HIGHLIGHTS OF WESTERN TRANSLATION STUDIES

西方翻译理论精华

赵 勇 编著

陕西人民出版社

图书在版编目(CIP) 数据

西方翻译理论精华 / 赵勇编著. —西安: 陕西人民出版社,2010

ISBN 978 - 7 - 224 - 09391 - 9

Ⅰ. ①西… Ⅱ. ①赵… Ⅲ. ①翻译理论 - 西方国家 Ⅳ. ①H059

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2010) 第 105892 号

西方翻译理论精华

Highlights of Western Translation Studies

编 著 者 赵 勇

出版发行 陕西出版集团 陕西人民出版社

(西安北大街 147 号 邮编: 710003)

印 刷 西安正华印刷科技有限公司

开 本 787mm × 1092mm 16 开 20.75 印张

字 数 310 千字

版 次 2010 年 6 月第 1 版 2010 年 6 月第 1 次印刷

书 号 ISBN 978 - 7 - 224 - 09391 - 9

定 价 39.00 元

前言

从1972年霍尔姆斯提出翻译研究的概念以来，西方翻译研究在近30年来取得了巨大的发展。尤其从20世纪70年代后开始，由比较文学、语言学、文学理论、哲学、跨文化研究等各学科的发展而产生的跨学科特征，更使翻译研究呈现出爆炸式的增长趋势。在短短的30年中翻译研究本身也发生了几次研究范式的转换。20世纪90年代可以说是翻译研究的“黄金十年”(golden decade)。

从学科发展的角度看，翻译研究也从一种个人随笔式的经验总结发展成为一门独立的学科。翻译作为高等院校的一门正式学科，在国内外学术界和高等教育界都取得了空前迅速的发展。国际上已有250多所著名高校建立了正式的翻译教学和研究机构，并设立了独立的、可授予翻译学硕士或博士学位的翻译学学位点。我国港台的著名高校，如香港中文大学、台湾的辅仁大学等，也都建有相应的翻译教学和科研机构，并可授予翻译学的硕士学位和博士学位。在我国，从翻译学概念的提出到2004年建立独立的翻译学学位点，并从2005年起招收独立的翻译学硕士和博士研究生起，大部分外语学院都已经成立翻译学院(系)或翻译研究中心。

正是在这种学科发展的背景下，本书总结了自西塞罗以来的西方翻译理论的发展进程，其中包括西方传统翻译理论、“科学”的翻译理论、翻译理论的哲学基础、翻译研究的“文化转向”、翻译研究派、功能主义翻译研究、文本语言学与认知翻译研究、解构主义翻译研究、女性主义翻译研究和后殖民主义翻译研究等十章。本书的主要体例是，首先对各个历史时期主要流派的主要观点作出了简洁独到的解释和归纳，然后是代表人物的主要观点和代表作品主旨的归纳，最后是各个时期、各种流派的翻译研究的经典文献。

在国外，对西方翻译理论做整体上的研究较早的著作有Andrew Chesterman的*Readings in Translation Theory*(1989)；Rainer Schulte & John Biguenet(1992)的*Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*; Andre Lefevere (1992)的*Translation / History / Culture: A Sourcebook*。根据Douglas Robinson的研究，Chesterman的选集当时在芬兰赫尔辛基出版，只有8万字，而且发行量很小；Rainer Schulte的著作也只有10万字。这两本书即使在西方国家的翻译研究中引用都很少，可以说影响不大。Lefevere的选集虽然由上海外语教育出版社影印出版，但该选集篇幅有限(根据Robinson的统计只有6.5万字)，而且选文只到20世纪30年代，因此缺乏70年代后西方翻译卷帙浩繁的主体文献。在西方翻译研究中，Douglas Robinson (1997) *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*是对西方传统翻译理论的总结，选文比较精到，但分析较少，理论文献只到尼采为止，因此当代西方翻译理论的主体文献仍然是付诸阙如。Lawrence Venuti的*The Translation Studies Reader*(2000)是西方翻译研究中较有影响的著作，每一章之前也有简短的分析归纳，但选文从20世纪初开始，对前期的经典西方翻译

理论没有涉及。在我国的宏观翻译理论研究中，主要著作有谭载喜的《西方翻译简史》(2004年第二版)、李文革(2004年)的《西方翻译理论流派研究》、李和庆(2005年)《西方翻译研究方法论:70年代以后》。这三本书对西方翻译理论发展的线索作了较好的梳理工作。在选集方面，有申雨平(1999)的《西方翻译理论精选》，但该书缺乏分析归纳，选文也仅限于Newmark，Nida等传统翻译理论。在介绍西方翻译理论，上海外语教育出版社的系列丛书，可以说对西方翻译理论的主要理论和流派的介绍方面起到了最重要的作用。但对于一般读者，尤其是对于翻译专业的研究生和本科学生而言，他们急需一本在整体上把握西方翻译理论发展的轨迹，同时对于经典文献又有一定程度介绍的书籍。本书就是出于这种现状而编辑出版的。

与国内外同类著作相比较，《西方翻译理论精华》分析归纳简洁准确，代表了翻译研究的最新成果;本书的选文全面精到，特别是Roman Jakobson(1959)《论翻译的语言方面》、Walter Benjamin(1923)《论译者的任务》、James Holmes(1972)《翻译研究的名与实》等都是翻译研究必读的经典文献。简言之，本书是一部融分析和选文于一体的翻译研究著作，期望对我国翻译研究的发展起到一定的推动作用。

本书的主要读者对象是我国英语专业翻译学方向的研究生、本科生，同时本书也期望成为翻译研究者和爱好者的必备书目。多年来，本人一直担任我院本科生笔译、研究生翻译理论与实践等课程的教学，《西方翻译理论精华》是编者在教学过程中，针对我国现阶段翻译理论教学与研究的现状编著的。大连外国语学院英语学院的霍跃红(第8－10章)、王春(第1－3章)、方菊(第4－5章，术语部分)、朱效惠(第6－7章)等老师也参与了本书的编著工作。大连外国语学院图书馆黄红梅老师对于本书的文献提供了很多帮助。本书的出版也得到了大连外国语学院学术出版基金的资助。编者在此谨一并致谢。

CONTENTS

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Chapter Ⅰ Traditional Western Translation Theories

1. Translation in Antiquity

In the West in 300 BC, when the Romans took over wholesale many elements of Greek culture, including the whole religious apparatus (Newmark, 2001:3), it is considered to be significant that inscriptions in two languages have been found. Saint Jerome's concept on the best kind of translator is the founding document of Christian translation theory.

Approaches to translation, in the Western tradition, have been seen as oscillating between an attachment to Classical learning, which stresses intellectual flexibility, and the Judaeo-Christian emphasis on the unchanging law of God, embodied in a language which also cannot be changed. The conflict between commitment to stylistic excellence, clarity of expression, and ad verbum exactness cannot be resolved, the terms having been established very early on. The principal arena has undoubtedly been the translation of the sacred texts of Judaism and Christianity with the geographic spread of these world religions, as well as the gradual and then incrementally rapid spread of literacy, and self-assertion of the vernacular languages, especially with the disintegration of such supranational entities as the Roman and Holy Roman empires and concomitant rise of nation states.

In Roman times, of course, translation relates to the construction of a supranational culture, based on Rome, and becomes an assertion of Roman cultural independence from or parity with Attic Greece. To achieve this parity, a non-subservient stance was essential.

Late Roman translation from Biblical Greek—St Jerome's handling of the Greek Septuagint, for instance—reflected the high status of the source text. The translations of the Holy Scriptures were necessarily 'inspired' and might enjoy equal and, in the case of the Septuagint, for instance, even superior status to the source text itself. It was in this connection that the myth of the origin of the Septuagint developed, obscuring the reality of the situation. The Septuagint was held to have been dictated by God, the seventy-two translators functioning as a kind of collective medium for him, the identity of the texts, according to the myth, further testifying to divine intervention.

Jerome, as a 'Ciceronian', even though he agonized over it and even though he admitted that in translation of the Scriptures even the order of the words was sacrosanct, was not able to suppress his Classicist leanings, being too committed to the demands of clarity and stylistic excellence, which required a free, or sense-for-sense approach. The Latin legacy, similarly, embodies both pre-Christian and Christian components. It is profoundly ambiguous, and this ambiguity runs through the entire Western tradition of translation, being evident even today, in scarcely less stark a form than at the beginning.

Cicero

In rendering into Latin what I had read in Greek, I not only found myself using the best words, and yet quite familiar ones, but also coining by analogy certain words such as would be new to our people, provided only they were appropriate.

—Cicero

Cicero(106-43 B. C. E.), also called Tully in English, was probably the most famous Roman rhetor and rhetorician: a powerful speaker whose greatest orations have been assigned countless schoolchildren to imitate, and a cogent theorist whose formulation of what has come to be known as 'Ciceronian rhetoric' has dominated Western thinking on the subject. Widely considered the originator of the 'periodic' style, Cicero was less an original thinker than a highly gifted transmitter of Greek thought. He might be thought of as a Roman encyclopedist who synthesized in Latin the important work of the Stoic, Academic, Peripatetic, and Epicurean traditions, with particular debts to Aristotle and Heracleides Ponticus.

Cicero is often considered the founder of Western translation theory; certainly he is the first to comment on the processes of translation and offer advice on how best to undertake them. His remarks on the pedagogical use of translation from Greek to Latin in the training of an orator were expanded by Horace, Pliny the Younger, Quintilian, and Aulus Gellius in Rome, adapted for medieval Christian theology by Jerome, and cited repeatedly by Catholics and Reformers and Humanists in support of their translatorial and pedagogical principles from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries.

De Oratore is a dialogue modelled on the works of Plato; the speaker here is Lucius Crassus, born in 140 B. C. E. and thus 49 years old when the conversation takes place, in September, 91 B. C. E. (a few days before Crassus´ death). As Sutton and Rackham, Cicero´s translators, note: "He was the most illustrious Roman orator before Cicero, and when Cicero was a boy he acted as his tutor in rhetoric. In the present dialogue he is the mouthpiece of Cicero´s own opinions".

Translating Greek Orations into Latin

For my part, in the daily exercises of youth, I used chiefly to set myself that task which I knew Gaius Carbo, my old enemy, was wont to practice: this was to set myself some poetry, the most impressive to be found, or to read as much of some speech as I could keep in my memory, and then to declaim upon the actual subject-matter of my reading, choosing as far as possible different words. But later I noticed this defect in my method, that those words which best befitted each subject, were the most elegant and in fact the best, had been already seized upon by Ennius, if it was on his poetry that I was practising, or by Gracchus, if I chanced to have set myself a speech of his. Thus I saw that to employ the same expressions profited me nothing, while to employ others was a positive hindrance, in that I was forming the habit of using the less appropriate. Afterwards I resolved, and this practice I followed when somewhat older, to translate freely Greek speeches of the most eminent orators. The result of reading these was that, in rendering into Latin what I had read in Greek, I not only found myself using the best words, and yet quite familiar ones, but also coining by analogy certain words such as would be new to our people, provided only they were appropriate.

The Best Kind of Orator (De optimo genereorarorum, 46 B. C. E)

But since there was a complete misapprehension as to the nature of their style of oratory, I thought it my duty to undertake a task which will be useful to students, though not necessary for myself. That is to say I translated the most famous orations of the two most eloquent Attic orators, Aesnhines and Demosthenes, orations which they delivered against each other? And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the ´figures´ of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language. For I did not think I ought to count them out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight, as it were. The result of my labour will be that our Romans will know what to demand for those who claim to be Atticists and to what rule of speech, as it were, they are to be held. ①

"But Thucydides will rise up against you: for some admire his eloquence." Right they are; but that has no bearing on the orator whom we are seeking. For it is one thing to set forth events in an historical narrative, and another to precut arguments to clinch a case against an opponent, or to refute a charge. It

① This famous, oft-quoted, and frequently misunderstood phrase in Latin is: *non converti ut interpres sea´ut orator*, or, literally, ´I did not convert/turn [them] as a translator, but as an orator´. The *interpres* for Cicero as a literal translator, whose main concern was rendering the source text as exactly as possible; the orator was more concerned with the impact of his words on the target audience than on literal accuracy. Cicero does not specifically speak of ´sense for-sense´ translation here (that phrase was coined by Jerome, by analogy with Cicero´s ´word-for-word´, below), but he is usually taken to mean something like it. In fact, his famous pronouncement might be translated more loosely (as an orator), using Eugene Nida´s terminology, as "I sought in my translations not formal but dynamic equivalence", or using Peter Newmark´s. "My aim was not semantic but communicative equivalence".

is one thing to hold an auditor while telling a story, anti another to arouse him. "But his style is beautiful." Is it better than Plato's? For the orator whom we are seeking must treat cases in court in a style suitable to instruct, to delight, and to move.

Saint Jerome

Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek except of course in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery—I render nor word-for-word, but sense-for-sense.

St. Jerome

Saint Jerome (347-419/420), born to a wealthy Christian family in Yugoslavia, was revered throughout the Middle Ages and went into the modern era as the "official" translator of the Bible. Within Western society, issues of free and literal translation were for over a thousand years after Jerome bound up with the translation of the Bible and other religious and philosophical texts. His *Letter to Pammachins* (395 AD) is well-known as the founding document of Christian translation theory. He criticizes the word-for-word approach because it produces an "absurd" translation, concealing the sense of the original. On contrary, he advocates the sense-to-sense approach, which allows the sense or content of the source text to be translated.

Although for a long time many scholars argue that the terms of word-for-word translation and sense-for-sense translation have been misinterpreted, Jerome's statement is still taken to refer to what came to be known as "literal" (word-for-word), and "free" (sense-for-sense) translation approaches. In his idea, word-for-word translation sometimes produces an absurd translation, cloaking the sense of original, while sense-for-sense translation, on the other hand, allows the content of the source text to be translated. To illustrate the concept of the target language taking over the sense of the source text, Jerome uses the military image of the original text being marched into the target language like a prisoner by its conqueror (Robinson, 1997b: 26).

In his book *The Science of Translation—Problems and Methods*, Wilss (2000) points out that Jerome also makes a distinction between two basic principles of translation method, literal translation and sense-oriented translation. However, Jerome practices both principles of translation. He proceeds from the premise that translating is linked to textual factors. He adheres to the principle of translation according to the constancy of sense when it comes to secular texts, for biblical texts, on the other hand, the principle to follow is that of literal translation, since the Word of God is sacrosanct.

Jerome persists that "If I translate word for word, I produce nonsense, but if I have to change something in the order of the words or their sound I could be accused of failing in my duties as a translator. If people maintains that the beauty of a language does not suffer from translation, let them simply translate Homer into Latin, word for word, or even better, let them simply render him on prose in his own language. The whole thing will turn into ridiculous comedy and the greatest poet will be reduced to a mere stammer."

Jerome was revered throughout the Middle Ages and (by Catholics) well into the modern era as the 'official' translator of the Bible, the author of the Vulgate Latin translation that in matters of doctrinal dispute took precedence over all Hebrew and Greek texts until the sixteenth century and beyond. His letter to Pammachius on the best kind of translator, written in Bethlehem in 395, is the founding document of Christian translation theory; along with Cicero, Luther, and Goethe, Jerome is one of the most influential translation theorists in the Western tradition.

In a famous dream from 375, one that was to shape the first major shift in Western translation theory, he was called before the Lord and accused of being a Ciceronian rather than a Christian; twenty years later he would formulate the first truly post-Ciceronian translation theory, incorporating Ciceronian elements into a new ascetic regimen that stressed the accurate transmission of the meaning of the text rather than the budding orator's freely ranging imitation.

The letter to Pammachius reflects Jerome's fiery, irascible nature, which strained all of his friend-

ships (including that with Augustine) and led to permanent breaks in several. In this he strongly resembles Martin Luther, who, eleven and a half centuries later, was to engineer a break with monasticism but not, finally, with Jerome's translation theory.

The Best Kind of Translator (395 A. D.)

In the above remarks, Pammachius, I have assumed that I did make some alterations in my translation, and that a simple version like mine may contain errors but not mistakes of criminal proportion. On the other hand, since the translation shows that no changes have been made in the sense, and that no extraneous doctrine has been fabricated into it, obviously, as Terence says, "Their purpose in understanding is to understand nothing"; and while my enemies desire to demonstrate another's ineptitude, they really exhibit their own. Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek—except of course in the case of Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery—I render, not word for word, but sense for sense.

For this practice I have behind me the authority of Cicero himself; he employed it in his versions of Plato's Pythagoras, the Occonomicus of Xenophon, and those two noble and beautiful orations of Aeschines and Demosthenes delivered against each other. What additions, omissions and alterations Cicero made, substituting the idiom and peculiarity of his own language for the original Greek—this is not the place to say. As far as I am concerned, it will be sufficient merely to quote his own justification for translating as he did. "I have considered it right," Cicero remarks in the prologue to the Latin version of the above orations:

I have considered it right for me to undertake a labor which, though not necessary for myself, should prove useful to other students. Here I have translated the noblest speeches of two of the most eloquent Attic orators, the debate between Aeschines and Demosthenes; but I have not interpreted and rendered them as a mere translator but as an orator, maintaining the sense but altering the form by adapting both Greek metaphors and diction to suit our own manner of speaking. Not thinking it necessary to render word for word, I have reproduced the general style; but I have not imagined myself obligated to payout each and every word to the reader; instead, I have paid out an equivalent in value.

This justification is repeated at the prologue's conclusion:

If my orations are found, as I hope they will be, true to this principle, I shall be satisfied. In translating this debate I have employed all the virtues of the original, that is, the sentiments and metaphors and order of the different parts. On the other hand, the literal wording has been followed only as far as I could without offending our notions of taste. If all that I have written is not to be found in the Greek, I have at least attempted to make the translation correspond with the original.

Similar advice is given by Horace, an acute and learned man, in The Art of Poetry when he tells the intelligent translator:

Try not to render words literally
Like some faithful translator.

Menander has been translated by Terence, the ancient comic poets by Plautus and Caecilius. But do they ever stick to the literal words? or instead, do they attempt to preserve the beauty and elegance of their originals? What is called fidelity in "interpretation" the learned designate as pestilent minuteness. Twenty years ago, my teachers favored such minuteness; and even then I remember being the victim of a mistaken notion of translation similar to the one which attacks me today, though I must say I never imagined that even you would look askance at my way of translating. When I put into Latin the Chronicle written by Eusebius of Caesarea, among other remarks in the preface I said: "In the following sentence composed by another man, it is difficult not to diverge somewhere; and in translating it is hard to preserve the beauty of idiom which in the original is most distinguished. Each particular word has a significance of its own. Possibly I have no equivalent by which to express some word, and if I then must go out of my way to reach the goal, miles are spent to cover what in reality is a short city block. To this difficulty must be added the windings of word transpositions, the dissimilarities in the use of cases, the varieties in figures of speech,

and, most difficult of all, the peculiar vernacular marrow of the language itself. If one translates each and every word literally, the passage will sound absurd; and if by necessity I change anything in the order and wording, it will seem that I have abused the function of translator." Then, after a lengthy discussion, which would be a bit boring to follow here, I added the following: "If anyone does not see how translation adulterates the charm of the original, let him squeeze Homer word for word into Latin—I will even go further and ask him to render Homer into Latin prose: the result will be that the order of the words will seem ridiculous, and that the most eloquent of poets will be hardly articulate."

Now if my own opinion seems to lack authority—in quoting the above my only object was to establish that from my adolescence I have always attempted to translate the substance, not the literal words—read and consider this short preface from a biography of St. Anthony of Egypt:

A literal translation from one language into another conceals, as with a coat, the original sense, just as an exuberance of grass strangles the crops. Diction is subject to grammatical cases and figures of speech; and when used for translation must explain by weary circumlocution what a few words would otherwise make evident. This blemish I have attempted to avoid in translating, at your request, the life of blessed Antony. Although my version is hardly literal, I have preserved the sense. Others may chase after syllables and exact duplicate words, I have only regarded the substance.

Time would run out if I were to mention all those who have translated according to this principle. Here it is sufficient to notice Hilary the Confessor as an example for the rest. When he turned some homilies on Job and several Psalms from Greek into Latin, he did not bind himself to the drowsiness of literal translation, or allow himself to be chained to the literalism of an inadequate culture, but, like some conqueror, he marched the original text, a captive, into his native language.

2. Translation in the Renaissance and Reformation

"I would never have thought that such a storm would rise from Rome over one simple scrap of paper…"

—Martin Luther

At time of the Renaissance, there was a flood of translations largely from Greek, with numerous translations of scientific and religious texts in England for the reason of accessing to Latin culture. As a well-known ideological movement "Protestantism" in Europe, in the religious field in Germany, their church authorities forbade the lay people to read the Bible in their native language. In a more conciliatory effort, Luther wrote a letter to Pope Leo explaining the substance of his ideas, "On the Freedom of the Christian", which surprised him as he said, "I would never have thought that such a storm would rise from Rome over one simple scrap of paper…" (Martin Luther)

This section stretches over a period of two and half centuries, a period of momentous changes in literature and culture, inaugurated by the Reformation and the Renaissance. These movements or paradigms are carried forward in no small part by translation: on the one hand biblical translation, on the other translation of Classical Greek and Roman canons of literary and historical writings, along with an increasing emphasis on more recent European literature.

Martin Luther, the most influential figure of the Reformation and one of its most radical thinkers, is the author of one of the most important Bible translations in European history, and his open letter on translation gives valuable insight into the relationship between the theo-political issues and translation matters. In England, William Tyndale is a key Reformation advocate, and a crucial translator of the Bible into English and a martyr to that joint venture. One need not be a Bible translator, however, to become a martyr to translation, as witnessed by the case of Estienne Dolet, the French scholar and translator, who wrote an early systematic account of the measures of translation. Dolet´s is not the only section in the chapter that testifies to the importance of French translation and translation theory during this period, France being of course, ever since the twelfth century, Britain´s strong literary neighbour. The sixteenth century, a golden age of translation in England, owes a good deal to France, and some of the translated works came via French into English, notably North´s famous version of Plutarch. This and other translations were a shaping influence on English as a literary language and even directly on writers of original works, some of

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

which carry distinct traces of translations, as may be seen in some of Shakespeare´s plays.

The strengthening of vernacular tongues and national cultures tends to obscure the view to a cross-cultural linguistic activity which also strongly characterized cultural and scholarly life in Europe in this era. Latin remained an important medium of scholarly and cultural preservation and dissemination, a bridge both across time and space—not least because texts translated into Latin had a potential readership all over Europe. Thus the most glorious period of translation in England was also the scene of much translation into Latin, and readers may catch a glimpse of this below.

As we move into the latter part of the period, it becomes clear how translation constitutes a shaping force on English literary and cultural activity. Its two primary flanks are obviously the English versions of the Bible especially the Authorized (King James) Version, one of the most important texts in English literature and the translation by Chapman, Dryden, Pope, and many others, of classical works of literature. Methods may vary a great deal, but the line of translators still forms a tradition within the English language, an ever-contested and ever-renewed strand of canonical writing whose significance is thus constantly confirmed even as its previous ´performances´ continue to be challenged. There is no better proof of a living tradition.

During the Reformation and Renaissance, and on into the eighteenth century, statements on translation are most frequently made in the context of actual practice, the most prominent platform being the translator´s own preface to his or her translation. There are, however, a number of more general and systematic accounts of translation as an act, and of its methods. Such accounts need not in themselves provide more of an insight into the act of translation, but they point the way to a more abstract theory, which in turn may help us, as students of translation, to understand this rich Weld, where translation can never be severed from comments on translation, translation being in itself a form of ´commentary´ on another text.

Martin Luther

Martin Luther (1483-1546) stands in history as one of those unique forces, an individual who by force of will and by his ideas changed the world fundamentally. Few if any men have changed the course of history like Martin Luther. In less than ten years, this fevered German monk plunged a knife into the heart of an empire that had ruled for a thousand years, and set in motion a train of revolution, war and conflict that would reshape Western civilization, and lift it out of the Dark Ages. Therefore, he was accepted as "father of the modern German language" in the translation field, he translated the Bible into High German and used it as an ideological weapon of the Protestant movement against the Roman church.

As a poet, writer and translator, Luther was the most famous example to advocate to reform the German language, since then non-literal or non-accepted translation came to be seen and used as a weapon against the Church. Luther follows St Jerome in rejecting a word-for-word translation strategy since it would be unable to convey the same meaning as the source text and would sometimes be incomprehensible (Mundy, 2000, 23). He believes in the meaning-oriented translation and postulates six principles of good translation: 1) shift of word-order; 2) employment of model auxiliaries; 3) introduction of conatives, whenever required; 4) use of phrases, where necessary to translate single words in the original text; 5) shifts of metaphors to non-metaphors and vice versa; and 6) careful attention paid to explanatory accuracy and textual variants (Nida, 1964: 15).

Contrast to Jerome, Luther developed the concept of translating the Bible specifically for the audience it was intended to reach. (Wolfram Wilss, 2000) Luther was the founder of the sixteenth-century Reformation and the first great spokesperson for the modern ´masses´—the emergent middle classes for whom the various Reformed churches were designed. As the translator of the German Bible, he is widely regarded as the father of the German literary language, and his pronouncements on translation in the ´Circular Letter´, especially the passage on "going out and asking the mother in her house, the children in the street, the ordinary man at the market", are still taught in German schools. Luther published his German New Testament in 1522, and his German Bible in 1534: the massive labour proceeded slowly due to Luther´s many other activities.

It is one of the great ironies of the history of Western translation theory that orthodox translation theory should be repeatedly defended in wild, shaggy, ´rebellious´ letters like this one—that, for example, Luther should feel just as compelled to take vicious potshots at the Catholic defenders of Jerome´s Vulgate translation as Jerome had felt to snipe at his detractors 1135 years before; and that the central issue, whether to translate word for word or sense for sense, should be exactly the same, unchanged by a millennium of medieval theology, in the two documents.

Luther´s most important contribution to translation theory lies in what might be called his ´reader-orientation´. When he formulates the standard principle that translations should be made out of good target-language words, idioms, syntactic structures, and the like, for example, he doesn´t idealize or objectify language, as Augustine had done—doesn´t treat the target language as a stable sign-system whose internal coherence must be respected when transferring source-language meanings into it. Instead he personalizes it, humanizes it, blends it with the vitality of his own sense of self. in so doing, significantly enough, he socializes it: what he internalizes is no solipsistic fantasy-system but language as social communication, language as what people like him (members of his class) say to each other in real-life speech situations.

/Circular Letter on Translation (Sendbrief yom Dolmetschen,1530)

There´s been so much talk about my translation of the Old and New Testaments, and the enemies of the truth have tried so hard to pretend that the text has been changed or falsified in so many places, and as a result so many simple-minded Christians (even some learned ones with no Hebrew or Greek) have either dismissed it or hated it, that I´m hoping this letter will at least thwart the godless in the exercise in their vices and buck up the pious in the exercise of their scruples. So tell every lover of truth to read this work with an open heart and to pray to God for a true understanding of the holy scriptures, for the good and the growth of all Christendom.

My dear friend, I got your letter with the two questions that you wanted me to answer. The first one was why I translated Paul´s words in Romans 3:28, which in Latin read *Arbitramur hominem iustificari ex fide absque operibus*, *as Wir halten*, *das der mensch gerecht werde on des gesetzs werck*, *allein durch den glauben*, or (literally) "We hold that (the) man becomes rectified without the law´s work. alone/only through (the) believing". You say the papists are getting themselves all worked up over the fact that Paul never wrote the word *sola* (*allein* or , alone/only) , and who am I to be adding things to the word of God, etc.

Well, on that first question, why don´t you just tell your papists for me that if I had thought for one second that the papists, even all the papists in the whole wide world, could translate a single chapter of the Bible without making hash of the thing, I would have eaten humble pie and asked them to help me translate the New Testament. But it was plain to me as the nose on my face that not a man jack among them knew how to speak German correctly, much less translate it, so I saved them and myself the trouble. Note what´s happening, though. They´re learning to speak and write German from my translation, and so in a sense stealing my language, which they hardly knew a word of before. But do they thank me for it? No they do not. They use it against me. But I don´t hold it against them. I´m flattered to have taught these ungrateful pups to talk right.

And, second, you can tell them that I´ve put the New Testament into German conscientiously and to the best of my ability; never forced anybody to read the thing, but left it up to them, and I did it all to help those who couldn´t do it better themselves. Nothing´s stopping anybody from making a better one. Whoever doesn´t want to read it can leave it lay; I´m not going to beg or praise anybody for it. It´s my Testament and my translation and nobody can take it away from me. If I´ve made mistakes in it anywhere (and I´m not aware of doing so, and you can bet I´d never mistranslate a single letter of it out of mischief) , I´m still not going to let the papists sit in judgment on it. Their ears are too long and their heehawing too feeble for that job. I know perfectly well what it takes in the way of skill, hard work, good sense, and understanding to be a good translator, but they know less than the miller´s beast, for they´ve never even tried it.

But let me tell you and our own people why I wanted to use *sola* in Romans 3:28—or actually, why I used not *sola* but *solum* or *tantum* there. That´s how closely these jackasses pore over my text! Still, I´ve used *sola fide* elsewhere, and do want both of them, *sola* and *solum*. I´ve worked hard in my translation to make my German pure and clear. And sometimes we looked for just the right word for two weeks, three, four weeks, and even then didn´t always find it. In the Book of Job Melancthon and Aurogallus and I sometimes managed to turn out three miserable lines in four days. Now that it´s all translated, of course, it´s easy as pie to read. Anyone can skim over three or four pages without stumbling once, and never even realizing what stumps and stones used to lie in what now looks as smooth as a planed board. Nobody noticed how hard we had to sweat and fret to remove those stumps and stones and smooth it out so nicely. It´s easy to plow when the field is cleared. But to pull out the wood and the stumps and get the field ready for the plow? Nobody wants that job. Working for the good of the world is a thankless task. Even God, what with the sun and the heavens and the earth, and the sacrifice of his son—even he can´t win the world´s gratitude. It´s the world; that´s just the way it is, in the devil´s name, and can do no different.

Anyway, working as I did on my translation I hardly needed papists to tell me that the Latin and Greek texts of Romans 3:28 had no *solum* in them. It´s true those four letters, s-o-l-a, aren´t there, and the jackasses stare at letters like a monkey at a new suit. What they can´t see is that it fits the meaning of the text, and if you want to want to translate it into strong and clear German, you´ve got to put it in there. You see, I wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since German as the language I was translating into. And see, that´s the way we do it in German, when we are talking about two things, one of which we´re affirming and the other denying: we use the word or ´alone´ or ´only´ or ´just´ alongside ´not´ or ´no´ For example, we say "The peasant only brings corn, no money". Or "Nope, ain´t got no money, only corn" Or "I´ve just eaten, haven´t had anything to drink yet". Or "The only thing you´ve done is write it, you haven´t proofread it yet?" There are lots of phrases like that in everyday speech.

So even if the Latin and the Greek might not use *sola* in these sentences, the German does. That´s the way German works. You´ve got to have an *allein* to bring the ´not´ or ´no´ out more fully and clearly. If you try to say "The peasant brings corn, no money", the "no money" lacks punch, sounds weak and puny compared to "The peasant only brings corn, no money" The *allein* (or ´only´) helps the ´no´ out, makes it clear, full-bodied German speech. Only an idiot would go ask the letters of the Latin alphabet how to speak German, the way these dumbasses do. You´ve got to go out and ask the mother in her house, the children in the street, the ordinary man at the market. Watch their mouths move when talk, and translate that way. Then they´ll understand you and realize that you´re speaking German to them.

Jesus says, for example, in Matthew 12: 34, *Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*. If I followed those jackasses, they would probably set the letters before me and have me translate it, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh". Tell me, is that how any real person would say it? Who would understand such a thing? What on earth is the "abundance of the heart"? Anybody who said that would probably mean he had too large a heart, or too much heart—and even that doesn´t sound right. For "abundance of the heart" sounds about as good in ordinary speech as "abundance of the house", or "abundance of the stove", or "abundance of the bench". What the mother in her house and the common man would say is something like: "speak straight from the heart". This is the kind of ordinary phrasing that I´ve always striven for, but alas, haven´t always managed to find. The letters of the Latin alphabet make it pretty hard to speak good German.

Or when the traitor Judas says in Matthew 26: 8, *Ut quid perditio haec*? and in Mark 14: 4, *Ut quid perditio ista unguenti facta est*? If I followed those lemmings the literalists, I´d have to render that latter question "Why was this waste of the ointment made?": What kind of talk is that? Whoever talks about "making a waste of the ointment"? You make a mess, not a waste, and anybody who heard you talking about making a waste would naturally think you were actually making something, when in fact you were unmaking it—though that still sounds pretty vague (nobody a waste either). If this sounds fight in ordinary speech, why don´t these people come forward and retranslate the New Testament into this fine, pretty talk, and leave Luther´s Testament alone? I mean, then the full extent of their skill would really see the light of day! What a real person would say, of course, is "What a waste!" or "What a shame to waste that oint-

ment!" Then the listener would understand that Mary Magdalene has squandered the ointment, at least according to Judas, who would have been more sparing with it.

John Dryden

John Dryden (1631–1700) was the predominant English literary figure of his day: poet, dramatist, translator, and critic, his influence on English literature for the next century or two was massive, and his pronouncements on translation are often cited (erroneously, as this volume testifies) as the first systematic theory of translation in the West.

Like his contemporaries John Denham, Abraham Cowley, and the Earl of Roscommon, Dryden was engaged in the gentlemanly search for secular principles of translation; and for him, as for them, ´gentlemanly´ largely meant ´amateurish´, meant refusing to put on scholarly airs—meant, in fact, resisting the temptation to write lengthy knit-browed treatises on the subject, as Lawrence Humphrey had in *Interpretatio /inguarum* (1559), as Charles Batteux would in *Principes de fittrature* (1743), and as Alexander Frazer Tytler would in *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1797).

Still, Dryden´s (undeserved) reputation today as the ´first translation theorist´ reflects a movement in his remarks toward system—a movement that motivates the writing of a handful of pages rather than a whole book, and that does not knit his brow, does not drive him into impenetrable thickets of jargon, both of which factors surely contribute to his continuing reputation among modern readers. His three ´new´ terms for translation, metaphrase, paraphrase, and imitation, for word-for-word, sense-for-sense, and ´free´ translation, were far from new; first theorized for translation in ancient Alexandria (by Philo) and Rome (by Quintilian), they were rediscovered in the Renaissance and used repeatedly by authors from Roger Ascham in 1570 to Pierre-Daniel Huet in 1661. Still, Dryden remains an attractive and accessible popularizer of this long tradition.

The Three Types of Translation

All translations, I suppose, may be reduced to these three heads.

First, that of metaphrase, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another. Thus, or near this manner, was Horace his *Art of Poetry* translated by Ben Jonson. The second way is that of paraphrase, or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered. Such is Mr. Wallet´s translation of Virgil´s Fourth Aeneid. The third way is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork, as he pleases. Such is Mr Cowley´s practice in turning two Odes of Pindar, and one of Horace, into English)

In short, the verbal copier is encumbered with so many difficulties at once, that he can never disentangle himself from all. He is to consider, at the same time, the thought of his author, and his words, and to find out the counterpart to each in another language; and, besides this, he is to confine himself to the compass of numbers, and the slavery of rhyme. ´Tis much like dancing on ropes with fettered legs: a man may shun a fall by using caution; but the gracefulness of motion is not to be expected: and when we have said the best of it, ´tis but a foolish task; for no sober man would put himself into a danger for the applause of escaping without breaking his neck. We see Ben Jonson could not avoid obscurity in his literal translation of Horace, attempted in the same compass of lines

The consideration of these difficulties, in a servile, literal translation, not long since made two of our famous wits, Sir John Denham and Mr Cowley, to contrive another way of turning authors into our tongue, called, by the latter of them, imitation. As they were friends, I suppose they communicated their thoughts on this subject to each other; and therefore their reasons for it are little different, though the practice of one is much more moderate. 71 take imitation of an author, in their sense, to be an endeavour of a later poet to write like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words,

or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country. Yet I dare not say, that either of them have carried this libertine way of rendering authors (as Mr. Cowley calls it) so far as my definition reaches; for in the Pindaric Odes, the customs and ceremonies of ancient Greece are still preserved. But I know not what mischief may arise hereafter from the example of such an innovation, when writers of unequal parts to him shall imitate so bold an undertaking. To add and to diminish what we please, which is the way avowed by him, ought only to be granted to Mr. Cowley, and that too only in his translation of Pindar; because he alone was able to make him amends, by giving him better of his own, whenever he refused his author's thoughts. Pindar is generally known to be a dark writer, to want connection (I mean as to our understanding), to soar out of sight, and leave his reader at a gaze. So wild and ungovernable a poet cannot be translated literally; his genius is too strong to bear a chain, and Samson-like he shakes it off. A genius so elevated and unconfined as Mr. Cowley's was but necessary to make Pindar speak English, and that was to be performed by no other way than imitation. But if Virgil, or Ovid, or any regular intelligible authors be thus used, 'tis no longer to be called their work, when neither the thoughts nor words are drawn from the original; but instead of them there is something new produced, which is almost the, creation of another hand. By this way, 'tis true, somewhat that is excellent may be invented, perhaps more excellent than the first design; though Virgil must be still accepted, when that perhaps takes place. Yet he who is inquisitive to know an author's thoughts will be disappointed in his expectation; and 'tis not always that a man will be contented to have a present made him, when he expects the payment of a debt. To state it fairly; imitation of an author is the most advantageous way for a translator to show himself, but the greatest wrong which can be done to the memory and reputation of the dead. Sir John Denham (who advised more liberty than he took himself) gives his reason for his innovation, in his admirable Preface before the translation of the Second Aeneid: Poetry is of so subtle a spirit, that, in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate; and, if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a caput mortuum. 8 I confess this argument holds good against a literal translation; but who defends it? Imitation and verbal [literal] version are, in my opinion, the two extremes which ought to be avoided; and therefore, when I have proposed the mean betwixt them, it will be seen how far his argument will reach.

No man is capable of translating poetry, who, besides a genius to that art, is not a master both of his author's language, and of his own; nor must we understand the language only of the poet, but his particular turn of thoughts and expression, which are the characters that distinguish, and as it were individuate him from all other writers. When we are come thus far, 'tis time to look into ourselves, to conform our genius to his, to give his thought either the same turn, if our tongue will bear it, or, if not, to vary but the dress, not to alter or destroy the substance. The like care must be taken of the more outward ornaments, the words. When they appear (which is but seldom) literally graceful, it were an injury to the author that they should be changed. But since every language is so full of its own proprieties that what is beautiful in one is often barbarous, nay sometimes nonsense, in another, it would be unreasonable to limit a translator to the narrow compass of his author's words: 'tis enough if he choose out some expression which does not vitiate the sense. I suppose he may stretch his chain to such a latitude; but by innovation of thoughts, methinks he breaks it. By this means the spirit of an author may be transfused, and yet not lost: and thus 'tis plain that the reason alleged by Sir John Denham has no farther force than to expression; for thought, if it be translated truly, cannot be lost in another language; but the words that convey it to our apprehension (which are the image and ornament of that thought), may be so ill chosen as to make it appear in an unhandsome dress, and rob it of its native lustre. There is, therefore, a liberty to be allowed for the expression; neither is it necessary that words and lines should be confined to the measure of their original. The sense of an author, generally speaking, is to be sacred and inviolable. If the fancy of Ovid be luxuriant, 'tis his character to be so; and if I retrench it, he is no longer Ovid. It will be replied, that he receives advantage by this lopping of his superfluous branches; but I rejoin, that a translator has no such right. When a painter copies from the life, I suppose he has no privilege to alter features and lineaments under pretence that his picture will look better: perhaps the face which he has drawn would be

more exact, if the eyes or nose were altered; but 'tis his business to make it resemble the original. In two cases only there may a seeming difficulty arise; that is, if the thought be notoriously trivial or dishonest; but the same answer will serve for both, that then they ought not to be translated:

Thus I have ventured to give my opinion on this subject against the authority of two great men, but I hope without offence to either of their memories; for I both loved them living and reverence them now they are dead. But if, after what I have urged, it be thought by better judges that the praise of a translation consists in adding new beauties to the piece, thereby to recompense the loss which it sustains by change of language, I shall be willing to be taught better, and to recant. In the meantime it seems to me that the true reason why we have so few versions which are tolerable is not from the too close pursuing of the author's sense, but because there are so few who have all the talents which are requisite for translation, and that there is so little praise and so small encouragement for so considerable a part of learning.

To apply, in short, what has been said to this present work, the reader will here find most of the translations with some little latitude or variation from the author's sense. That of Oenone to Paris is in Mr. Cowley's way of imitation only. I was desired to say that the author [Aphra Behn], who is of the fair sex, understood not Latin. But if she does not, I am afraid she has given us occasion to be ashamed who do.

For my own part, I am ready to acknowledge that I have transgressed the rules which I have given; and taken more liberty than a just translation will allow. But so many gentlemen whose wit and learning are well known being joined in it, I doubt not but that their excellencies will make you ample satisfaction for my errors.

3. Romanticism in Translation Theories

Translation was one of the main issues of Romanticism, not only because the art of translation served to extend the horizon of literature but also because it involved several points of central polemics on the conjunction of language and imagination. The issue surrounding translation is deeply related to the principles of translation in the 1790's which allow a great amount of freedom in poetical translation especially. Unlike the rigour of classical aesthetic of the eighteenth century, when translation of Classics was the only matter of importance, the general tendency of the 1790's was toward innovation and novelty, and consequently, the demand for translations of contemporary European literature, especially of German literature became very keen. In order to discuss the definition of translation in the 1790's, we had better start with *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791) by Alexander Fraser Tytler, Lord Woodhouselee.

Alexander Frazer Tytler

In English, perhaps the first systematic study of translation is Alexander Frazer Tytler.

—Munday

In the 18th century, an important work relating to translation studies was Alexander Fraser Tytler's *The Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791). The ideas of Tytler can give inspiration to modern TS scholars, particularly his open-mindedness on quality assessment and his ideas on linguistic and cultural aspects in translations, which are illustrated with many examples. As the original preface states: "It will serve to demonstrate, that the Art of Translation is of more dignity and importance than has generally been imagined." *The Essay on the Principles of Translation* is "an admirably typical dissertation on the classic art of poetic translation, and of literary style, as the eighteenth century understood it." ("Introduction", p. viii) In the first chapter, Tytler begins his discussion by referring to two opposite extremes in translation. At one extreme, "the duty of a translator" is "to attend only to the sense and spirit of his original, to make himself perfectly master of his author's ideas, and to communicate them in those expressions which he judges to be best suited to convey them."

Tytler's definition of good translation is a very moderate one: that, in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused with into another language, as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work. (Tytler, p. 9)

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com