

国外翻译研究丛书之二十三

TRANSLATION/HISTORY/CULTURE

A Sourcebook

翻译、历史与文化论集

Edited by ANDRÉ LEFEVERE



上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

国外翻译研究丛书之二十三

TRANSLATION/HISTORY/CULTURE
A Sourcebook

翻译、历史与文化论集

Edited by André Lefevere

外教社

上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

翻译、历史与文化论集 / 勒菲弗尔 (Lefevere, A.) 编.

—上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2004

(国外翻译研究丛书)

书名原文: Translation / History / Culture: A Sourcebook

ISBN 7-81095-069-X

I. 翻… II. 勒… III. 翻译—研究—文集—英文 IV. H059-53

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2003)第112415号

图字: 09-2003-408号

出版发行: 上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300(总机), 35051812(发行部)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 潘 敏

印 刷: 上海古籍印刷厂

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 880×1230 1/32 印张 6.375 字数 260 千字

版 次: 2004年7月第1版 2004年7月第1次印刷

印 数: 3 500 册

书 号: ISBN 7-81095-069-X / H · 021

定 价: 12.00 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题,可向本社调换

出版说明

近年来,国内翻译研究取得了很大进展,有关翻译研究的丛书也出了多套。不过,长期以来,国内引进的原版翻译著作匮乏,不少研究都是根据二手资料;另外,学习翻译专业的研究生人数越来越多,这种状况若继续存在,将十分不利于学科的发展和翻译人才的培养。鉴于此,上海外语教育出版社约请了多名国内翻译研究著名学者分别开列出最值得引进的国外翻译研究论著的书目,并对这些书目进行整理、排序,最终确定了准备引进的正式书单。该丛书涉及的论著时间跨度大,既有经典,也有新论;内容的覆盖面也相当广泛,既有翻译本体的研究,也有跨学科的研究。这套丛书的引进将会满足翻译专业研究生教学原版参考书和翻译理论研究的需要。

上海外语教育出版社谨以此丛书献给我国的翻译学界。

借鉴和创造

(代序)

上海外语教育出版社自成立以来一直是我国外语教育最优秀的后勤部和侦探部。因为它不但为我国各个层次(尤其本科与研究生层次)的外语教育提供了多种高水平的教材、教参和工具书,而且还出版了多学科、多语种和多系列的中文版和外文版的学术著作,比如“现代语言学丛书”、“牛津应用语言学丛书”、“美国文学史论译丛”、“外国文学史丛书”、“剑桥文学指南丛书”、“当代英语语言学丛书”以及列入国家及教育部规划的人文社科重点项目的外国语言文学、文化等方面的图书等。为了适应我国现代化建设和教育改革的需要,还出版了一批国际金融、对外贸易、涉外保险、国际经济法、国际新闻和管理科学等方面的教材与专著。这些著作在外语的学科建设与学术研究以及复合型人才培养等方面都在发挥着强有力的侦察、调研和指导作用。这是外语界有口皆碑的。

随着中外文化交流的纵深发展以及我国现代化建设对人才的需求,对比语言学和翻译学近些年来在我国有了较快的发展,最突出的证据就是①外语类硕士博士点上研究对比与翻译方向的学生在逐年迅速增多,而且我们的高校已经有了翻译学院和翻译系(当然还太少)。②外语专业的学生考中文、法律等其他人文社科专业的硕士、博士以及反方向的走向已经起步。这种跨学科的人才已成为人才资源竞争的最主要对象,因此发展趋势定会看好。上海外语教育出版社为适应这种高层次人才培养和新学科建设的需要,不但积极出版国内关于对比研究和翻译研究的专著和论文集,最近又推出了原版“国外翻译研究丛书”,这套丛书时间跨度从古代到现代,所选书目皆为译学发展史上有里程碑作用的名家名著,堪称译学经典。他们计划分批出

版,以满足读者的需求。

这套丛书的出版首先可以解决国内翻译教学原版参考书多年匮乏的困难,真可以说是我国翻译教学与理论研究的及时雨。我想学习和关心这个学科的师生和其他人士定会对这套书的引进为之欢呼,为之祝贺。

这套丛书的价值还在于能大大促进我国翻译学科建设的发展。译学学科的发展依赖于研究者在三个方面的深入研究和结合。一是对本国译学的继承性研究;二是对外国译学的借鉴性研究;三是对翻译实践和翻译教学中新问题的探索性研究。只有这三者研究深入并结合好了,才可能从经验与技巧逐步升华为具有科学性的译学理论。这三个方面的研究,改革开放以来,在我国已取得了很显著的成就,这是有目共睹的。翻译学在我国已于 20 世纪 80 年代末有了独立学科的初级形态,90 年代又有了新的发展,对学科的独立性以及理论体系的结构与功能有了更多的探讨。依照学科建设的规律和研究现状,我们尚需在上述三个方面加大研究力度,而这套丛书就是借鉴性研究的主要资源。从这个角度讲,这套丛书的引进也是我国文化基本建设的重要工程之一。

在新的世纪,文化(包括各类科学技术)会多方面快速深入人类的日常生活,各国之间的交流会空前深广,因此翻译的功能会逐步扩大,实用性翻译人才的需求量定会空前增加。这就要求我们除了做好高层次研究型人才的培养以外,还应十分重视实用性人才的培养和应用译学的研究。我想出版社一定会关注和引导译学建设的理论研究与应用的发展趋势。

杨自俭

青岛海洋大学六三居室

2001 年 3 月 28 日

出版前言

安德烈·勒菲弗尔(André Lefevere, 1946—1996)是文化翻译研究领域的一大旗手。他认为将翻译局限在语言层面讨论不足以反映翻译的复杂性,因为在翻译所受的诸多束缚中,来自语言的束缚是最不重要的。而对传统的了解、对意识形态的认识不仅能使我们关注常规的翻译问题,而且还能让我们关注翻译研究如何更有效地促进整个文化研究,因此,翻译应当在文化历史中占据比它今天更核心的地位。而本书汇编的资料论及的意识形态、赞助人、文化体系等问题正是对安德烈·勒菲弗尔这种文化视角的强有力支持。

它收录了公元前 106 年至公元 1931 年西欧原本以拉丁语、法语、德语和英语表达的有关翻译的最重要或最具独创性的思想。其中相当一部分由于没有对应的英文表述,所以虽然经常被提及,但引用得很少,更少有人读到原句。但在本书中都由编者提供了英语译文。有些选录的文字还能帮助我们窥见现代文学翻译思想产生的基石。

本书所录内容均选自来源中直接有关翻译的部分,按意识形态的影响、赞助人的作用、诗歌翻译、文化体系、翻译与语言发展和教育、翻译技巧、中心文本与中心文化等七个主题排列,每一主题均自成一节,在各节下又按时间顺序排列。最后一节,也即第八节,收录了较长的论述,是前面各小节的延伸和拓展。

对文化翻译研究者而言,本书是一本不可多得资料汇编。

Preface

This collection contains what many consider to be some of the most important, or at least most seminal texts produced over centuries of thinking about translation in Western Europe in Latin, French, German, and English. The collection spans approximately the twenty centuries that elapsed between the birth, in 106 BC, of the Roman orator, statesman, and translator Marcus Tullius Cicero and the death, in 1931 AD, of the German classical scholar and translator Ulrich von Willamowitz-Moellendorff. No attempt has been made to include modern or contemporary texts. These should, and will, be gathered in other collections to be published in the series for which the present collection endeavors to establish a modest genealogy.

A fair number of the texts collected here have been much referred to, infrequently quoted, and even more rarely read since they have not all previously been available in English. I have translated anew all the texts printed here, except for those originally written in English, and I have tried to select texts that should provide the essential background for current thinking about the translation of literature.

Not all texts collected here have by any means been translated or printed in their entirety. To do so would have necessitated the production of a book several times the size of this one. Moreover, a fair number of well-known texts on translation tend, on closer inspection, to say relatively little about translation while touching on a wide variety of other topics. I have, accordingly, limited myself to those extracts which bear directly on translation, as in Luther's famous *Letter*, for example, where I have excluded the (great majority of) passages dealing with all kinds of disputes between the German rulers of his time.

The texts have been arranged thematically, rather than chronologically. It is my conviction that translations are made under a number of constraints of which language is arguably the least important. I have therefore arranged the shorter texts according to the constraint they seem to address most obviously. Some texts deal with ideological constraints on the production of translations, with the power of patronage to enforce these constraints, with constraints of a more poetical nature, with so-called Universe of Discourse constraints and, finally, with both constraints imposed by the structure of different languages and attempts to expand the scope of languages in spite of these constraints. Other texts raise the question of the position of a central text in a culture and of a central culture in a configuration of cultures. Still other texts deal with the role translation has traditionally played in education. A final category of texts deals mainly with the technique of actual translating, usually in the form of lists of rules.

It is hoped that this arrangement will highlight the important topics that should be covered in any discussion of literary translation more effectively than any chronological arrangement could have done, even though the texts have been arranged chronologically within their respective sections, for reasons of historical continuity. Needless to say, I found myself pleasantly surprised and more than a little envious to discover the constraints I thought I had identified and elevated to the status of organizational categories neatly set out in Madame Dacier's introduction to her translation of the *Iliad*. This illuminating text therefore occupies the position of a "second introduction" to the present collection.

Both my surprise and my envy are symptomatic of current thinking on literary translation. Much of what we are saying has been said already, albeit in a different kind of jargon. This should not deter us, however. Looking back at the long tradition of thinking on translation in Western Europe, we realize that relatively recent attempts to limit discussions of translation to what pertains to constraints of language only, signally fail to do justice to the complexity of the problem. Furthermore, knowledge of the tradition, the genealogy of our thinking, helps us to focus not just on problems concerning translation as such, but also on ways in which the study of translation can be made productive for cultural studies in general. We are finally beginning to realize that translation deserves to occupy a much more central position in cultural history than the one to which it is currently relegated.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deep gratitude and great appreciation to Mr Roger Tavernier, chief bibliographer of the University Library in Leuven, Flanders, without whose help I would not have been able to gain access to some of the texts translated here, and most especially to my colleague and friend Dr Judith Woodsworth of Concordia University, Montreal, who has worked miracles proofreading the manuscript.

Contents

Preface	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
Introduction	1
Anne Dacier: from the introduction to her translation of the <i>Iliad</i>	10
1 The role of ideology in the shaping of a translation	14
Flaccus Quintus Horatius: from the "Letter to the Pisones," also known as the <i>Ars Poetica</i>	15
Aurelius Augustinus (Saint Augustine): from "On the Christian Doctrine"; from the "Letter to Saint Jerome"	15
Martin Luther: from the "Circular Letter on Translation"	16
August Wilhelm Schlegel: from the "History of Romantic Literature"	17
Anne Louise Germaine de Staël: from the <i>Writings</i>	17
Victor Hugo: from the preface to the New Shakespeare Translation	18
2 The power of patronage	19
John of Trevisa: from the "Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk upon Translation," printed as the preface to his translation of the <i>Polychronicon</i>	20
Jean de Brèche, called de Tours: from the preface to his translation of Hippocrates	21

Joachim Du Bellay: from the <i>Défense et illustration de la langue française</i>	22
Philemon Holland: from the preface to his translation of Pliny's <i>The Historie of the World</i>	22
John Dryden: from the "Dedication" to his translation of the <i>Aeneid</i>	24
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: from the "Writings on Literature"	24
3 Poetics	26
Etienne Dolet: from "On the Way of Translating Well from One Language into Another"	27
Antoine Houdar de la Motte: from the preface to his translation of the <i>Iliad</i>	28
Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet): from a letter to Anne Dacier	30
August Wilhelm Schlegel: from "Something About William Shakespeare on the Occasion of Wilhelm Meister"	30
Edward Fitzgerald: from the preface to the <i>Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam</i>	32
Ulrich von Willamowitz-Moellendorff: from "The Art of Translation"	33
4 Universe of Discourse	35
Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt: from the preface to his translation of Lucian	35
Jacques Delille: from the preface to his translation of Virgil's <i>Georgics</i>	37
Pierre le Tourneur: from the preface to his translation of Young's <i>Night Thoughts</i>	39
Antoine Prévost, better known as Abbé Prévost: from the preface to his translation of Richardson's <i>Pamela</i>	39
Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet): from the preface to his translation of Shakespeare's <i>Julius Caesar</i>	40
John Hookham Frere: from the preface to his translation of Aristophanes	40
Dillon Wentworth, Earl of Roscommon: from the <i>Essay on Translated Verse</i>	43

5 Translation, the development of language, and education	46
Marcus Tullius Cicero: from "On the Orator"; from "On the Limits of Good and Evil"	46
Marcus Fabius Quintilianus: from the "Guide to Rhetoric"	47
Hieronymus (Saint Jerome): from the "Letter to Pammachius"	47
Roger Bacon: from "On the Knowledge of Languages"	49
Juan Luis Vives: from "Versions or Translations"	50
Jacques Pelletier du Mans: from his "Poetics"	52
August Wilhelm Schlegel: from "The Works of Homer by Johann Heinrich Voss"	54
Percy Bysshe Shelley: from "A Defence of Poetry"	56
Gaius Caecilius Plinius Secundus: from the "Letters"	56
Johann Christoph Gottsched: from the "Critical Poetics"	57
Thomas Carlyle: from "The State of German Literature"	57
6 The technique of translating	59
Desiderius Erasmus: from the "Letter to William Warham"	60
Antoine Lemaistre: from the "Rules of French Translation"	60
George Chapman: from the prefatory texts to his translation of the <i>Iliad</i>	62
Alexander Pope: from the preface to his translation of the <i>Iliad</i>	64
August Wilhelm Schlegel: from the "Letter to Herrn Reimer"	66
Dante Gabriel Rossetti: from <i>Dante and His Circle</i>	67
Matthew Arnold: from "On Translating Homer"	68
7 Central texts and central cultures	70
Sir Thomas More: from the <i>Confutation of Tyndale's Answer</i>	71
Anonymous: from "The Translators to the Reader," the preface to the <i>Authorized Version</i>	72

Johann Gottfried Herder: from the "Fragments"	74
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: from "Poetry and Truth"; from the "Book of West and East"; from the "Writings on Literature"	74
August Wilhelm Schlegel: from the "Argument Between Languages"; from the "History of Classical Literature"	78
Edward Fitzgerald: from a letter to E. B. Cowell	80
8 Longer statements	81
Leonardo Bruni, called Aretino: from "The Right Way to Translate"	81
Petrus Danielus Huetius: from "Two Books on Translation"	86
John Dryden: from the preface to his translation of <i>Ovid's Epistles</i>	102
Jean le Rond d'Alembert: from "Remarks on the Art of Translating," printed as the preface to his translation of Tacitus	105
Charles Batteux: from "Principles of Literature"	116
Gaspard de Tende, sieur de l'Estaing: from the "Rules of Translation"	120
Johann Jakob Bodmer: from the "Ninety-Fourth Letter" in his "Painter of Morals"	124
Alexander Fraser Tytler, Lord Woodhouselee: from the <i>Essay on the Principles of Translation</i>	128
Wilhelm von Humboldt: from the preface to his translation of Aeschylus' <i>Agamemnon</i>	135
Friedrich Schleiermacher: from "On the Different Methods of Translating"	141
Ulrich von Willamowitz-Moellendorff: from "What is Translation?", originally written as the preface to his translation of Euripides' <i>Hippolytus</i>	166
Bibliographical references	172
Index	175

Introduction

A translation, says Petrus Danielus Huetius in a text translated in this collection, is "a text written in a well-known language which refers to and represents a text in a language which is not as well known." This, to my mind, is the most productive definition of a translation made within the tradition represented here, simply because it raises many, if not all of the relevant questions at once.

First of all, why is it necessary to represent a foreign text in one's own culture? Does the very fact of doing that not amount to an admission of the inadequacy of that culture? Secondly, who makes the text in one's own culture "represent" the text in the foreign culture? In other words: who translates, why, and with what aim in mind? Who selects texts as candidates to "be represented?" Do translators? And are those translators alone? Are there other factors involved? Thirdly, how do members of the receptor culture know that the imported text is well represented? Can they trust the translator(s)? If not, who can they trust, and what can they do about the whole situation, short of not translating at all? If a translation is, indeed, a text that represents another, the translation will to all intents and purposes function as that text in the receptor culture, certainly for those members of that culture who do not know the language in which the text was originally written. Let us not forget that translations are made by people who do not need them for people who cannot read the originals. Fourthly, not all languages seem to have been created equal. Some languages enjoy a more prestigious status than others, just as some texts occupy a more central position in a given culture than others—the Bible, for instance, or the Qur'an. Fifthly, why produce texts that "refer to" other texts? Why not simply produce originals in the first place?

So much for the questions. Now for some tentative answers, culled from the genealogy drawn up in this collection. If you produce a text that "refers to" another text, rather than producing your own, you are most likely to do so because you think the other text enjoys a prestige far greater than the prestige your own text might possibly aspire to. In other words, you invoke the authority of the text you represent. It may be a sobering thought that some of the masterpieces of world literature, such as Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, profess to be translations of lost originals, i.e. that they refer to non-existent texts in order to derive some kind of legitimacy which, it is felt, would otherwise not be present to the same extent.

Translation has to do with authority and legitimacy and, ultimately, with power, which is precisely why it has been and continues to be the subject of so many acrimonious debates. Translation is not just a "window opened on another world," or some such pious platitude. Rather, translation is a channel opened, often not without a certain reluctance, through which foreign influences can penetrate the native culture, challenge it, and even contribute to subverting it. "When you offer a translation to a nation," says Victor Hugo, "that nation will almost always look on the translation as an act of violence against itself."

No wonder nations have always felt they needed some person or persons they could trust enough to entrust him or her with the task of translating: the Horatian "fidus interpres," or "trustworthy interpreter." It is important to remember that the trust is invested in the producer of the translation, not necessarily in the product itself. "Trusted" translators, like the group of translators who produced the Septuagint, in fact produced what is generally acknowledged as a relatively "bad" translation, but one that continues to function to this day as the "official" translation used by the Greek Orthodox Church. Trust may be more important than quality. Translations which members of a culture have come to trust may mean more to them than translations that can claim to represent the original better. Witness the following extract from one of St Augustine's letters to St Jerome:

When one of our brothers, a bishop, had introduced the use of your translation in the church of which he is the pastor, the congregation hit upon a passage in the prophet Jonah which you translated in a very different way from the way in which it had established itself in the mind and memory of all, and the way it

has been sung for such a long time. Great unrest arose among the people, especially since the Greeks protested and began to shout about falsification in a vituperative manner. As a result the bishop — it happened in the town of Onea — saw himself forced to rely on the Jews who lived in the city to clear up the matter. But they replied, either out of ignorance or out of malice, that the Hebrew manuscripts contained exactly what was also to be found in the Greek and Latin manuscripts. And then what? To escape from great danger the man was forced to correct himself, as if he had made a mistake, since he did not want to lose all the people in his church.

Obviously, trust is most important where the most central text of a culture is concerned, a text invoked to legitimize the power of those who wield it in that culture. It may just be possible that the West has paid so much attention to translation because its central text, the Bible, was written in a language it could not readily understand, so that it was forced to rely on translators to legitimize power. The other alternative was, of course, not to translate the central text at all, but to have those whose lives are ruled by it learn the language it is written in, or at least go through the necessary motions in that direction, as in the case of the Qur'an.

Huetius puts the matter in similar terms when he quotes St Jerome as saying

One word should be translated by one word in Holy Writ, *where even the order of the words is a mystery*, where a construction that has not been refined with great art often carries more than one sentence. Since the greater part of Holy Writ should not be studied for its elegance, however, Saint Jerome also admits that other texts should be translated in a different manner, nor does he always follow his own precepts.

Trust is one thing, expertise another. Not only does Huetius point to the ever present gulf between theory and practice, between what translators profess to be doing and what they actually do, he also suggests that trust need not be absolute in all cases. Translators can be trusted more with texts that are not central to the culture as a whole since they can only do limited damage at worst. Or, to put it simply in text-linguistic terms: different types of texts need to be translated in different ways.

The same reasoning has also been extended to different cultures. Whereas translators in the West have held Greek and Latin works in