On the Norm of Intercultural Ethic in Translation

论跨文化伦理对翻译的规约

葛 林 著

On the Norm of Intercultural Ethic

in Translation

论跨文化伦理对翻译的规约

葛 林 著

厦门大学出版社

序

　　在全球化发展不断加快的大趋势下,各民族对自身和对方差异性、特殊性的关注程度不断提高,民族中心主义和话语中心主义对翻译交流的平衡以及交流双方平等性的影响也随之增强,语际翻译已无法再局限于单纯的文本与文化间的转化。本书作者葛林博士在攻读博士学位期间,经过深入、系统的调查研究,提出了翻译理论和实践中的跨文化伦理规约,从文化间性、主体间性、文本特性、译论研究等角度系统论述了跨文化伦理规约的本质及规约模式,全面分析了跨文化伦理规约翻译理论和实践的方式及效果。

　　作者将操控文化群体间互相尊敬、和平共处的尺度界定为跨文化伦理,强调跨文化伦理是保证翻译研究和实践深入及适度开展的必要前提,书中系统分析了跨文化伦理与译者主体性之间的互动方式,讨论了跨文化伦理的规约模式,阐述了跨文化伦理适度规约的前提。作者指出,忠实与自由的二元划分需要结合跨文化伦理考察,接受跨文化伦理规约的译者主体性会表现为挑战原文权威的策略,以及模糊作者及译者固定身份的交互式翻译、自翻译、作者翻译等翻译行为,存在简单或繁复的规约、多渠道的规约、半独立的规约等跨文化伦理的规约模式。

　　作者结合人类学、哲学、伦理学、统计学、跨文化交际学等学科的研究成果,提出其他独特的观点,例如,Venuti 对于抵抗策略的论述不同于 Bassnett;职业伦理会与跨文化伦理相冲突;跨文化伦理的规约客体不限于文学文本;我国的异化策略研究明显侧重于翻译的文化传播功能,虽然跨文化伦理倾向逐年递增,但是比重偏低。同时,为了进一步促进翻译研究的严谨性,作者大胆质疑了某些权威翻译学者的观点以及翻译理论界若干约定俗成的看法。例如,作者证伪了 Lefevere 对于中西方忠实传统的误读,证伪了"作者死亡"的观点,指出将食人主义等同于归化的观点的谬误。

　　本书的初稿是葛林向厦门大学提交的博士论文。由于论文选题新颖,逻辑清晰,具有较强的学科前沿性和较高的理论价值,已顺利通过答辩。与已有的相关文献相比,本书加强了相关领域薄弱环节

的研究,对文化转向后翻译理论和实践将产生较大的推动和促进作用,也将为翻译研究在多元文化共存的格局下更客观、更有效地履行文化功能做出积极贡献。作为葛林的导师,我祝贺她的博士论文得以出版,并期待她继续发扬刻苦钻研、求真务实的严谨治学精神,在翻译理论研究方面做出更多贡献。

连淑能

2008 年 6 月 28 日

厦门大学外文学院

前　言

20 世纪 70 年代翻译研究的"文化转向",将翻译放置于更为广阔的文化语境中考察,成为翻译研究历史上具有划时代意义的重要变革。然而,已有的研究较多停留于寻求翻译过程及结果的目的文化动因,其前提在于假定翻译行为相关的双文化或多文化在历史、国际地位、态度、价值观念等方面彼此平等,理所当然地将翻译理论及实践放置于公正、民主、互利的文化交流背景中。较深入的探讨表现为后殖民主义翻译和女性主义翻译,这两类研究着眼于如何以翻译为中介,促成、揭示或抵制殖民、新殖民、性别歧视等行为,强调若干翻译策略及文本选择的文化功能,为维护跨文化伦理这一终极目标发挥了不可或缺的作用,但在经历了一段时间的热潮后,进展平缓,人云亦云的讨论较多,仍然留有许多有待解决的问题。本书尝试通过系统地研究跨文化伦理对翻译的规约,突破翻译研究在"文化转向"后无视或轻视翻译的负面文化效应的倾向,突破少数民族和弱势文化立场局限,促进翻译研究在多元文化共存的格局下,更客观、更有效地履行文化功能。

跨文化伦理作为协调并衡量平等、公正、和平、友好的文化群体间交往的尺度,是保证合理译介原语文化和丰富译语文化,从而推进人类文化整体进程的重要因素,对于译者的翻译动机、翻译策略、翻译行为和翻译效果具有重要影响。本书以跨文化伦理为视角,为深入、合理的翻译主体间性研究提供了新的视角。笔者从译者地位、语言层次、忠实程度、异质忠实等侧面回顾国内外忠实策略的研究,质疑 André Lefevere 对于中西方忠实传统的误读及其他相关观点,进而提出,如果人们能够从跨文化伦理角度审视译者忠实的限度,突破二元对立的窠臼,将有可能在一定程度上对以往的研究做出有益的补充。由于翻译主体受到多样化的经济、社会、性别、民族、文化环境影响,译者对于其他主体的服从有必要建立在维护跨文化伦理的基础上。本书大胆质疑了翻译界固有的译者服从于其他主体的先入之

见。笔者指出翻译主体的行为可能不合乎跨文化伦理，从而共同生成有损于某文化群体的译文，或共同导致某些译文受到不应有的排斥，认为跨文化伦理从翻译策略、文本取向以及语言杂糅等侧面，为译者主体性提供了新的诠释视角，是食人主义、杂合、异化、归化、劫持等挑战传统翻译规则的译论引发广泛关注的深层次动因。笔者分析了相关理论和研究的独特性及缺陷，讨论了跨文化伦理在其他方面对于译者主体性的规约，如交互式翻译、自翻译、作者翻译等，论证了不同译者接受跨文化伦理规约方式的差异，强调跨文化伦理对于译者主体性的规约受到其他参数的影响。

笔者围绕跨文化伦理与文化特性、文本特性、主体间合作、翻译理论研究、意识形态和赞助人的操控的规约关系等，论述了跨文化伦理规约翻译的途径。同时，笔者还通过大量例证，指出得体的策略、有责任感的赞助以及恰如其分的翻译批评是保证翻译适度维护跨文化伦理的必要前提。其中，评论人介入的质量如何把握，罕见有学者深入分析。笔者从跨文化伦理规约的角度提出翻译策略评论的合理性、翻译目的评论的合理性以及关于其他评论人评论的合理性等三个标准。

笔者在本研究中适度建立语料库，对国内 1998 年至 2006 年间采用"foreignization"和"翻译"作为关键词的 670 余篇论文进行了统计分析，运用方差分析方法，得出我国异化策略研究不同于 Venuti 的研究、侧重于翻译的文化传播功能、跨文化伦理动机的比重偏低等结论；通过建立包含 TNIV 译文在内的近十本《圣经》译文的语料库，得出 Kohlenberger 的评论有失公允，以及 TNIV 译者有必要适度介入等结论。

为了保证翻译合理地维系文化间真诚、友好交往的桥梁，跨文化伦理具有存在和深入研究的理据。在目前相关的翻译研究尚未引起足够重视的情况下，希望本书为突破乌托邦式的翻译观，促进翻译研究在多元文化共存的格局下，更客观、更有效地履行文化功能发挥积极的作用。

葛林

2008 年 6 月 27 日

于厦门大学外文学院

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

1. 1　Background of this study

1. 1. 1　Cultural turn of translation studies

Traditionally, translation is treated as a rule-bound technique for the transfer between languages. With the author and the audience inviolable, a translator is put in the dilemma of imitating the original and satisfying the readers. In the devoted pursuit of equivalence and fidelity, such external parameters as history, society, economy are ignored as if they were equal. Since a culture is subject to constant changes and the existence of cultural factors has preceded many misunderstandings and reconstitutions, a translation is irredeemably partial in the interpretation and representation. Besides, a translator need not necessarily "surrender" to the rhetoricity of the foreign text in that he/she is inevitably influenced with his/her personal capacity, habits, beliefs, interest, values, etc. The conventional linguistics-centered controversy about freedom and fidelity is therefore subject to many criticisms.

The last two decades have witnessed flourishing translation studies. With more and more awareness of the relevance of linguistics, philosophy, psychology, aesthetics, archaeology, literary criticism, anthropology and so on with translation studies and practices, the scopes of translation studies are widened with more in-depth perception of the

nature and patterns of translation activities. Correspondingly, sociocultural factors are taken into account in translation studies. The culture-oriented translation studies, which focus on the external elements influencing translation process, have provided a firm theoretical basis for current study.

In the early 1970s, Tel Aviv scholar Itamar Even-Zohar applied the notion of "polysystem" to translated literature and cast his eyes to translations within a "cultural system" (cf. 1990: 51). According to his Polysystem Theory, a translated literature bears a correlation to the nature of the polysystem of the receiving culture. A heterogeneous and hierarchical literary system keeps constantly changing, and there will always be the struggles of a minor or less influential literary form for its equality with the major or "canonized" form as well as the fluctuation between acentral and "peripheral" position. The ways translation is practiced in a culture are determined by the position it occupies in the given polysystem. There are three situations for the primary position of translated literature in a certain society (1990: 46 –48). The first is the circumstance where literature is too "young" or in the process of being established, the second instance occurs when the original literature is "peripheral" or "weak", and the third is the situation where the literature is going through a crisis. Despite the criticism that Polysystem Theory has focused too much on the target culture, that it has neglected other text types, and that it has to rely on other cultural theories, Polysystem Theory is undeniably of significant insight and profound influence on translation studies (cf. Bassnett 1998: 107, Baker 2004: 178, Zhang Nanfeng 2004: 166 – 168).

Enlightened with Even-Zohar's theorization, a group of scholars in the Manipulation School set their minds to descriptive researches on translation-relevant cultural parameters in the early 1980s. In their introduction to *Translation, History and Culture*, Susan Bassnett-McGuire and Andr Lefevere (1992) take the term "cultural turn" as a metaphor for the close association of translation with sociocultural

2

environments. For Bassnett-McGuire, only in cultural contexts can the problems in translation studies be truly solved. According to Lefevere, translation as a type of "rewriting" need be examined with ideology, power, patrons and poetics. Lefevere (1992) views the "image" of the target culture, "cultural scripts" and the translator's ideology in terms of particular strategies as the "control factors" of translations. The all-pervasive cultural turn has alerted many other scholars to how translations are undertaken in accordance with cultural dimensions, for instance, Vermeer (1987, 1996)'s consideration of translation as a bicultural event, Nord (1991, 1997)'s attention to cultural barriers of translation as a type of "intercultural communication", Toury (1985)'s interest in target or recipient culture as a system which initiates translation decisions.

The narrations in each chapter of the book are grounded as they are on a diagnosis of past and present culture-relevant translation theories and practices with the aim at reassessing cannons of intercultural translation. But it is noteworthy that translation between cultures, which serve more their own interest, is inherently biased and often based on the hegemonic, discriminatory or suspicious assumptions. Or rather, it might possibly violate intercultural ethic. All these foreshadows the appearance and prevalence of postcolonial translation studies and feminist translation studies.

Between the 1940s and the 1960s, with the disintegration of European empires, anti-colonial cultural studies were brought on the stage. By the end of the 20th century, with postcolonial theories flourishing, "postcolonial turn" appeared in translation researches. Different from above-mentioned culture-oriented translation theorization, postcolonial translation studies are centered upon historicity and power differentials behind translation activities and hegemonic or prejudiced intercultural communication between a strong culture and a weak culture for third-world independence in the true sense (cf. www. uqtr. uquebec. ca/ AE/ vol4/ notesbio. htm#petters).

The cultural turn in translation studies has also brought about the reflection on gender stereotypes produced or reproduced with translation in feminist translation researches in the late 1970s. By closely associating translation with women, such studies intentionally struggle against feminist ideology and strive for female emancipation through language and translation. Similar with their postcolonial translation counterparts, feminist translation scholars give prominence to visible rather than invisible translations (For more, see Section 4. 4).

Postcolonial translation studies and feminist translation studies have greatly illuminated the author's devotion to the balance of intercultural ethic coordinating intercultural communication both for better explanation and guidance of current translation studies and practice and for the reconsideration of and recuperation from conventional historiography as well as past and present domination or exclusion as regards certain social communication. Aware that the violence facilitated with translation can always influence translation activities with various social and historical formulations, I argue that it is highly desirable to strategically reflect, restrain or revise the unjust dominance, subordination or marginality engendered by cultural narcissism, racism, imperialism or sexism. But we need to point out here that current study on intercultural ethic in translation differs a lot from the two researches. First, what I am advocating here is not confined to the communication between a weak culture and a strong culture. Other cultural communities like kindred groups, religious groups, classes, etc. are concerned. Besides, a translation activity usually works between two or more cultural groups at the same time, e. g. the versions with postcolonial feminist inclination and the coexistence of a patron's support for one type of intercultural ethic and disagreement with another type of intercultural ethic (cf. Section 4. 1). Second, the current study does focus more on the ways unantagonistic dialogue is effected than postcolonial or feminist translation studies, e. g. the translations of Pearl Buck and James Legge discussed in the book. And the scope of present discussion goes beyond

4

the afore mentioned two studies. Anyway, many translation behaviors against intercultural ethic cannot be simply treated as colonialist or sexist (cf. Section 4.5.2.1).

1.1.2 Researches on translation ethics

With traditional prescriptive translation studies going out of date, there appears the necessity to explore translations across cultures and disciplines. Correspondingly, researches on ethics in translation become a trend. As Chesterman (1997: 48) predicts, the next stage of translation studies will be featured with the hot debates around ethics. Pym (2001: 129) points out, "Ethics has become a cross-cultural concern, as it has been in translation studies (sic)". Bassnett (1991: 4) says, "As research in Translation Studies increases and historical data become more readily available, so important questions are starting to be asked, about... more recently, the problems of determining an ethics of translation".

More explicitly, increasing concerns about ethics in translation can be ascribed to the following major factors. Firstly, ethical researches may contribute to more considerations about cultural roles a translator plays for the development of his/her native group and intercultural interaction in a globalized era (Lane-Mercier 1997: 63, Venuti 1995, 1998, Berman 1992, 2000). Secondly, cultural turn of translation studies brings about more emphasis on and respect to a translator's freedom and right, but overdue subjectivity can engender patchwork, mistranslation and plagiarism. As a consequence, ethical topics about the plausibility of a translator's activity are involved (cf. Xu Jun 2002: 229, Lv Jun 2001: 272). Thirdly, a translator alone does not complete a translation process. He/she is economically, politically and linguistically relevant with other subjects. Therefore, translation activities need to be properly realized with responsible cooperation between subjects, hence the necessity to study translation ethics (cf. Berman 1995, Chesterman 1997, 2001: 139 – 54, Ge Lin 2007b).

A. Berman is generally regarded as the first spokesman for "ethics of translation" (cf. Simon 1996, Koskinen 2000: 48). In 1981, he proposed the term with the emphasis on "the responsibilities of intersubjectivity", a translator's right and the respect to the original against ethnocentrism and annexation (cf. Koskinen 2000: 49, Berman 1995: 93). Opposed to Polysystem Theory, he argued that a translator should not be treated as a passive conveyor belt of the norms in the foreign culture (Berman 1995: 50, 63, 76). Later on, Anthony Pym discusses translation ethics from the perspective of fidelity. Conscious that translation studies on ethics should pay more attention to intercultural contacts, he draws a hasty conclusion that it is not necessary to put fidelity into the researches on translation ethics (1997: 82). Chesterman is another scholar concerned with translation ethics. He relates ethics to "virtues" and distinguishes macro-ethical matters from micro-ethical matters. Lawrence Venuti has also contributed a lot to the researches on translation ethics with his ethics of difference against ethnocentrism (For more, cf. Section 1. 2. 3. 2).

We should not hesitate to acknowledge that the current study has benefited a lot from former and current researches on translation ethics, though there exist remarkable differences between intercultural ethic and other ethics, as is discussed in Section 1. 2. 3.

1. 1. 3　Researches on translation norms

The present author is also greatly enlightened with the researches on translation norms. A number of translation scholars have sought to examine them on which decisions between adequacy and acceptability are based. In translation studies, the term norm was first advanced by Toury, who attempts to offer reasonable and systematic description and interpretation of a translation process in combination with the source or target culture. Many other scholars have set their minds to translation norms, which is discussed in Section 1. 3. In present book, for the sake of convenience, the words "normalization" and "normalize" are adopted

from time to time. As the derivatives of the noun "norm" restricted to the notion of intercultural ethic, the two words are not to be understood in Baker(1998)'s and Kenny(1997)'s sense, who have equalized normalization with standardization in corpus-based translation studies devoid of cultural concern.

1.2 Definition of intercultural ethic in translation

1.2.1 Definition of "intercultural"

Culture is such an influential notion as to defy all-inclusive definition. Though quite a few philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists and linguists have tried, from different perspectives, to offer satisfactory definitions for it, no one is universally preferred. According to Kroeber and Kluckhorn (1952), there are at least 150 definitions so far. In general, we prioritize the one put forward by Kramsch (1998: 127), who classifies the compound of culture into three categories:

1. Membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space and history, and a common system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting

2. The discourse community itself

3. The system of standards itself

More explicitly, our understanding of the concept varies in this way. When translation-relevant cultures are examined, we agree more with the third statement. In other words, culture is seen as collective patterns of values, customs, behaviors, habits and other capabilities and behaviors acquired by a member of a community. At the same time, when "intercultural" relationship is involved, the first two statements are helpful and the term is better viewed as geographical, biological, class, gender or other groups with comparatively homogeneous thinking modes, practices, lifestyles, etc.

In accordance with foregoing discussion, as concerns their similar

intergroup paradigms, intercultural ethic overlaps with intercultural communication. And it is noteworthy that the notion of interculturality in our study differs from that proposed by Pym, though they are both concerned with concentrative researches on translation-associated intersection between cultures. Pym (1998) prefers intercultures to monocultures. According to Toury (1995: 28), "as long as a (hypothetical) interculture has not crystallized into an autonomous (target!) systemic entity ... it is necessarily part of an existing (target!) system" (emphasis in the original). Pym (1998: 180) disagrees with him and is skeptical about the necessity to confine a translator within one particular group, though he does not advocate a translator's absolute neutrality (see Section 1. 2. 4. 3). In contrast, interculturality in this paper is investigated without any priority given to intercultures.

1. 2. 2   Definition of "ethic"

Originating from the Greek word *ethos* meaning "character", "custom", "manner of life and conduct", etc., "ethic" is concerned with conventional standards of virtues, duties, values and so on[1]. It focuses on judgment-based acceptance or exclusion of certain human thoughts or activities (cf. Koskinen 2000: 11, Bauman 1993: 47, 60, 61). Different from morality, an ethic deals theoretically and systematically with moral principles and is accordingly often designated as collective morality (cf. Guo Guangyin 1995: 12, Zhang Yingkang 1991: 1). In general, it is approached from two major angles. Firstly, it is analyzed in terms of extensively welcome codes about social members' words, beliefs and deeds. Ethics studied from this perspective can be illustrated with Confucian ethic, Aristotle's ethic, Kant's "ethical law", Wittgenstein's transcendental ethic and He Huaihong's Bottomline Ethic[2]. Secondly, an ethic is treated as impartial and beneficial cooperation between an individual and nature, between an individual and a collective, between individuals or between groups. Habermas's