a broader cultural understanding of the tradition and the period can suggest analogies with Western periods, styles and forms, and thus ways of rendering the translation familiarly unfamiliar or unfamiliarly familiar. A sample of his translated poems with annotations will offer translators, scholars, and readers a poet's profound insights into the art of Chinese poetry and the art of translation.

Tony Barnstone is also poet-scholar. His paper discusses how to address formal issues in translating Chinese poetry. Placing translation in the larger context of "world literature," he addresses some problems or what he terms "paradoxes" arising from translating literary texts from Chinese into English in particular and from one language to another language in general. He examines the dichotomy between original and copy in translation; the relationship between translation and creation, and the search for the hidden poem behind the given poem through formal strategies in the original so as to create a new original after translation. In a way, the two papers most fully reflect the spirit of the symposium because they deal with the problem of how to turn a Chinese text into a Western text through translation.

Yuehong Chen's essay critically reviews the craft of translation by two well-known American poets, Ezra Pound and Amy Lowell, and proposes a new translation assessment criterion. Chen argues that traditionally faithfulness in translation is basically restricted to the linguistic level. As a translation principle, it cannot do justice to the aesthetic beauty of the original and, as a standard of

assessment, cannot conduct a fair evaluation of a translation. In her efforts to deconstruct the binary opposition between “beauty” and “fidelity” in translation, Chen turns a famous Chinese aesthetic principle, *yijing* (literally, ideorealm, or aesthetic conception) into a new criterion for measuring the quality of translations. She suggests that as a classical Chinese poem largely rests on the construction of an ideorealm, its successful translation depends on the extent to which the translator succeeds in reproducing the aesthetic conception of the original poem. The more closely a translation reproduces the original aesthetic conception, the greater success it achieves. Employing this proposed idea as the yardstick for her reassessment of Pound’s and Lowell’s translations, she concludes that while Lowell’s renditions are more faithful to the originals at the linguistic level, Pound’s translations are more faithful to the originals at the aesthetic level. She concludes that since Pound has done a more successful job in reproducing the beauty of the original ideorealm, his seemingly unfaithful translations are paradoxically more desirable as a form of translation art.

This volume distinguishes itself from available books on Chinese-English translation via several special features. First and foremost, many of the authors are nationally and internationally renowned scholars from prestigious universities in several countries. Unlike authors of other similar books, they are both renowned scholars in their own fields and practicing translators who have done a good deal of translation. Second, the book mostly deals with translation from classical Chinese texts into Western languages, an area which has not been given sufficient attention due to the difficulty of rendering classical Chinese into modern Western languages. Third,

it is both theory driven and practice oriented, aiming to provide scholars and translators with conceptual principles and practical techniques of translation. A distinctive feature of the book is its direct wrestling with the difficulties in translating premodern Chinese texts, an area translators of Chinese culture tend to avoid due to its more demanding prerequisites for a translator. Thus, it may serve as a guide and reference book for those who want to dedicate themselves to translating premodern Chinese materials. In general, we hope it will make a contribution to the advancement of translation from Chinese into Western languages and vice versa.

### Notes

[21] Ibid., 71.

[22] T. S. Eliot, “Introduction” to *Selected Poems of Ezra Pound* (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1928), xvii.

[23] A case in point is the publication of 大中华文库 (Library of Chinese Classics; Chinese-English), a major translation project undertaken in China to systematically introduce Chinese classics to the world. With original classical Chinese texts, modern Chinese translations, and English translations placed side by side, the project has afforded China specialists and common readers alike much needed firsthand source materials of Chinese culture, and made an inestimable contribution to cultural exchanges between China and the world. However, while most of the available texts provide excellent English versions of the original Chinese works, some do not appeal to English readers because of their faithful but insipid English rendition.

[24] Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator,” 72.

[作者信息] Mingdong Gu, 美国达拉斯德州大学 (The University of Texas at Dallas) 人文艺术学院教授, 芝加哥大学博士。

## 翻译地理学视域下的日本民族翻译文化研究

天津外国语大学/洛阳师范学院 许建忠 鹿彬

**摘要:**本文从翻译地理学的视角探讨民族文化在文化全球化背景下遇到的种种现象和问题,通过日本民族文化对外来文化的模仿、吸收、选择、放弃以及融汇生发等特点,分析在特定空间内审视文化交融问题的各种影响和制约因素,为探索今后民族文化在全球国际交流频繁及其发展趋势积累经验和教训;同时,以日本借鉴外来中西方文化过程中出现的种种现象为例,揭示翻译在文化交流渗透过程中的重要使命和价值,探索民族文化保持常青的经验教训,以供当前文化发展潮流借鉴和思考。

**关键词:**翻译地理学;日本民族;翻译文化

民族文化是指一个民族在其长期的历史发展过程中创造和发展起来的具有显著民族特征的文化,是其所有优秀物质文化和精神文化的总和。在全球化的世界体系中,民族文化是一个民族身份的象征。每一个民族都有它传统的文化习俗和悠久的文化遗产,这些传统构成了这个民族国际舞台上的鲜明特征。民族文化同时也反映着民族成员的思维方式、价值取向、伦理观念、国民品性等属于深层结构的东西,反映着特定的人际关系和价值体系。这种深层结构的文化,及其所承载的人际关系和价值体系,充分反映着文化的民族性。这实际上就是一个民族与别的民族在文化特质方面的根本区别。因此,一旦民族文化传统消失,该民族成员会感到身份认同危机以及缺乏归属感。

在全球一体化的今天,交流与融合是发展的大潮。只有顺应潮流,才能创造和谐的翻译新局面。全球化带来了挑战,同时也提供了发展的机遇。在地球村,各个文化群落不得不面对各种新思潮带来的挑战,这些新思潮必然会挑战本土文化固有的思想和观念,考验文化群落思想观念的先进性、科学性和适用性。但同时,这些挑战也必然引发深入的思考,根据具体情况做出理性的应对策略,更新观念,甚至创造

出更新的理念。在这样的时代背景下,民族文化的传承与发展,民族文化与空间内其他文化发生的碰撞和融合,都会带来新的文化现象和文化思潮。翻译,作为空间内协调不同文化实现理解的手段和方法,需要从民族地理学、文化地理学等相关视域中借鉴相关的信息和思路,才能真正实现民族文化的丰富与互补。

随着翻译活动的深入发展,各种文化相互碰撞、相互渗透、相互影响,任何一个民族文化都不会轻易地、彻底地被取代,而是在其他文化融合的过程中多样性发展。文化的全球化,就是各民族文化通过交流与融合、互渗和互补,不断突破本民族文化地域和模式的局限性而走向世界,不断超越本民族文化的国界,并在人类的评判和取舍中获得文化的认同,将本民族文化随着社会的进步、科技的发展而有效传承并深入下去。因此,只有通过学习和借鉴历史上民族文化在外来文化侵入的巨大压力下,成功消化融合吸收的经验教训,才能探索在文化全球化的今天,民族文化的发展方向 and 趋势。

### 一 翻译与日本民族地理

影响翻译发展的因素有很多,例如翻译资源布局就受到地带和地形、地貌的影响,平原地区翻译资源的分布比较均匀,而山区或偏远



地区翻译资源分布比较零散。而影响翻译资源分布的直接原因是人口的数量,城市人口密集,农村,特别是偏远的农村,人口稀少而分散,因而其翻译资源的分布格局是很不相同的;翻译同时也受当地经济发展水平的影响,比如,城市的经济发展比农村快,沿海地区比内地发达,这就决定了发达地区的翻译资源大大多于欠发达地区,因为发达地区经济发展快,对外合作机会多,对翻译的需求大。这里选择日本民族文化出现的空间内部的不同文化之间的冲突和解决实例,是为了对当前的某些区域空间内部发生的文化冲突提供借鉴经验。日本民族文化特色和我们国家各个民族的文化特色有相似之处,都具有与外来文化鲜明差异的民族特色,因此,在关注多元文化共存的过程中,在探索自己民族文化在全球化背景冲击下的发展趋势,可以借鉴其他民族曾经出现的种种民族文化发展以及矛盾冲突问题,以及如何避免这些矛盾冲突再次发生。

首先,介绍一下日本的地理概况。日本位于亚洲最东部,太平洋西北角,其最古的底层于古生代中期(4.3亿年至3.5亿年前)已经形成。它曾于亚洲大陆相连,经过长期激烈的地壳运动,进入旧石器时代洪积期(约1万至2万年以前)后,它逐渐与大陆分离。进入冲积期后,逐渐形成如今的弧状列岛状态(叶渭渠,2005:3)。因此,日本虽处岛国,却并非是孤岛,其曾是亚洲大陆的一部分。这种特殊的地理形势,酿成了后来日本民族的双重性格:一方面是岛国人固有的闭塞性、狭隘性和排他性;另一方面是接近大陆的地理位置所形成的开放性、吸收性和宽容性(沈仁安,2004:319)。

其次,再来看看日本的民族地理概况。8世纪初,日本最早的历史文学作品《古事记》问世,其中记载了许多关于日本的国土、皇族和民族由来的神话传说。事实上,与上述的资料一样,日本国土无疑是在自然界规律的作用下形成的,而日本民族也和其他民族一样,是根据人类的发展规律经历了长期的各种血统混合而诞生的。但由于日本地处海成层,岛上物

资匮乏,关于列岛上是否有原始人存在,一直处于争论之中。1957年,日本丰桥市牛川町发现人类化石,也就是“牛川人”,是日本列岛发现的最早的人骨化石,具有“古人”的特征,这就说明早在旧石器时代日本岛就已经有原始人类开始活动了。

关于日本人类起源的问题,史学界一般认为,在远古交通不发达的条件下,从外流入日本北部(现北海道地区)的蒙古种人、通古斯人(满族祖先),以及南方的马来种人再向外回流的可能性微乎其微,又与后来的归化人(主要是指从朝鲜和中国赴日的韩人和汉人,前者主要从事劳役,后者主要传授技能)在日本这一异常封闭的环境中发生了融合。《崇神纪》十一年条记载:“是岁,异族多归化。”以及十二年三月的诏书也曾有“异俗重来,海外已归化”的记录。这些都是对这些现实情况的文字映射。

从这可以看出,日本民族并不像中华民族一样是由单一人种衍化而来,而是经过长时期、多人种的混居融合发展而成。在此期间不同种族之间的原始信仰也开始为了调整民族之间的对立层面而进行融合。原始信仰是人类宗教的原生形态,而宗教作为一种奇特的文化形态,是人对客观环境错误的感觉、认识及至荒谬解释的结果(程裕祯,2003:86)。原始信仰的融合其实就可以看作是最早的文化融合。由此来看,日本民族从其根本上就是一个不断吸收、不断排斥、不断归化的民族,其民族文化也对这一特征有了充分的继承。

日本由于岛国特殊的地理环境和生存环境,使日本呈现既开放又封闭的地理状态,这种矛盾的地理状态形成了日本人既排斥又吸收,既自尊又自卑的国民特性。体现在艺术形式上则是日本艺术既自然又人工,既伤感又亢奋的特征,使日本的艺术设计呈现一幅幅特有的景观:似是而非,矛盾共生。

借助翻译地理学的视角,关注当前国家的城镇化扩张问题,全国各个城市都在拆迁,忙着建设城中村。可是在这样高效建成的区域空间内,就忽视了一个重要的文化建设和交流

问题,即城中村的居民,就像日本这样的岛国一样,来自不同的文化信仰,有自己的生活习惯,对于城市的环境,是喜欢又讨厌,对待外人的态度是既排斥又模仿,既自尊又自卑的区域内空间群体的特性,一旦形成了既排斥又吸收的空间文化特色,就会使得城中村中的城市消费文化理念迅速蔓延,而原先作为乡村美好的乡土、恭敬、勤劳甚至诚实的品质却渐渐消失,这样就为空间矛盾的产生奠定基础。同时,当空间内部的群落既自尊又自卑,那么对于外来文化模式的态度就会产生抵抗和排斥,因此,交流和沟通尤为重要。这就需要一种“再现”文化景观的方式,将有利于民族特质的空间群体意识和品质,以一种特殊的空间生产形式再现、表征出来,使得不同群落实现理解和交流,将矛盾共生的空间个体协调统一起来,以减少那些本可以避免的矛盾和冲突。

## 二 翻译与日本文化地理

文化地理学是研究人类文化的空间组合,人类活动所创造的文化在起源、传播方面与环境关系的学科。文化地理学研究,旨在探索各地区人类社会的文化定型活动,人们对景观的开发利用及影响,人类文化在改善生态环境过程中所起的作用,以及该地区区域特性文化继承性,简单地说,就是研究人类文化活动的空间变化。它既是人文地理学的重要分支,又是文化学的一个组成部分。

翻译无论是作为一种活动本身,作为一种活动过程,还是作为一种活动结果,都具有一定的文化意味。翻译活动能否开展、如何开展以及在哪些领域开展,都取决于译语文化的诸多因素。翻译的结果不但丰富了民族文化,而且在某种程度上反映了文化的变迁与发展。实际上,翻译与文化地理之间是互动的。从宏观上把握翻译与文化地理的关系,为从文化学与跨文化交际学的角度研究翻译理论提供了现实依据。

### 1. 模仿领会

由于日本特殊地理环境的开放性和独特

民族性格的吸收性,使其自身文化在发展过程中对外来先进文化进行了不同程度的吸收和模仿。下面将以日本的文字和科技两方面为例,分析日本对东西方文化的模仿领会。

文字是文化的一种载体,记载了文化发展的历史轨迹和丰富成果(程裕祯,2003:61)。而且人类历史上一种高级文化对相对低级文化的渗透,或者低级文化对相对高级文化的引进往往都是从文字开始的。以朝鲜为例,据《乐浪郡时代遗迹》记载,朝鲜曾出土过刻有“乐浪富贵”、“乐浪礼官”、“千秋万岁”等字样的瓦当,以及凤凰“万岁”印和“天帝皇神”印。这不仅反映了汉字的传入,也反映了中国儒学的传入。

13世纪,日本进入自身文化转型的重要时期——镰仓时代,当时的神道学者卜部兼方在自己的《释日本纪》中写道:“与和字者,其起可在神代。”这是关于日本“神代文字”论的最早起源。事实上,和日本语言的“神代论”一样,神代只是人类原始时代对自身起源的一种神秘的幻想的产物,缺乏事实和史实依据支撑。而且日本人斋部广成在其《古语拾遗》中写道:“盖闻上古之世,未有文字。”《隋书·东夷传·倭国》有载:“倭国,无文字,惟刻木结绳。敬佛法,于百济求得佛经,始有文字。”由此,我们可以看出日本文字是从外国引进发展而来的,所引进的就是中国汉字。汉字的传入时间,从日本的种种出土文物如货币、铜镜和金印来看,应该是在日本弥生时代,也就是公元前后。据《后汉书·东夷传》记载,建武中元二年东汉光武帝曾赐印绶于倭奴国王。1784年,刻有“汉倭奴国王”字样的金印于九州志贺岛出土,对此史实进行了印证。而在京都熊野郡出土的王莽时代铸有“货泉”二字的货币,更是迄今发现的日本最早记载着文字的遗物,由此可见,日本最早是在引进汉字以后才获得文字的。

日本《古事记》应神段有载:和迺吉师贡进《论语》十卷、《千字文》一卷。这是有关儒学传入日本的最早记载,而中国儒佛典籍经朝鲜半岛传入日本,加速了日本人对汉字的学习。制



作于5、6世纪之后的和歌山县隅田八幡宫的人物画像镜,共有48个铭文,其中固有名的音假名表记明显出于日本人之手。这说明日本人开始自由地运用汉字,并使用日本固有的语言来读汉字,也就是我们现在所说的“训读”。由此我们可以这样推断,此时日本的文字不仅仅是吸收汉字而已,而是已经开始走上了模仿、进化之路。

在我国隋唐时期,随着和日本交流的不断加强,日语文字模仿、进化速度不断升级,并逐渐开始独立。如推古四年(596年)的《元兴寺露盘铭》(现已无存)和推古三十六年(628年)的《法隆寺金堂药师佛光背铭》,其中的文字已经突破汉文的规范,不但很多汉字已具有与原义已经全然不同的和式意义,而且句法也开始出现和式句法。在此基础上,日本人于9世纪创造了假名,并逐步完成了汉字的日本化。对汉字的模仿使日本文化有了书面化的载体,并以此使得自身文明得以延续。而明治维新时期,对西方科技文明的引进吸收,则可以看作是日本民族和日本社会的一次转型和飞跃。

民族和社会赖以存在的基础就是生产,而生产方式改革的动力往往就是科技的进步。在第一次工业革命的推动下,资产阶级革命席卷了整个欧洲,日本的明治维新之所以能迅速改变其自身的落后面貌,原因就在于对西方科技的引进和吸收。这一时期日本的资本主义产业实际上是从官办企业开始的,并以此进行了自上而下的移植、改造。明治三年(1870年)日本工部省成立,其目的在于“工艺之事,其用甚大,富强之道,无有比之更为急务者……劝奖百工,开明工学,管理矿山,铺设与维修铁路、通讯、灯塔,制造船舰、机械,测量海陆”等(石冢裕道,1973:29)。虽然工部省的经营重点主要集中在铁路和矿山等重型工业方面,并未达到“劝奖百工”的目的,但是却为日后日本向军事资本主义产业转型打下了坚实基础,成为了日本资本主义的一大特征。

1873年,日本内务省成立,日本资本主义产业进入新阶段。由于工部省在大型重工方

面打下了生产基础,这就使得这一时期的日本产业具有了明确的资本主义生产特征,诸如机器生产的引进,产品的社会化等。这时产生了一些“模范工厂”,就文化吸收和模仿而言,具有代表性的就是富冈制丝厂。因为日本自“开国”、对外通商以来,对外出口的货物主要就是生丝,所以该厂的成立,一方面保证了生丝出口的质量,另一方面也加速了新的生产技术在各地制丝厂的推广,使得在1890年前后,机械缫丝达到了日本国产生丝的40%(楫西光速,1950:294)。

综上所述,日本对东西方不同文化的引进、吸收和模仿促成了自身文化在精神和物质两个方面的飞跃。这种对民族性格和地理位置积极面的发扬,不但使得日本民族文化永葆青春,而且也是对世界文明发展的巨大贡献。

## 2. 排斥拒绝

上述资料论述了日本地理环境和民族性格中的积极面,但是也不能忽略其中的消极面,即地理环境的闭塞性和民族性格的排他性。因为这种消极面的存在,使得日本对外来文化的吸收模仿过程中出现了排斥和拒绝的现象,下面将以东西方文明在日本的渗透过程中受到的一系列排斥为例,对此现象加以分析。

以中国文明为首的东方文明对日本的输出物,不仅仅有上述所提到的汉字和儒学,其实还有宗教信仰,即佛教。公元6世纪,佛家作为大陆文明的载体经朝鲜半岛传入日本(叶渭渠,2005:87)。成书于8世纪的《日本书纪》卷19中曾对佛教的传入有如此记载:钦明天皇十三年(公元552年)“冬十月,百济圣明天王遣西部姬氏达率怒俚斯登献释迦佛金铜像一躯,幡盖若干,经论若干卷”。

同世界其他地区 and 民族一样,原始社会的日本普遍存在着对自然界的精灵崇拜和对祖先的崇拜。在进入绳纹文化时代以前已开始有灵魂观念,此后的万物有灵论和祖先崇拜观念、宗教活动,都是它的发展形式(杨曾文,1995:13)。随着文明进化,这种原始信仰演变成为了日本的本土宗教——神道的先驱成分。