互文性：
《三国演义》多个英译本研究

Intertextuality in the English Translations of
San Guo Yan Yi

彭文青 著 ◀

互文性：
《三国演义》多个英译本研究

Intertextuality in the English Translations of
San Guo Yan Yi

彭文青　著

博学文库
编委会成员

出版说明

　　上海外语教育出版社始终坚持"服务外语教育、传播先进文化、推广学术成果、促进人才培养"的经营理念,凭借自身的专业优势和创新精神,多年来已推出各类学术图书600余种,为中国的外语教学和研究作出了积极的贡献。

　　为展示学术研究的最新动态和成果,并为广大优秀的博士人才提供广阔的学术交流的平台,上海外语教育出版社隆重推出"外教社博学文库"。该文库遴选国内的优秀博士论文,遵循严格的"专家推荐、匿名评审、好中选优"的筛选流程,内容涵盖语言学、文学、翻译和教学法研究等各个领域。该文库为开放系列,理论创新性强、材料科学翔实、论述周密严谨、文字简洁流畅,其问世必将为国内外广大读者在相关的外语学习和研究领域提供又一宝贵的学术资源。

<div align="right">上海外语教育出版社</div>

序言

　　彭文青的博士论文《互文性:〈三国演义〉多个英译本研究》已获得外教社博学文库的认可,即将交付书稿,她请我为她作序,我是很高兴的。彭文青从硕士开始成为我的学生,2013年提前完成硕士学业,而后继续攻读博士学位,又成了我的弟子,2016年,她的博士论文顺利通过答辩,并获得优秀等级,拿到博士学位。现在,她已成为一名年轻的讲师,走上了工作岗位。看到她这些年来的进步和取得的成果,看到学术事业后继有人,作为导师,我十分高兴,也十分欣慰。

　　彭文青是一位很有才华的青年学者,潜心学术研究,态度踏实认真。读博期间,她获得了中国国家留学基金管理委员会奖学金,赴英国伦敦大学学院联合培养博士一年,并按期于三年内完成了英文博士论文全稿,期间在核心期刊发表了论文,获得国家奖学金,被评为上海市优秀毕业生,能够取得这么多成绩是很不容易的。当今正是信息爆炸、充满诱惑的时代,不少学生忍受不住学术的冷清,或转而去做兼职、赚外快,或承受不住压力出现种种问题。在这样复杂的学术环境中,彭文青博士能够守住心中的净土,踏踏实实做学问,全面发展自己,极为难得。

　　从理论层面来看,彭文青博士的这本专著以互文性理论为依据和基础,通过对《三国演义》多个英译本的个案研究,对互文性理论本身作出了延展性思考,对某些界限模糊的问题进行了新的探讨,体现出较强的理论创新性。从研究对象来看,彭文青博士的专著将中国古典小说《三

国演义》三十个英译本、相应的副文本与其他相关西方作品等纳入一个完整全面的网络体系中，以此描述出译本之间、译本与原本之间错综复杂的互文关系。我从事《红楼梦》英译研究多年，坚持从文本出发，通过对译本语言的分析，结合与译者相关的副文本，研究译本风格与译者风格，我始终认为，中国古典文学作品的翻译历程值得我们深入研究与不断探索，我也鼓励我的学生们进行这一类的研究。彭文青选择了《三国演义》，她以这部作品的英译作为个案，并在海外留学期间收集了很多珍贵的一手资料，在一定程度上弥补了学界对早期译本研究的匮乏。同时，我自己进行译本词句研究时，尝试应用了一些电脑辅助文本分析软件，为译本语言分析提供更为宏观和可视化的数据与描述。在彭文青博士的这部专著中，也部分地应用了文本分析软件如PowerConc和PowerGrep，这种研究方式切合了翻译研究技术转向的趋势，可以与传统的文本分析方法结合起来，促进翻译研究的全面发展。

在中国文化走出去的时代背景下，如何讲好中国故事是各个领域都在关注的话题。中国古典文学的翻译与传播关乎国家软实力的提高与中国特色话语体系的建设，在服务国家"'一带一路'倡议"中发挥重要作用。我相信会有越来越多的人投身到中国典籍英译研究中来，有所收获、有所作为。

是为序。

冯庆华

2018年3月于上外虹口校区

前言

　　翻译研究经历了语言学转向与文化转向两个重要阶段，又在当代科技发展的背景下呈现出技术转向趋势，从关注文本或语言转换规律，到研究影响活动的外部因素，它体现出翻译研究方式方法的不断变革与扩展。翻译研究不仅要求译者深入分析译本正文，也要求译者关注序言、注解等副文本，将文本放置于历时与共时层面合理探究，勾勒全貌，从文本之间不断发现新的天地，展现相互交织的世界。

　　本书以中国古典小说《三国演义》多个英译本为个案，探讨文本中以及文本之间体现的互文关系。研究涉及的译本共有三十个，其中包括《三国演义》两个全译本，一个由译者邓罗（C. H. Brewitt-Taylor）完成，于1925年出版，另一个由译者罗慕士（Moss Roberts）完成，于1991年出版。研究还包括二十八个早期英文节译本，时间跨度是从1820年到1999年。所谓早期节译本是指在19世纪至20世纪期间，译者节选《三国演义》部分章节或人物，英译后或以单行本出版，或收录于文集中，或连载于刊物上。早期节译本涉及丰富多样的体裁与风格，比如某些节译本是以戏剧、长诗或神话故事的形式展现原作，某些节译文则夹杂于译者的论文或著述中，不同体裁的译本为探讨互文性提供了更大的研究空间。本研究对所有译本进行了细读和分析，并与相应的历史社会语境相结合，力求更全面地描述和探究译本及译者。本研究的核心问题包括：1)《三国演义》所有英译本之间存在怎样的互文关系？ 2）译者在译本

中发出了怎样的声音、书写了怎样的价值观？

IV　　基于对互文性理论的深刻理解，对于这两个问题，本书从影响、引用、平行、变形四个方面进行探讨，以《三国演义》多个英译本为案例，对互文性理论作了延展。论文主体部分共四章，第二章分析了一种较为模糊的互文关系即影响（Impact），包括前译本对重译本有怎样的影响，包括文本体裁、译者以及相关机构在译本之间的互文关系中发挥了怎样的作用。第三章探讨了另一种互文关系即引用（Quotation），从最为直接的抄袭，到间接的借用与参考，再到特殊的自我引用与自我指涉，深入分析了几个较为特殊的英译本及其关系。第四章讨论的平行概念（Parallel），属于比较文学范畴的常见术语，但在这一章中被赋予了不同的内涵，本章从《三国演义》评注的翻译、极端直译的文本、原作与西方文学的对比三个方面，丰富了平行概念在文学翻译中的维度与意义。第五章以文本的变形（Transformation）为焦点，以译者的选择为切入点，从文本变形和人物重塑两个角度，分析了原文与译文、译文之间的互文关系。

　　通过层层论证，本书以互文性理论为依据和基础，将《三国演义》所有英译本、相关的评注译文与其他西方作品等纳入一个完整全面的网络体系，从不同的层面与维度进行归类和分析，以此描述出译本之间、译本与原本之间错综复杂的互文关系。同时，通过对《三国演义》多个英译本的个案研究，也对互文性理论本身作出了延展性思考，尤其对某些界限模糊的问题进行了新的探讨。在研究材料方面，本研究较为完整地描述和分析了《三国演义》早期译本，在一定程度上弥补了学界对早期译本研究的匮乏。除了传统的文本分析方法，本研究也部分地借用了电脑辅助的文本分析软件如PowerGREP等，更为可视化、宏观地把握译本与译者风格。此外，本研究通过构建这样一种互文关系网，力求对今后的多译本研究有所助益，研究者能够更深入地理解译本所处的历史语境，理解译本之间存在的多层次关系。本书在撰写与修订过程中，一直渴望构建这种多层次的网络体系，拓展传统的互文性理论，也结合《三国演义》英译情况，对中国古典文学译介与中国文化走出去问题作出一定的思考。尽管不知能在何种程度上揭示论题，但愿能以此为切入点，求教

于同行专家、学者。

衷心感谢导师冯庆华教授对我的谆谆教诲，感谢伦敦大学学院赫曼斯教授（Theo Hermans）给予我学术上的指导，在上海外国语大学的五年硕博生涯里，受教于冯庆华教授对我的殷切教导，受益于上外良好的培养平台，我顺利获得博士学位，取得当下的研究成果，我深觉幸运与感恩，唯有在科研的道路上脚踏实地、厚积薄发。感谢匿名审稿专家给予我宝贵的修改意见，感谢上海外语教育出版社孙静老师、梁晓莉老师与王叶涵编辑的悉心工作，使本书得以面世。

书中不妥之处，渴望得到您的批评、指正。

彭文青

2018年3月于苏州大学天赐庄校区

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

The classic Chinese novel *San Guo Yan Yi* (commonly translated as *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*) outlines the great and terrible events of the period from A.D. 168 to 280, when China's first great dynasty, the Han (202 B.C.–A.D. 220), was riven, through decades of bloody battles, into three separate states at near constant war with each other. *San Guo Yan Yi* was disseminated overseas at a comparatively early date. The earliest translation into a foreign language was the one into Japanese in 1689, and the novel remains the most popular foreign work of fiction among Japanese readers. The earliest English-language version was produced as early as 1820, with several partial translations published in various genres before C. H. Brewitt-Taylor produced the first full-text version in 1925. The enduring popularity of the novel, and its numerous translations, is testament to its great literary merit. As one of its translators, Moss Roberts (1991: 937), remarks:

> *Three Kingdoms* describes China's traditional political culture and its struggle to define its political form, transporting the reader from the highest councils of dynastic power to the lowest fringes of society, from the capital and key provinces to the edges of the empire and beyond. It is a tale of China itself in its infinite variety, a tale peopled with kings and courtiers, commanders and scholars, magicians and peasant rebels.

This book examines the intertextual relations, based on the English translations of the novel *San Guo Yan Yi*, two full-length translations and

1

2 more than twenty excerpted renderings and partial adaptations from 1820 onwards, on the one hand the interactions between the versions in historical context and on the other the intertextuality in the translation between two different cultures. In the first chapter, I present the background to the original text and the theoretical approach I have taken. After setting out the theory of intertextuality and the academic debate surrounding this concept, I discuss the relation between texts, translators and other agents in the production of a translated work. I then analyse twenty-eight partial translations of *San Guo Yan Yi* (that is, translations of excerpts of the novel) which were serialized in periodicals, monographs and even textbooks during the 19th and 20th centuries, as well as two full-text versions by C. H. Brewitt-Taylor and Moss Roberts. I also consider paratexts, including critics' reviews, forewords, afterwords, acknowledgements of translated texts, and so on. The introductory chapter concludes with a summary of the scope of my project and an overview of the structure of this book.

1.1 *San Guo Yan Yi*

San Guo Yan Yi (《三国演义》, *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*), composed by Luo Guanzhong (罗贯中) in the 13th to 14th century is a historical novel based on *San Guo Zhi* (《三国志》, *Records of the Three Kingdoms*) written by a historian and critic Chen Shou (陈寿). It is the first full-length book with clear chapter divisions to appear in ancient China. I call it a historical novel here yet, in fact, *San Guo Yan Yi* as a literary work spans three genres: novel, epic and drama. As a Qing scholar Zhang Xuecheng (章学诚) remarks, it is "seven parts facts and three parts fiction" (七分史实, 三分虚构).

San Guo Yan Yi outlines the great and terrible events of the period from A.D. 168 to 280 when China's first great dynasty, the Han (202 B.C.–A.D. 220), was riven, through decades of bloody battles, into three separate states at near constant war with each other. It features the waxing and waning of the states with literary complexity and depth. This novel has also been effective in

popularizing Confucian moral ideas and instilling them into individual moral life. The novel focuses on the discrepancy between rites and appropriateness. Lots of characters are framed within these values, like Guan Yu, who is the embodiment of courage and faithful service to his lord and whose virtue has fascinated readers and theatre audiences for centuries.

1.1.1 *San Guo Yan Yi* and Its Development

The novel has been described as a compilation of subject matter built up over generations. Indeed, in the twelve hundred years between the events and the novel, various historians, officials, philosophers and poets interpreted the stories in their special contexts. So it is interesting and necessary to consider the following questions: on what basis did they make their choice? How did the author Luo Guanzhong come to create *San Guo Yan Yi* under their influence? Three issues will be discussed in the following parts: use of source, dynastic legitimacy, and two editions of the novel.

Firstly, let us begin with the sources of the novel. Various genres can be found in the sources on which Luo Guanzhong based his work, including traditional historical records, oral texts from story-tellers and dramas or plays in the Yuan Dynasty. The main source for the period is the *San Guo Zhi*, or *Records of the Three Kingdoms* (SGZ). The author, Chen Shou (A.D. 233–297), wrote the SGZ in sixty-five chapters, which consist of single or multiple lives (传 *zhuan*) of the leading figures of the age. Chen Shou's work is not written in a novel genre, but as a series of biographies with essential facts about each individual's life. And it was greatly enriched one hundred and thirty years after his death by Pei Songzhi (裴松之)'s annotations (Pei Songzhi, 2011), which incorporated a lot of new material. Another work, *Zi Zhi Tong Jian* (《资治通鉴》, *General Mirror for the Aid of Government*), composed in A.D. 1084 by a northern Song historian Sima Guang (司马光), is also an ancestor to the novel. The book (Sima Guang, 2012) covers 1,362 years of Chinese history, including the late Han — Three States period.

Story-telling tradition also had a considerable impact on the novel *San Guo Zhi Yan Yi Ping Hua* (《三国志演义评话》, *PH*). It can be described as

a storyteller's prompt book version of the novel in colloquial language and presents the events of the century in serial fashion. The narrative is crudely **4** handled but *PH* clearly sets out the outline of the plot of the later *San Guo Yan Yi*. It is apparent that the author of *San Guo Yan Yi* was familiar with it, although we cannot be sure that the novel was based on this novella.

Moreover, dramas written on *San Guo Yan Yi* subjects developed particular incidents and characters and had a limited focus, usually a single episode. Most of the extant plays feature Liu Bei or heroes devoted to him — Kongming, Lord Guan, Zhang Fei and so on. The others deal with Cao Cao, Dong Zhuo and Lü Bu. The salient feature of the Yuan plays is that they are either entirely fictional or fictional elaborations on traces of historical data. Working with a small cast of characters and within a time frame restricted to a few episodes, the plays develop their chosen subjects imaginatively. This was an inspiration to the novelist. The most striking creation of the dramatists is the character of Lord Guan. In *San Guo Zhi*, Chen Shou used less than one thousand words to describe him, yet the character became a dominant figure of Yuan Dynasty drama *Three Kingdoms*. A difference between *PH* and the Yuan drama is that *PH* was dominated by Zhang Fei and Kongming, but the drama made the figure of Lord Guan paramount and in this respect decisively influenced the novel. The return of Lord Guan as a ghost in the novel is based on Guan Hanqing (关汉卿)'s surviving *Three Kingdoms* play, *The Double Dream* (《关张双赴西蜀梦》).

Now I would like to elaborate on the second issue, dynastic legitimacy, which was debated and revised several times in the centuries and influenced the shaping of the characters in the novel. Broadly speaking, there are two attitudes towards legitimacy: one is pro-Shu-Han and the other is pro-Cao-Wei. In the early Tang Dynasty, the ruling house expressed pro-Cao sentiments; Li Shimin (李世民), the second emperor, praised Cao Cao as a sage. A historian in the Northern Song, Sima Guang, holds a view of dynastic legitimacy like Chen Shou's which is "northern" not "southern", acknowledging the Wei — a view other Northern Song historians such as Su Dongpo (苏东坡) and Ouyang Xiu (欧阳修) share. In his work *Zi Zhi Tong Jian*, Sima Guang explicitly excludes the claims to legitimacy of Liu Bei.

The other attitude is sympathy for Shu-Han. Sometimes, sympathy for Shu

rather than for Wei was a political touchstone. For example, Zhu Yuanzhang (朱元璋), the first emperor of the Ming Dynasty, attempted to portray himself as an emperor after the model of Liu Bang, the first emperor of Han. If we could say the presumed author Luo Guanzhong lived in that period when the ruler was Zhu Yuanzhang, then *San Guo Yan Yi* can be seen as celebrating the restoration of Han-like rule in China. Thus, the novel naturally builds upon the contradiction between Liu Bei and Cao Cao. Apart from the involvement of the political element, we could also discern the impact of some important scholars on the novel. The most important Southern Song champion of Liu Xuande's cause was the model of neo-Confucian philosophy, Zhu Xi (朱熹). His work in 1172 directly influenced the novel *San Guo Yan Yi*. Zhu Xi recast the *Zi Zhi Tong Jian*, which was composed by Sima Guang in a slightly altered form, placing Sima Guang's text under a series of interpretative headlines which imposed a judgement on the events recounted. Zhu Xi treated Liu Xuande as the legitimate successor to Han; he rejected Sima Guang's technical acceptance of Wei as Han's heir. The Yuan plays continued the Southern Song tradition of taking the side of Liu Bei against Cao Cao. In the Yuan drama, even the southern China side, Wu Kingdom, were regarded as enemies of Liu Bei. For example, in Guan Hanqing's *Dan Dao Hui* (《单刀会》, *Lone Swordsman Attends the Feast*), Lu Su is the villain, with his plot to kidnap Lord Guan and retake Jingzhou. However, the novel *San Guo Yan Yi* corrects this as well as other fictional excesses in the dramatic texts.

The third issue is the most relevant to the translations: the original editions and its interlinear commentary. Twelve hundred years after the historical events, the novel *San Guo Yan Yi* was written. It is titled *San Guo Zhi Tong Su Yan Yi* (《三国志通俗演义》, *TS*). Scholarly attempts to date the work have produced various suggestions, ranging from Northern Song to the mid-Ming. The oldest complete printed edition, published in 1522, has a preface dated 1494 in addition to its own preface. Moreover, interlinear notes accompanying the 1522 edition seem to postdate the text itself. The dating problem is complicated by the problem of authorship. The novel has been traditionally assigned to the late Yuan-early Ming (around 1350–1390), and many accept this approximation, if only because the presumed author, Luo Guanzhong, lived at that time.