外国语言文学研究系列丛书

总主编◎高继海　杨朝军

推而行之

《中庸》英译研究

Extending the Familiar: The Creation of the *Zhongyong* in English-Speaking Cultures

侯　健◎著

科学出版社

外国语言文学研究系列丛书　总主编　高继海　杨朝军

推而行之：《中庸》英译研究

Extending the Familiar: The Creation of the *Zhongyong* in English-Speaking Cultures

侯健　著

科学出版社
北京

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

推而行之：《中庸》英译研究=Extending the Familiar: The Creation of the *Zhongyong* in English-Speaking Cultures / 侯健著. —北京：科学出版社，2014. 12
（外国语言文学研究系列丛书 / 高继海，杨朝军主编）
ISBN 978-7-03-042510-2

I. ①推… II. ①侯… III. ①《中庸》-英语-翻译-研究 IV. ①H315.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字（2014）第 268404 号

责任编辑：阎 莉 常春娥 / 责任校对：鲁 素
责任印制：肖 兴 / 封面设计：铭轩堂

联系电话：010-6401 9007 电子邮箱：changchune@mail.sciencep.com

科学出版社 出版
北京东黄城根北街 16 号
邮政编码：100717
http://www.sciencep.com

中国科学院印刷厂 印刷
科学出版社发行 各地新华书店经销
*
2015年1月第一版 开本：A5（890×1240）
2015年1月第一次印刷 印张：8 3/4
字数：300 000

定价：78.00 元

（如有印装质量问题，我社负责调换）

安徽理工大学 藏書 图書馆

丛 书 序

河南大学外语学院与河南大学同岁，其前身为1912年的河南留学欧美预备学校，迄今已有百年的办学历史。现设有英语、翻译、俄语、日语、德语、法语6个本科专业，拥有外国语言文学博士后科研流动站、外国语言文学一级学科博士、硕士学位授权点。河南大学外语学院的英语专业为国家级特色专业和国家级专业综合改革试点，“高级英语”为国家级精品课程，英语语言文学教学团队为国家级教学团队，外国语言文学为河南省一级重点学科。英语专业连续多年跻身全国专业排行榜A++行列。

河南大学外语学院目前的在校本科生总数为852人，在校硕士研究生360余人，在校博士研究生18人，另有博士后进站人员10余人。现有教职工106人，其中教授18人，副教授32人，博士生导师12人，硕士生导师36人。拥有河南省高校人文社科重点研究基地（英语语言文学研究中心）、河南大学外国语言学及应用语言学、英美文学、翻译理论研究所等科研机构并主办有《外文研究》学术期刊。

一百多年来，河南大学外语学院的教职工生秉承河南大学明德新民、止于至善的校训，殚智竭诚，筚路蓝缕，涌现出张今、刘炳善、吴雪莉、徐盛桓等国内知名专家学者，其关于认知语言学、莎学、语用学的研究在国内外有广泛影响，功能语言学、文体学、英汉语言对比、翻译理论、俄罗斯语言文学等方向的研究在国内居于前列。

按照十八大“科教兴国，人才强国，可持续发展”的科教战略，河南大学外语学院进一步完善了学科布局，出台了一系列的规章制度，使得学院学术研究空前繁盛，近五年来，共发表学术论文360多篇，出版教材和著作50余部；先后承担国家社科基金项目9项，省部级科研项目16项，获得省部级以上科研和教学奖励24项。正是在这样一种氛围中，我们决定推出这套《外国语言文学研究系列丛书》，旨在展现河南大学外

语学院的最新成果，向学界汇报我们的研究发现。

这套丛书的组织有以下两个明显的特点：

一是学科的覆盖面较为广泛，涉及文学、语言学和翻译等研究领域。文学方面有探讨文学批评原理的，如吕长发教授的著作；也有关于具体的文学理论流派的，如薛玉凤教授的创伤文学研究、孙晓青老师的印象主义研究、张玉红老师的民俗文学批评研究、张璟慧老师的现象学精神分析研究等；还有文学史料的研究成果，如李巧慧老师的《尤利西斯》出版史料研究等。涉及语言学的研究涵盖英语、汉语和俄语，均是利用当代语言学研究的最新成果对具体语言现象的分析，如杨朝军教授关于形式和功能关系的探讨、李香玲老师的认知研究、王志坚老师的俄语被动句语义研究、刘倩老师的心智哲学研究、庄会彬老师的现代汉语否定现象的句法研究等。涉及翻译的作品有侯健老师关于中国典籍翻译的方法论思考和薛凌老师关于理雅各《左传》英译的研究等。

这套丛书的另外一个特点是涉及不同的年龄阶段，可以说是老中青结合，反映了河南大学外语学院薪火相传、生生不息的学术传统，例如博士生导师吕长发教授已经是74岁高龄但仍然笔耕不辍，杨朝军教授和薛玉凤教授则是年富力强的中年学者，而其他作者皆为近几年涌现出来的青年才俊，他们学识渊博、风华正茂、成果丰硕，是当代外语界学者们的一个缩影。

最后想要说明的是，著作编撰难免有学术或技术上的问题，恳请各位同仁能够不吝指正。同时学院代表这套丛书的所有作者，向在背后默默付出的科学出版社的阎莉编辑和常春娥编辑表示谢忱！

总主编

2014年9月于河南大学外语楼

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

前　言

本书试图运用源自《中庸》的方法论，来对《中庸》的英译进行研究。以往的《中庸》英译研究未及深入《中庸》英译的本质；而通过对不同的译文进行比较系统的研究，探索它们的共性，可以将之展示出来。这就需要某种创新的方法论，需要把重心由原文本的意义转向翻译主体。本文提出的新的方法论是“推而行之”（extending the familiar），简言之，亦即以熟悉推及陌生。就《中庸》英译而言，“推而行之”意味着推及文化他者（the cultural other），用西方文化中熟悉的宗教和哲学理论来理解、翻译陌生的中国文化概念。本文通过研究理雅各（James Legge）、辜鸿铭、赖发洛（Leonard A. Lyall）和经乾堃（King Chien-Kun）、休中诚（E. R. Hughes）、陈荣捷（Wing-tsit Chan）、安乐哲（Roger T. Ames）与郝大维（David L. Hall）、浦安迪（Andrew Plaks）等的译本来展示“推而行之”的运用，旨在阐明，中国经典是如何被译入西方文化的，确切地说，在西方文化中被创造出来的过程。对上述重要译本的研究大体按照时间顺序展开，侧重不同译者在不同历史阶段近取诸身。本文试图为《中庸》的翻译及一般意义上的翻译研究带来新思想，预期能在理论和实践两个层面上引出新的东西，希望作者能尽绵薄之力，以某种方式为《中庸》的哲学探索做出应有的贡献。

本书共分七章。

第一章为绪论，是对研究整体思路的介绍，其中包括研究背景、研究课题及意义等；在回顾以往研究的基础上，提出本文的方法论的创新并对之简述，最后介绍研究步骤以及各章的主要内容。

第二章试图通过对理论工具的打造，为《中庸》的翻译研究开出一片天地：凭借对《论语》和《中庸》的思考，推出本研究的方法论。可以认为，《中庸》是《论语》哲学思想的发展，因此本章不是直接分析

《中庸》，而是从《论语》进入《中庸》，在先秦儒家思想发展的语境下把握后者的哲学内涵。在《论语》中，孔子把其思想概括为“一以贯之”。本文认为，“一以贯之”就是孔子的“道”，可以理解为“推及”（extending）；其基础是儒家“性相近”的思想，即人心相近相通。《中庸》“天命之谓性”把“推及”延伸到人与世界关系的哲学层面，“推及”相应地变为“推而行之”。人与天，平常的人道与非常的天道，熟悉的与陌生的既相区分又相贯通。通过修身，人可以推及天，成为与天地相参的圣人，同样，熟悉的日常人伦也能实现非凡的化育流行。这种“由人推及天”的主体性思维（subject-oriented thinking），对研究《中庸》的英译具有深刻的方法论意义。它可以把研究焦点从“忠实”“对等”等客观、抽象的概念，转到译者的主动创造上，转到译者以自己的理解和表达实现原文，即“推而行之”的实践上。所有其他因素，社会的、政治的、文化的、语言的等等，都是在译者的翻译活动中表现的；因此，对译者的“推而行之”展开研究，也就涵盖了对上述因素的考虑。这样，“推而行之”，也便可成为一种主体性翻译研究综合研究方法。

第三章分析理雅各和辜鸿铭的译本。理雅各有两个不同的《中庸》译本。第一个译本表现出明显将《中庸》基督教化的倾向，比如一些重要词语的翻译及译者对《中庸》中与基督教教义相抵触的内容的批判。理雅各将基督教一神论推及《中庸》，且态度强硬，对儒家哲学缺少应有的倾听，因而，其翻译必然导致对儒家思想的简单化和误读。在第二个译本中，理雅各比较宽容。此一译本关联较强，也比较可靠，尽管基督教一神论这个核心思想仍未动摇，而这是与儒家哲学格格不入的。辜鸿铭反对理雅各的《中庸》英译。他也是从宗教的角度出发来理解、翻译《中庸》，但目的却是捍卫、宣扬中华文明作为道德文明的优越性。理雅各和辜鸿铭的译本推动了西方对《中庸》的认识，虽然这种认识还只是围绕宗教展开的。

第四章探讨赖发洛和经乾堃、休中诚及陈荣捷的译文，重点在陈荣捷的译本。这些“现代”译本，不再从宗教的角度而是从哲学的角度，来理解、翻译《中庸》。它们越来越关注文化差异，因而，在挖掘儒家经典独特的哲学价值上不断推进。陈荣捷的译本主要依据理学家，尤其是朱熹的解释，尽管宋明理学与后来的“新儒家”都是向西方的形而上学靠拢，而逐渐远离古典儒家的思想。陈的译本虽然沿用了理雅各的有关术语，但重新赋予了形而上学的含义。译者将自己对儒家哲学的理解，即两轮哲学——兼顾抽象与具体，普遍与特殊，形而上与形而下——推及《中庸》。这样，译文便把《中庸》塑造成了一部带有超越性思想的哲学著作。虽然古典儒家思想的形而上学化有助于《中庸》作为哲学文本被西方接受，但却削弱了中国经典的思想价值。

第五章研究安乐哲与郝大维及浦安迪的译本。与以往译者不同，安乐哲与郝大维更加突出文化差异，力图揭示中国文化特殊的假设。中国典籍的翻译之所以困难重重，就是因为未能认清这些假设。通过对中华文化与英美文化的研究，他们摒弃了中华文化中的超越观念，坚持认为西方哲学中过程—关系哲学作为非主流的传统思想，与中国文化的会通最具相关性。因此，他们把西方的过程—关系思想推及《中庸》，并且运用过程—关系哲学的语言进行翻译。这样，中国哲学被重新塑造，摆脱了形而上学的枷锁，与后现代思想齐头并进，并将西方哲学引入了一个新的时期。可以假定，二位译者的努力有志公正对待中国哲学，但毕竟因实践与理论的距离而免不了为人所诟病。浦安迪则把基于理学的功夫思想的解读推及《中庸》，在译文中凸显儒家所强调的道德修养和实践。实际上，《中庸》的意义会不断更新，涌现，对更好的译文的需要一直存在。

第六章有志对上述研究加以总结并尝试对《中庸》英译的本质加以理论论述。古典儒家的思想是西方文化陌生的他者，但陌生的可以变为熟悉的，进而成为可译的。译者将其熟悉的东西推而广之，以确定《中庸》的意义与意指。这样，“推而行之”便可有力地证明，翻译是一种

创造。我们认为，“推而行之”可以推及任何翻译；而翻译作为创造包含两个维度：现象学创造和历史创造。文中提出，与这一理论相应，翻译的标准应是“诚”。

第七章总结全书，对要点再作回顾，并点出了进一步研究的可能性。

本书是在蔡新乐教授的悉心指导下完成的，感谢他给我提出“从《中庸》到《中庸》”的研究课题和在整个写作过程中对我的细心指导和无微不至的关怀。感谢张克定教授，由于他的帮助，我才能边做研究边工作，没有后顾之忧。感谢郭尚兴教授，从他那里复印到了珍贵的中国哲学研究书籍，得到了宝贵的研究建议。本书的撰写还得到外语学院师生诸君之鼓励、帮助，其他一些专家之修改建议，亦所感谢。“衣锦尚絅”，感谢河南大学外语学院让我变得更简单和纯粹。最后，还要感谢科学出版社阎莉女士和常春娥编辑为本书的出版所做的工作。

Contents

丛书序 ………… i

前言 ………… iii

Chapter One Introduction ………… 1

1.1 Research Background ………… 1
1.2 Research Topic and Research Questions ………… 5
1.3 The Significance of the Research ………… 7
1.4 Methodological Considerations ………… 9
1.5 Creation as the Primary Object of Study ………… 16
1.6 Procedural Considerations ………… 19

Chapter Two From "Extending" to "Extending the Familiar" ………… 28

2.1 Deriving a Methodology from the *Zhongyong* ………… 28
  2.1.1 The Relationship Between Philosophy and Translation Studies ………… 28
  2.1.2 Differences Between Western Philosophy and Classical Confucian Philosophy ………… 30
  2.1.3 The Three Features of Classical Confucian Philosophy ………… 31
2.2 An Introduction to the *Zhongyong* ………… 34
  2.2.1 The Reasons for Choosing the *Zhongyong* ………… 34
  2.2.2 The Context of the *Zhongyong* ………… 36
  2.2.3 The Text of the *Zhongyong* ………… 38
2.3 The Way to Read the *Zhongyong* ………… 41
  2.3.1 Learning from the *Zhongyong* ………… 41
  2.3.2 Accessing the *Zhongyong* from the *Analects* ………… 43
2.4 Taking the Way from the *Analects* to the *Zhongyong* ………… 44
  2.4.1 "Extending" in the *Analects* ………… 44

2.4.2 "Extending the Familiar" in the *Zhongyong* ········· 55
2.5 "Extending the Familiar" and the Study of Translation ········· 72
2.5.1 The Trouble with Translation Studies ········· 72
2.5.2 "Extending the Familiar": A Subject-Oriented Approach ········· 75
2.6 Summary ········· 77

Chapter Three Extending Christian Monotheism ········· 90

3.1 James Legge: the Missionary and Scholar ········· 90
3.2 Discovering God in Confucianism ········· 94
3.3 Extending Christian Monotheism in Legge's Translations ··· 101
3.3.1 Extending Christian Monotheism Aggressively ········· 101
3.3.2 Extending Christian Monotheism Sympathetically ········· 118
3.4 Gu Hongming's Response ········· 122
3.4.1 Gu Hongming as a Cultural Amphibian ········· 123
3.4.2 Extending the Religion of Good-Citizenship Proudly ········· 126
3.5 Summary ········· 130

Chapter Four Extending the Two-Wheel Pattern ········· 139

4.1 Two Predecessors ········· 139
4.1.1 Lyall and King's *The Centre, The Common* ········· 140
4.1.2 Hughes's *The Mean-in-Action* ········· 145
4.2 Wing-tsit Chan and His Translation of the *Zhongyong* ········· 155
4.2.1 Wing-tsit Chan and *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* ········· 156
4.2.2 Discovering the Two-Wheel Pattern in the Confucian Tradition ········· 161
4.2.3 Extending the Two-Wheel Pattern Objectively ········· 168
4.2.4 The *Zhongyong* as a Metaphysical Work ········· 179
4.3 Summary ········· 181

Chapter Five Extending Process-Relational Thought ········· 187

5.1 Ames and Hall's Collaborative Work ········· 188
5.2 Discovering Process-Relational Thought in Classical Chinese Philosophy ········· 190

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

5.2.1 Hall's Critiques of the Dominant Tradition in Western Philosophy ······ 190
5.2.2 Hall and Ames's Studies in Comparative Philosophy ······ 194
5.3 Extending Process-Relational Thought Responsibly ······ 199
5.3.1 From the Language of Substance to the Language of Focus and Field ······ 200
5.3.2 The Central Argument ······ 203
5.3.3 *Shendu* (慎独) ······ 207
5.3.4 *Zhongyong* (中庸) ······ 211
5.3.5 *Cheng* (诚) ······ 214
5.4 The Chinese Way of Transcendence ······ 219
5.5 Andrew Plaks's Translation of the *Zhongyong* ······ 221
5.6 Summary ······ 227

Chapter Six The Translation/Creation of the *Zhongyong* ······ 232

6.1 The *Zhongyong*: Translatable or Untranslatable? ······ 233
6.2 Translation as Phenomenological and Historical Creation ······ 237
6.2.1 The Phenomenological Creation ······ 238
6.2.2 The Historical Creation ······ 243
6.3 *Cheng* (诚) as the Translation Criterion ······ 246
6.4 Summary ······ 252

Chapter Seven Conclusion ······ 255

References ······ 258

Chapter One

Introduction

This book is an attempt to study the translation of the *Zhongyong* (中庸) with a methodology derived from the *Zhongyong*. The methodology in question is known as "extending the familiar", which means, simply stated, "extending the familiar to the unfamiliar". As far as the translation of the *Zhongyong* is concerned, extending the familiar means extending oneself to the cultural other, using familiar religious and philosophical theories in Western culture to apprehend and translate strange Chinese cultural concepts. In this book, several translations of the *Zhongyong* are selected, probed and illustrated to demonstrate how "extending the familiar" works and to clarify how a Chinese classic is translated, or rather, created in the English-speaking world. These translations include James Legge's (1815—1897) *The Doctrine of the Mean*, Gu Hongming's (辜鸿铭) (1857—1928) *The Universal Order or Conduct of Life*, Leonard A. Lyall and King Chien-Kun's *The Centre, The Common*, E. R. Hughes's *The Mean-in-Action*, Wing-tsit Chan's (1901—1994) *The Doctrine of the Mean*, Roger T. Ames (1947—) and David L. Hall's (1937—2001) *Focusing the Familiar*, and Andrew Plaks's (1945—) *On the Practice of the Mean*. These works will be studied roughly chronologically and with a focus on each translator's choice of analogy made between what is most familiar to them and what can be found in the *Zhongyong*. The research is expected to bring theoretical and practical benefits by shedding more light on the translation of the *Zhongyong* in particular and on translation in general. Hopefully, it will contribute, in some small way, to the philosophical study of the *Zhongyong*.

1.1 Research Background

The *Zhongyong* is one of the most important works in Confucian literature[1]. It first appeared in the *Book of Rites* (*Liji* 礼记), and its profound thought gradually attracted people's attention.[2] In the Song Dynasty, it was singled out with the *Great Learning* (*Daxue* 大学), the *Analects* (*Lunyu* 论语), and the *Mencius* (*Mengzi* 孟子) to form a new Confucian canon known as the "Four Books"[3]. Since then, they have been given scriptural authority and invested with fundamental importance. For example, they were officially recognized as the basic texts for civil service examinations in 1313 and remained so until the early years of the 20th century when the examination system was brought to an end. For more than six centuries, the *Zhongyong* has dominated China's cultural life. There is little doubt that it has exerted enormous influence on the hearts and minds of Chinese people and it is no exaggeration to say that the *Zhongyong* is a gold mine of Chinese wisdom. The concept epitomizes Confucianism and even Cultural China[4].

Given its central place in Chinese culture, the *Zhongyong* has figured as a crucial text in the communication and even competition between Chinese culture and foreign cultures. Moreover, the *Zhongyong* deals with the subject of man and the world, which has a close bearing on Western religion and philosophy, hence giving the book the privilege of entering into a series of cross-cultural dialogues. In fact, the canonization of the *Zhongyong* in the Song Dynasty is a result of cultural confrontation, as the Song Confucian scholars, by tapping this source of Confucian literature, sought to meet the Buddhist religious and metaphysical challenge. In this first encounter with Indian Buddhism, Chinese culture was generally on the receiving side, absorbing Buddhist doctrines by recourse to local Taoist or Confucian ideas, and developing them into a new system of thought. It is, in general, a one-way communication, with few Chinese cultural classics translated into Sanskrit or other languages.

The real cultural exchange flourished in the second major encounter between China and the West. It began in the late Ming Dynasty (1580—1644), when Jesuits, Catholic priests belonging to a Christian organization called the Society of Jesus, came to China for Christian mission work.[5] These men who were specially selected and trained for the task were, as E. R. Hughes describes, "besides being evangelists, also scientists, historians, students of politics and manners and customs, explorers and map makers, and, above all, men who gave themselves to the study of Chinese literature and the sympathetic understanding of Chinese way of thinking."[6] In the study of Chinese literature, they found Confucianism compatible with Christianity and conducive to their missionary work[7], so they began to translate Confucian classics into Western languages and proffered their commentaries on the classics. However, these translations were done with heavy resort to Christian categories and in a sense favorable to Christianity. The *Zhongyong* is no exception. It was first translated into Latin by the Jesuits.[8] Later the first English version, which was an abridged translation from French, appeared in London. However, with the arrival of other Catholic groups, especially Dominicans and Franciscans, who refused to adapt Christianity to fit Chinese society, there emerged a sectarian clashes and hatred which finally caused the irritated Kangxi Emperor (1654—1722) to ban Catholicism.[9] This ban remained effective for almost a century, from 1706 to 1785. When the ban was lifted, a new wave of missionaries, most of them English Protestants, arrived and began to translate Chinese classics directly into English.[10] The most renowned translator in this period is James Legge. He translated almost all the major Chinese classics, including the *Zhongyong*. His translation of the *Zhongyong* is lauded as the standard translation and plays a far-reaching role in Westerners' understanding of Confucianism. Yet the translation is still underwritten by the Christian world view. The dissatisfaction with theologically loaded translations and the wish to clear the image of Confucian philosophy prompted contemporary scholars to re-translate Chinese cultural classics. The important figure in this project of reconstruction is Wing-tsit Chan, whose *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* "is the first anthology of Chinese philosophy to cover its entire historical development."[11] The book, like a bridge, intends to lead Westerners to an accurate understanding of Chinese thought, and it includes a fresh translation of the whole text of the *Zhongyong*, along with an introduction and annotations. Tu Weiming (1940—), in his influential monograph on the *Zhongyong*, *Centrality and Commonality*, uses Chan's translation and speaks highly of it. However, Chan's translation, with its Neo-Confucian[12] prejudice, does not say all that the *Zhongyong* purports to say. The ontological framework of

Neo-Confucianism, characterized by the coherence of transcendence and immanence, tends to conceal the real originality of classical Confucian philosophy, which has a different notion from Western culture regarding transcendence. To emphasize the distinction of Chinese philosophy and its use as a complement to Western philosophy, Roger Ames and David Hall published another philosophical translation of the *Zhongyong*. Their translation agrees with previous philosophical translations that a Chinese philosophical work, after being translated into English, should also be a philosophical work, with "recognizably philosophical terminology"[13]. However, as they contend, the previous translations fall short of conveying the philosophical import of Confucianism because there lacks a relevant vocabulary to articulate Chinese experience of the world. They think now they have found the vocabulary, which is the language of process philosophy, especially the philosophy of A. N. Whitehead (1861—1947). Their translation differs drastically from previous translations; it looks odd at first but indeed calls attention to what is philosophically significant in the *Zhongyong*. Ames and Hall are also taken to task on several counts, especially for their notorious disregard for the notion of transcendence in Confucianism. Their obsession with expanding on the Confucian vision of the world prevents them from adopting a subject-oriented way of thinking which is fit for the interpretation of classical Chinese thought. Essentially, as this work will demonstrate, the core of Confucianism is humanism. Its ultimate concerns are human matters and Confucian transcendence is the transcendence of man and his world to a better state.[14]

If no translation is flawless, how will the *Zhongyong* be translated? How to produce a translation that is beyond reproach? The answers to these two "lofty" questions depend on a down-to-earth exploration of the nature or truth of translating the *Zhongyong*. Clarification of the nature of the translating of the *Zhongyong* helps to do away with delusions and provide a sense of orientation, which may keep the future translations on the right track. The nature, as a general attribute inherent in every translation, can only be gleaned from a careful study of the translations that have been done. Consequently, it is necessary that the research take a historicist approach.[15] In a word, the objective of this work is to identify the nature of the translation of the *Zhongyong* by investigating its translation history, focusing specially on three important translations, and to provide some insight into the study of the translation of the *Zhongyong* and, by extension, the study of translation.

1.2 Research Topic and Research Questions

This book studies the English translation of the *Zhongyong*, and its central theme is that, despite different ways of translating the *Zhongyong*, there is a primal way, a core way, a common thread running through. This way is called "extending the familiar"[16]. To describe the way as "primal" and "core" is to say that it meets two conditions. First, "extending the familiar" is the underlying attribute of every translation of the *Zhongyong*; without it, translating the *Zhongyong* becomes impossible, with the unfamiliar kept in the dark. Translation works because the familiar is extended to disperse the darkness of incomprehensibility. Second, translations of the *Zhongyong* vary because the familiar which is extended to accommodate and interpret the source text varies. What is familiar to one translator may be strange to another; what is familiar in one age may turn unfamiliar in another age. The same work is translated differently, with variation in the input of the familiar, though the way of "extending the familiar" never changes.

In this work, the primal and core way is obtained from a close examination of the translations of the *Zhongyong* from the beginning of the 19th century to the present. This period has witnessed the great encounter of China and the West, one that has continued gaining speed and momentum till today, and shows no sign of abating. This period can be roughly divided into three stages: the first stage spans across the 19th century, the second covers about the first half of the 20th century, and the third extends from the latter part of the 20th century to the present. Each stage produces its representative translations of the *Zhongyong*, and each translation contributes, to a varying extent, to assimilating this "alien, exotic and wondrous" piece into English-speaking cultures.

The translations of the *Zhongyong* in this work are analyzed with a

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com