

The 'Chineseness' vs. 'Non-Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory

TAN, Zaixi

Published in:
The Translator

DOI:
[10.1080/13556509.2009.10799282](https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2009.10799282)

Published: 01/01/2009

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

TAN, Z. (2009). The 'Chineseness' vs. 'Non-Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory: An ethnoconvergent perspective. *The Translator*, 15(2 SPECIAL ISSUE. CH), 283-304.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2009.10799282>

General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent publication URLs

The 'Chineseness' vs. 'Non-Chineseness' of Chinese Translation Theory

An Ethnoconvergent Perspective

TAN ZAIXI

Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong

Abstract. *Since the early 1980s, when China began to witness an influx of foreign, mainly Western, translation theories as a result of its opening up to the outside world, a number of Chinese scholars have argued that the importation of these theories has been excessive, that the Chinese have always had their own tradition of studying translation, and that this tradition must be preserved and protected from too much outside influence. The author accepts that a Chinese tradition of theorizing translation does exist and attempts to outline the main features of this tradition. He argues, however, that the 'Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory is not something to be deliberately designed and manufactured but something that naturally forms and develops within the Chinese tradition, that Chinese scholarship, like all scholarship, can only benefit from interacting with other traditions, and, furthermore, that Sinocentrism can be as damaging to the development of translation studies as Eurocentrism.*

Keywords. Chinese translation theory, tradition, Chineseness, non-Chineseness, dialectic, ethnoconvergence

The end of the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) in China marked the beginning of the country's open door policies, not only on the economic front but also on the cultural front. The field of translation witnessed an unprecedented influx of foreign (especially Western and Soviet Russian) translation theories in the early 1980s. The earliest major volume on Western translation theory was *Selected Papers on Foreign Translation Theory*, edited and published by the China Translation and Publishing Corporation in 1983. This collection of 14 essays, many originally published as journal articles, introduced such figures as A.V. Fedorov, Eugene Nida, John Catford, Peter Newmark, Roman Jakobson, L.S. Barkhudarov and G.R. Gachechiladze. Though many of these figures were familiar to Chinese readers because of their earlier journal appearances, the collection had a powerful impact on the emerging translation studies scene in China. The impact was further strengthened by the publication of *Nida on Translation* (Tan 1984), and in quick succession by other translations of Western and Russian works, including Barkhudarov's *Language and Translation* (Cai *et al.* 1985), Steiner's *After Babel* (Zhuang 1987), Gachechiladze's *An Introduction to the Theory of Literary Translation* (Cai 1987) and Delisle's *Translation: An Interpretive Approach* (Sun Huishuang 1988).

Between the 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century, China saw not only more translations of major Western works on translation theory, but also the re-publication of many English-language works licensed for the Chinese market. So far, two major *Translation Studies from Abroad* series have been made available by the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press and the Beijing Foreign Language and Research Press, totalling some sixty volumes of translation studies that were first published in Western countries.

The various non-Chinese approaches to translation, introduced through both Chinese translations and foreign originals, broadened the theoretical thinking of Chinese scholars. They brought a sharp awareness that the study of translation is not and should not be confined to the paradigm to which they were accustomed, which mainly consisted of Yan Fu's three-word principle of *xin* (信 faithfulness), *da* (达 smoothness/comprehensibility) and *ya* (雅 gracefulness/elegance), and the age-old discussion of translation methods such as *zhiyi* (直译 literal translation) versus *yiyi* (意译 sense translation).

No sooner had the importation of foreign thoughts and ideas on translation begun, however, than there emerged voices of opposition among Chinese scholars in the PRC. Sometimes strong and sometimes weak, these voices have repeatedly expressed two closely interrelated points. The first asserts that the importation of foreign, especially Western, translation theories in recent years has been 'excessive', and that as a result, the field of Chinese translation studies has been 'overwhelmed' by Western ideas (Zhang 2006:59).¹ The second, related point of this opposition argues that the Chinese system of translation theory must 'maintain its own characteristics' in the face of foreign influences (Luo 1984, Gui 1986, Liu 1989, 1993, 2005, Sun Zhili 1997, Sun and Zhang 2002). These traditionalist standpoints constitute the starting point of this article, which addresses two questions. First, is it true that the Chinese importation of foreign translation theories in recent years has been 'excessive', and that Chinese translation studies has been 'overwhelmed' by Western ideas? Second, does it make sense (and if so, to what extent) for Chinese translation scholars to insist on an element of 'Chineseness' in the development of translation theory? In addressing these questions, this article adopts an 'ethnoconvergent' perspective, in the sense that the author believes more in the convergent than divergent aspects of translation theory across different traditions. This perspective, as described more fully in Section 4 below, adopts a positive attitude towards increased 'sharing of ideas' and 'mutual understanding' in the development of translation studies the world over. The article will first examine some of the features that could be regarded as characteristic of the 'Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory; it will then propose and discuss an appropriate position from which to approach such Chinese features. The aim is to highlight the point that while Chinese translation theory has always demonstrated some kind of distinctive 'Chineseness', it is arguably unproductive to over-emphasize the relevant features of this 'Chineseness'.

1. Past discussions on the 'Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory

The issue of 'Chineseness' in Chinese translation theory was first raised by Luo Xinzhang, a Chinese culture and translation studies scholar from the Chinese Social Sciences Academy. In 1983, Luo published an article entitled 我国自成体系的翻译理论 (Our Country's Translation

¹ The following quote from Zhang's article is typical of this view:

“……我国翻译理论界许多人现在把自己的传统和经验丢到了一边，津津乐道外国翻译理论，主次颠倒。…近年来，该刊〔指《中国翻译》〕发表文章的趋向非常明显，现仅以2005年为例。……《中国翻译》2005年谈翻译有赖外国翻译和译者、译家的文章占了69.16%，超过压倒多数量化标准2.99%。这样看来，说《中国翻译》成了《外国翻译》一点也不为过。更准确点说，成了《西方翻译》，因为在我国流传的外国翻译理论基本上来自西方。” (... Now many people in our country's translation studies community have thrown aside our own tradition and experience, and take delight in talking about foreign translation theory. How they have turned our translation studies upside down! ... This journal (that is, *Chinese Translators Journal*) has in recent years shown a marked tendency toward publishing a particular type of article. Take 2005 for example. That year, the number of articles carried in *CTJ* which relied on foreign translation and translators in their discussion of issues of translation reached 69.16% of the total number, that is, 2.99% more than the figure required to form an overwhelming majority (calculated according to quantification standards). It is no exaggeration to say that the *Chinese Translators Journal* has become a 'Foreign Translators Journal'. More accurately, it has become a *Western Translators Journal* because the foreign translation theories prevalent in our country have mostly come from the West.) (Zhang 2006:59; my translation)

Theory: A System of Its Own) in the influential translation studies journal *Translators' Notes* (翻译通讯), later renamed *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译). The paper had been specially written as an introductory chapter for his then-forthcoming volume, *翻译论集* (An Anthology of Essays on Translation, Luo 1984). The article had an immediate impact and sparked traditionalist discontent with foreign influence in contemporary translation studies in China.² The opening statement of Luo's paper is representative of his traditionalist views: "In recent years, translation journals in our country have introduced a great variety of foreign translation theories and approaches, so much so that one is under the impression that by comparison there is much that is lacking in our own translation theory. But is this really so? Having researched the various discourses on translation produced down the centuries, I am deeply convinced that our country's translation theory has its own characteristics and occupies a unique position in the world arena of translation. Therefore, there is no reason to belittle ourselves" (Luo 1984:1; my translation)

Out of context, such a statement sounds harmless. However, since China was just then opening up to the outside world and the importation of foreign thinking about translation had only just begun, Luo's remarks about the danger of 'belittling ourselves' can be seen to represent a conservative attitude towards non-Chinese approaches. This attitude evolved into more Sinocentric arguments by other scholars demanding that a 'Chinese translology' be developed (Gui 1986, Fang 1988, Liu 1989, 1993, Zhang and Jiang 1997) and that Chinese translation theory must bear 'Chinese characteristics' (Fang 1988, Liu 1989, 2005, Sun and Zhang 2002). This traditional insistence on developing translation theory with a distinct element of 'Chineseness', apparently modelled on the widely publicized call in China to 'build socialism with Chinese characteristics' (建设中国特色社会主义),³ has a strong ideological, political and even 'patriotic' ring.

The emphasis on holding on to national characteristics, it should be noted, is not confined to the Chinese situation. Scholars in other contexts have also attempted to assert national or ethnological characteristics in translation theory. For example, since 2004, three special conferences on Asian Translation Traditions have been convened, one at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London (2004), one in Tejgadh, India (2005), and the third at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul, Turkey (2008). The aim of these conferences and their sequels has been to "challenge the Eurocentric bias of Translation Studies by exploring the richness and diversity of non-Western discourses and practices of translation" (Circular from *The Third Asian Translation Traditions Conference*). As with the traditionalist push in China to develop 'Chineseness' in Chinese translation theory, these conferences have helped to enhance a non-Eurocentric awareness of translational development in non-Western countries.

There has also been some degree of national awareness in the development of translation

² It must be noted that traditionalist scholars' resistance to Western influence and their insistence on maintaining or developing what they call 'Chineseness' in translation theory have not been confined to translation scholarship alone. In fact, traditionalist trends have been influential in all fields of learning in the arts and humanities, in philosophy and the social sciences, as well as in all aspects of social, cultural and political life in China. All of the following, for example, can be regarded as forms of discontent with foreign (especially Western) influences: the revival of the teaching of Confucianism and other forms of classical Chinese philosophy and literature in school curricula since the end of the Cultural Revolution; the paradoxical emphasis in the arts, even before the Cultural Revolution, on the idea that the more 'national' something is, the more it will be 'international' (越是民族的, 越是世界的; Yuan 2007:33); and most conspicuously of all, the campaign following the 1989 Tiananmen event against cultural, political and ideological 'total-Westernization'. In a sense, it was within this kind of cultural context that the traditionalist trends in translation studies in China were first formed and developed.

³ This call was first made by the late Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping (1904-1997) in his opening speech on 1 September 1982 at the 12th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, and has since been reiterated by the CCP at all its subsequent congresses. (Deng's original words were: "走自己的道路, 建设有中国特色的社会主义" [Go our own way and build socialism with Chinese characteristics].) The call has become one of the slogans most frequently used in China to rally support for the way in which the country develops its economy and political system.

theory in Western countries. André Lefevere (1977) has talked of a German tradition of translation characterized by four types of contributors – precursors, pioneers, masters and disciples. Flora Amos (1920/1973) and Lieven D’huilst (1990) have talked about the theory and practices of English and French traditions, respectively. There have even been attempts by scholars of translation history to study the characteristics of individual nations within the Western ‘polysystem’ of translation traditions. These notably include Thomas Steiner’s distinction between a *poetic* English tradition and a *pragmatic* French tradition of translation during the 17th and 18th centuries (Steiner 1975).

The point here is not merely to recognize and describe a translation tradition – or more specifically, the ‘characteristics’ of that tradition. The issue is how one views the ‘characteristics’ of one’s own tradition against those of other traditions. This central premise of the article will be addressed more specifically in section 4 below. First, let us examine some of the major literature on what constitutes ‘Chineseness’ in Chinese translation theory.

Various attempts have been made in the field to explain what is meant by the term ‘Chineseness’ or ‘Chinese characteristics’ (*Zhongguo tese* [中国特色] in Chinese). Among these, the views offered by Luo Xinzhang (1984) and Liu Miqing (1989, 2005) stand out most prominently. Luo summarizes the ‘Chinese characteristics’ of Chinese translation theory in his paper (cited above) entitled ‘Our Country’s Translation Theory: A System of Its Own’:

... with the efforts made by well-known (as well as unknown) translators and translation scholars over a thousand years and more, China boasts a system of translation theory of its own, which can be described as follows: (1) The ancients argued that one should “translate according to the meaning of the original” ... and “no attempt should be made to beautify the translation at the expense of meaning”; (2) while pointing out ‘the three difficulties of translation’, Yan Fu stresses that “it is most difficult to be faithful”, and ‘being faithful’ then constitutes an improvement on the ancients’ idea of “translating according to the meaning of the original”; (3) recognizing the difficulty of achieving ‘faithfulness’ in the absolute sense, Fu Lei stresses “getting at the spirit of the original” and advocates “spiritual resonance”; and (4) according to Qian Zhongshu, the concept of ‘transformation’ implies that “the translation is so faithful to the original that it does not read like a translation” and that “the essence and guise of the original should remain” ... If we trace things back to their source, we will find that Qian’s insistence on faithful rendition of the “essence and guise” of the original is but a re-interpretation of the ancients’ idea of “transmitting by following the source”⁴, of Yan’s ‘faithfulness’ which incorporates both ‘fluency’ and ‘elegance’, and of Fu’s ‘spiritual resonance’. Clearly, these concepts are independent and yet interrelated, and they constitute a complete whole divisible into stages of development. It is this complete whole that forms the core of our country’s system of translation theory. (Luo 1984:18-19; my translation)

In his major work on Chinese and Western thinking on translation, Liu (2005) defines the ‘Chineseness’ of Chinese translation theory as follows:

- (1) Chinese translation theory is characterized by its geo-humanitarian, geosocial and geopolitical features, with strategic consideration of culture as its primary concern.
- (2) Chinese thinking about translation is deeply rooted in the rich soil of Chinese culture.
- (3) Chinese translation theory enjoys a unique history of development as well as a unique pattern of evolution divisible into five phases: that of Buddhist sutra translation; that of science translation carried out during the late-Ming to early-Qing period [early 17th-early 18th century in the Western calendar]; that of translation of all types of texts, especially knowledge-based works, during the late Qing period; that of translation of all types of texts during the first half of the 20th century; and that of translation of all types

4 “transmitting by following the source” is the English translation offered by Cheung (2006a:11).

of texts during the second half of the 20th century. Compared with Western translation theory, the development of Chinese translation theory is characterized by several major features. First, there is a strategic consideration of culture. In the late-Ming to early-Qing period, translation was closely associated with the idea of ‘Save the nation through science’; during the late Qing and the Republican periods, it was associated with that of ‘National salvation’ and ‘Save the nation through learning’; and during the 1950s, and especially during the post-1970s and 1980s period, it was associated with the idea of ‘National revival’. Second, Chinese translation theory always prioritizes the study of ‘meaning’. In addition, from the very beginning of its existence, Chinese translation theory has been attached to traditional Chinese philosophy and Chinese aesthetics.

(4) Chinese translation theory is characterized by its being based on a language system of its own. In this connection, the ‘Chineseness’ of translation theory is reflected in seven aspects, namely: (a) the way in which Chinese translation studies is conducted; (b) theories of meaning; (c) theories of understanding; (d) the aesthetics of translation; (e) translation strategies; (f) manipulation theories of translation; and (g) reception theories. (Liu 2005:73-127; my translation)

As noted previously, the views offered by Luo and Liu are influential, and thus constitute a significant contribution to the general understanding of ‘Chineseness’ in contemporary Chinese discourse on translation. Luo’s views – the first to emphasize the uniqueness of the Chinese translation tradition explicitly – represent a groundbreaking “exercise in identity construction” (Cheung 2002:144). Liu, who published the first book-length comparison of Chinese and Western thinking on translation in 2005, had made other attempts to construct that identity – that is, the character of Chinese thinking in a Eurocentric world of translation studies (see Liu 1989, 1993).

While both Luo and Liu have tried to define what they see as the ‘Chineseness’ of Chinese translation theory, they differ in their foci and approaches. Luo focuses on the theme of translational ‘faithfulness’ – the thread that can be traced from the ancients through the moderns right up to our contemporaries. Thus, from Dao An (314-385) to Yan Fu (1854-1921), and further to Fu Lei (1908-1966) and Qian Zhongshu (1910-1998), the most outstanding characteristic of Chinese translation theory has been adherence to the fundamental principle that a translation should be faithful to the source. This took many forms through the centuries, from Dao’s insistence on ‘transmitting by following the source’, to Yan’s principle of ‘faithfulness, comprehensibility and elegance’, Fu’s ‘spiritual resonance’, and Qian’s interpretation of ‘complete transformation’.⁵ In other words, these translational concepts, proposed during different historical times and by people with different backgrounds, are all interwoven and form, to paraphrase Luo, a complete ‘system of its [China’s] own’.

Luo was perceptive in linking the previously disconnected concepts of translational faithfulness into a theoretical continuum, and in his description of this continuum as a characteristic feature of Chinese theory. However, several questions arise. Is a single line of development – and one concerned entirely with ‘translational faithfulness’ – sufficient to represent ‘a system of its own’? Can the entire Chinese system of translation theory be reduced to a single proposition of ‘faithful’ translation? Moreover, if ‘faithfulness’ is the only component of the theoretical continuum, then where would one place such ‘unfaithful’ or ‘creative’ translators as Kumārajīva (350-409) of the classical period, or modern-era translators such as Lin Shu (1852-1924) and Yan Fu? Would it not be more accurate to say that there are at least two lines of development, one following the principle of ‘faithful’ translation and the other that of ‘unfaithful’ translation? Since faithfulness, or unfaithfulness, is not and cannot be the only preoccupation of Chinese translation theory, or any translation theory for that matter, what other

⁵ For an in-depth analysis and discussion of these, and of the importance of Luo’s work in general, see Cheung (2002:156-61).

issues or features within the Chinese tradition may also be regarded as characteristics of Chinese translation theory?

In his prolific writings on translation, Liu Miqing (1989, 1993, 2005) is more specific about what he means by ‘Chineseness’. His particularly insightful definition of ‘Chineseness’ in translation theory incorporates the ‘geo-humanitarian’ (*diyuan renwen* 地缘人文), ‘geosocial’ (*diyuan shehui* 地缘社会) and ‘geopolitical’ (*diyuan zhengzhi* 地缘政治) features of Chinese culture. Liu not only talks about translational ‘faithfulness’ and ‘unfaithfulness’, but he also emphasizes the importance of preserving *meaning* in translation. In addition, he incorporates issues not directly related to the act of translation *per se*, such as the Chinese tradition of philosophy, aesthetics and discourse in general, and the Chinese socio-political and cultural context. Stressing that Chinese thinking about translation is deeply rooted in the rich soil of Chinese culture, Liu points out that the theory and practice of translation in China boasts a ‘strategic consideration of culture’ (*wenhua zhanlue kaoliang* 文化战略考虑) as well as a ‘consideration’ of social needs. That is why they are so closely associated with the various socio-political and cultural movements throughout Chinese history. Indeed, Chinese translation theory draws its national and ethnological characteristics from the translational and philosophical areas described by Liu.

Liu’s definition of ‘Chineseness’, however, is not unproblematic. He singles out *wenhua zhanlue kaoliang* (strategic consideration of culture) as part of the first major feature of Chinese translation theory, and continues to use this phrase as if it needs no explanation. The book also offers such abstruse terms as *gongneng daichang* ([语言的]功能代偿 functional compensation), *guanlian bawo* (关联把握 relevant grasping) and *poge gainian moshi* (破格概念模式 license-conception oriented⁶). Also problematic is Liu’s claim that “Chinese translation theory is characterized by its being based on a language system of its own, a system that is unique” (Liu 2005:102; my translation). One is tempted to ask whether there are languages that do *not* constitute a system of their own. Maybe a creolized or pidginized language? But even a creole or a pidgin language could, in at least some respects, be considered a ‘language system of its own’.

In addition to Luo and Liu, other scholars have expressed similar traditionalist views. Gui (1986), for example, argues for establishing a Chinese translatology, while Fang (1988) and Sun and Zhang (2002) propose developing a translatology ‘with distinctive Chinese features’. These scholars have not added anything substantial, however, to what Luo and Liu have envisaged; neither have they pointed out or addressed the weaknesses, discussed above, in the arguments of Luo and Liu. A more comprehensive description of what ‘Chineseness’ means in the context of Chinese translation theory is therefore in order.

2. Understanding ‘Chineseness’ against ‘non-Chineseness’

The use of the term ‘non-Chineseness’ in the above subheading is necessary. To my mind, it would not be possible to talk about ‘Chineseness’ if there were not at the same time features which could go into the category of ‘non-Chineseness’. In other words, the issue of ‘Chineseness’ is one of relative identity. This is not only because ‘Chineseness’ must be defined in relation to something other than ‘Chinese’, but also because nothing in whatever kind of ‘Chineseness’ there may be is forever fixed and unchanging.

It should also be noted that while the term ‘Chineseness’ has been quite widely used in Chinese translation studies, the epithet ‘Chinese’ has often remained vague. Should it refer to properties of the Chinese language, or properties of the Chinese as a nation, or an ethnological, sociocultural or geopolitical entity? Should it describe the China of a particular historical time, or a China of all times or one with special designative meanings (the PRC, Taiwan, etc.)?

⁶ ‘License-conception oriented translation’ is Liu’s own English translation of this term.

Understandably, no standard answer is available or even possible; different people may see or interpret ‘Chineseness’ differently, and at different times. However, differences of opinion do not hinder meaningful dialogue. Instead, they provide an opportunity for reflection – on what is important about one’s own tradition and the traditions of the Other.

At this point, it would also be helpful to explain how I use the terms ‘theory’ and ‘discourse’ in this article. As evident from the title of the article, I chiefly use the term ‘Chinese translation theory’. Though ‘Chinese discourse on translation’ is also used from time to time, it is not used interchangeably with ‘Chinese translation theory’. In my use of the term, ‘discourse’ refers to ‘utterances by means of which ideas or opinions are expressed’.⁷ The focus is on the ‘expression’ rather than the ‘idea/opinion’ that is ‘expressed’. The term ‘theory’, in this article, refers to any type of theoretical thinking about translation, to ideas or opinions ‘expressed’ through ‘discourse’. It is not used in the sense in which contemporary Western translation theorists such as Popovič and Toury use it – as a “discipline engaged in the systematic study of translation” (Popovič 1976:23), or as entailing “systematic and exhaustive description and explanation of each and every phenomenon within the domain it allegedly covers” (Toury 1980:19). By the same logic, the difference between ‘Chinese translation theory’ and ‘Chinese discourse on translation’ parallels the difference between such terms as ‘Western translation theory’ and ‘Western discourse on translation’.

Having clarified these points, I will now discuss the ‘Chineseness’ of Chinese translation theory as I see it. Here, I identify five features. The first is **pragmatism**. In Chinese translation theory, the emphasis has been mostly on translation methods, skills and techniques – that is, on how to produce a piece of good translation. Often, translation theory has been concerned with practical translation experience, especially the experiences of master practitioners. This is true not only of the ancients, such as Dao An and Xuan Zang (602-664), but also of modern translators and scholars such as Yan Fu, Fu Lei, Mao Dun (1896-1981), Lao Long, Sun Zhili and Zhang Jinghao. Dao An in the 4th century and Xuan Zang in the 7th, for example, were primarily concerned with the pragmatic aspects of translation when they wrote about the ‘five instances of losing the source’ (‘five losses’ for short) and ‘three difficulties’, and ‘five guidelines for not translating a term [and using a transliteration instead]’ (see detailed account of these in Cheung 2006a:80-83, 156-59). It was also true of the ancients when they spoke of various ‘translational steps’ and the various ways to maintain the ‘beauty’ or the ‘content’ of the original. Other scholars across the decades have stressed the pragmatic or practical aspects of translation, including: Yan (1898/1984:136), who wrote about the “difficulty of being faithful, smooth or elegant in translation” (my translation); Fu (1951/1984:558), who claimed that “in actual practice, translation [is] even more difficult than painting” (my translation); Mao (1954), who wrote about literary translation and translation quality; Sun (1996:15), who is concerned with “integrating translation theory with practice” (my translation); and Lao (1996:38), who has called on Chinese scholars to “stop daydreaming about the science of translation and do more practical work” (my translation). Even Zhang (2006:60), a conservative who complains that “the preponderance of foreign translation theory in Chinese translation studies harms Chinese translation practice” (my translation), could be said to have expressed views that reflect the pragmatic orientation of Chinese discourse on translation.

Pragmatism, or practicality, it must be stated, is not an exclusively Chinese feature; it is a feature of all traditions of translation and translation theory. Certainly, interest in the practice of translation has not been any weaker in the Western tradition. Western theory – from Cicero,

⁷ Martha Cheung treats ‘discourse’ as ‘a category of knowledge’. Her discussions of the signification of ‘discourse’ in relation to ‘theory’/‘theories’, the relationship between them, and why she prefers using the term ‘discourse’ (in both its ordinary and Foucaultian sense) in preference to ‘theory’ (or theories, etc.) in the title of her *Anthology* (2006a) are particularly relevant to discussions on the Chinese tradition of translation. For a detailed account of her views, see Cheung (2006a:Introduction, 2006b, 2004).

Horace and Jerome, through Dante, Luther, D'Ablancout, Amyot, Dolet, Dryden, Arnold, Newman, Tytler, Goethe and Schleiermacher, right up to Pound and Levý in modern and contemporary times – has also, in large measure, been concerned with how best to translate. But while the Chinese tradition has been basically content with pursuing this question of how translation is done or can be done, there has been a stronger tendency in the West to engage with other, more abstract issues – such as the nature and semiotics of language and translation, as found in the discussions by Augustine (428), Bruni (1424/1426), Huet (1661), Humboldt (1816) and Benjamin (1923). It may well be that pragmatism – the primary concern of Chinese scholars – has delayed engagement with more abstract issues.

The second feature is **reliance on cultural heritage**. Chinese translation scholars take pride in their cultural heritage and have sought translational inspiration from cultural contexts of a non-translational nature, or in the words of Martha Cheung, have sought “[to deploy] concepts from Chinese literary and aesthetic discourse to articulate thinking on translation” (Cheung 2006a:62). For example, Zhi Qian (3rd century, BCE), whose work is a precursor of Chinese translation theory, turned to the sages Kongzi (Confucius, 551-479 BCE) and Laozi (c. 600-479 BCE) to find support for his method of “follow[ing] the original theme of the sutra without refining [*wén* 文] it with embellishment [*shì* 饰]”. To make his case, he quoted Laozi’s caution that “**beautiful** [*měi* 美] words are not **trustworthy** [*xìn* 信] and **trustworthy** [*xìn* 信] words are not **beautiful** [*měi* 美]”. He referred also to Kongzi’s saying that “[w]riting cannot fully express what is conveyed by speech; speech cannot fully express ideas” (Cheung 2006a:59; bold type and italics in original). According to Qian Zhongshu, Yan’s famous triplet principle of *xin*, *da*, *ya* can be traced all the way to Zhi Qian (Qian 1984:23). Of the three, the word *xin*, with its multiple senses (e.g. ‘faithful’ as rendered here and ‘trustworthy’ as seen above), in turn goes back further to Chinese sages such as Kongzi and Laozi, who had inspired him.

Contemporary examples of borrowing terms and concepts from the Chinese cultural tradition can be found in Xu Yuanchong’s ‘competition theory’ (*jingsailun* 竞赛论) of ‘beauty in sound, form and meaning’ (*yinmei* 音美, *xingmei* 形美, *yimei* 意美; Xu 2000) and Zheng Hailing’s ‘theory of translational harmony’ (*hexie shuo* 和谐说; Zheng 1999), where the concepts of *mei* (美 beauty) and *hexie* (和谐 harmony) are traceable to both Laozi and classical Chinese aesthetics. Thus, it can be said that the use of traditional concepts from Chinese culture to theorize about translation is a ‘distinct’ characteristic of Chinese translation theory.

The third feature is a **preoccupation with *xin***. As suggested above, the term *xin* is loaded with cultural values in Chinese; Cheung thus finds it necessary to translate it as ‘confidence and trust’, ‘faith’, ‘faithful, honest, truthful, true, to trust’, ‘keep one’s word’, ‘reliable’, ‘sincere’, ‘trust’, ‘trustworthy’ and ‘trustworthiness’ (Cheung 2006a:267).⁸ Apart from these, other translations might include ‘fidelity’, ‘loyal’ and ‘loyalty’. Even then, none of the translations can convey by themselves the primary cultural value communicated by the Chinese term *xin*, namely: “the most important of the absolute essentials of government” in Confucianism (see relevant account in Cheung 2006a:28).

In fact *xin* – as designating ‘faithful’/‘faithfulness’, ‘loyal’/‘loyalty’, ‘fidelity’ ‘trustworthy’/‘the quality of being trustworthy’, etc. – is so deeply rooted in the cultural consciousness of the Chinese that Yan’s 1898 use of it found immediate acceptance as the single most important principle of translation. According to Luo, from ancient times to the present, discussions in Chinese translation theory have been dominated by a concern with *xin*. Although I do not quite agree with Luo’s apparent equation of the discussion of translation principles with the entirety of translation theory, I do agree that the concern with *xin* is a continuous line of

⁸ Cheung describes this type of rendering as ‘thick translation’ (2007). According to Cheung, there are two categories of “manoeuvres of thick translation applied to the rendering of translation concepts in the Chinese tradition: local manoeuvres and structural manoeuvres”. For a detailed discussion of these ‘manoeuvres’, see Cheung (2007:31-32).

development in Chinese translation theory, and hence also one of the main aspects of ‘Chineseness’ in Chinese translation theory.

The fourth feature of ‘Chineseness’ is a heavy reliance on **intuitive thinking** in theorization. Theoretical thinking about translation within the Chinese tradition is primarily directed towards the translators’ direct apprehension of translation, of its problems and solutions, rather than on detailed analytical discussion. For example, Zhi Qian talked of his having translated “in an **unhewn** (*zhì* 质) and **straightforward** (*zhí* 直) manner”, and later generations described his approach as “**refined** (*wén* 文) without excessive adornment, and **concise** (*yuē* 约) to highlight the content” (Cheung 2006a:58). In Chinese terminology, the four descriptors – *zhi* (unhewn) and *zhi* (straightforward), and *wen* (refined) and *yue* (concise) – represent the thinking of the ancients about how translation should be done. Because of this, modern translation studies has credited Zhi with creating the earliest distinction in China between ‘literal’ (*zhi*) and ‘non-literal’ (*wen*) translation. Clearly, the kind of language used by Zhi and subsequently by other scholars – including Dao An’s ‘five losses’ and ‘three difficulties’, Xuan Zang’s ‘five guidelines for not translating a term’, and even Yan Fu’s emphasis in modern times on the difficulty of translating ‘faithfully’, ‘smoothly’ and ‘elegantly’ – is intuitive, based on translational experience. This, indeed, is something very characteristic of Chinese translation theory.

The fifth aspect is **terseness**. Chinese theoretical discourse on translation tends to be compact rather than elaborate. Again, it must be noted that this feature is not confined to translation studies alone. Terseness is an important feature of Chinese discourse in general, partly due to tradition and partly to the conciseness of the Chinese language. Of course, formulations that are economical and compact – such as Yan’s *xin, da, ya* – may also be criticized as vague and ambiguous in meaning. Yet it is precisely because of the conciseness, as well as the polysemy of these words, that terseness stands out so clearly as a feature of ‘Chineseness’.

As Luo has quite rightly pointed out, “different languages have different ways of expression and the same word may weigh very differently in different languages. For example, in commenting on the quality of a work of translation, it might be considered a form of commendation in a non-Chinese situation to say, ‘This translation is quite equivalent to the original’. But in Chinese, one may need to say something like *yibi chuanshen*” (译笔传神, literally, ‘translation-pen transmitting spirit’; Luo 1984:17, my translation). It should also be noted that even though vernacular Chinese, which is far less compact than classical Chinese, is the standard language used in China now, compactness in expression is still very highly regarded. A case in point is the way Yan’s principle of *xin, da, ya* has been reworked by modern scholars. They found *ya* (elegant), for example, to be an outdated concept and wanted to abandon it for a more current and relevant concept, such as ‘appropriate’ or *tieqie* (贴切) in Chinese. Instead of saying *zhongshi, tongshun, tieqie* (忠实、通顺、贴切 – faithful, comprehensible, appropriate), a formulation which consists of three terms, each comprised of two Chinese characters, they prefer to keep the original triadic compact pattern and say *xin, da, tie* (信达贴, faithful, comprehensible, appropriate) or *xin, da, qie* (信达切). The same kind of consideration is also obvious in such catchy phrases as Xu Yuanchong’s ‘Three types of beauty’ (三美说; that is, ‘beauty in sound, form and meaning’).

The issue of ‘Chineseness’, as previously noted, is one of relative identity, and discussion of this question is open-ended. Nonetheless, I hope the features outlined above will contribute to a better understanding of what is meant by ‘Chineseness’ in Chinese translation theory, and at the same time will serve as a basis for further discussion of this and related issues.

3. Towards an ethnoconvergent view of translation studies

As I have already explained, the importance of recognizing and describing the characteristics of a translation tradition lies not so much in the features, in and of themselves, but how one views them in relation to those of other traditions. To traditionalist thinking, the purpose of discussing the Chinese translation tradition is to emphasize that it is a unique system which must be protected from excessive outside influence (Zhang 2006). To my own mind, the point of discussing and recognizing the characteristics of the Chinese system of translation is not to exclude non-Chinese features from this system. To be sure, there are differences in the way different traditions approach translation, and these differences are always conditioned by socio-cultural needs, and are nurtured by the systems of thought that characterize the broader socio-cultural setting. But some kind of ‘universality’ also exists, in the sense that there are common principles and strategies of translation. Translation traditions as independent from one another as the Chinese and Western traditions have produced quite similar ideas on translation over the centuries (Tan 2001:68). I would argue, therefore, that in spite of differences between traditions, exchange can bring about mutual understanding. Our thinking on translation will thus witness a convergence in development; ideas produced in one geosocial location may spread to other locations and achieve greater dissemination. Some ideas may not necessarily be accepted in other locations, but they may bring an awareness of other ways of thinking in the study of translation, and help scholars in many different locations to reflect on translation with a broadened vision.

In this sense, the concept of ‘ethnoconvergence’, as I propose to use it in this paper, is not equivalent to ‘[ethnologically] becoming identical’, but rather means gradual progress towards increased ‘sharing of ideas’ and ‘mutual understanding’ across geosocial, cultural and ethnological borders. I am not suggesting that the various translation traditions in the world will one day all lose their own identity and merge as one uniform tradition. On the contrary, differences will remain – old differences may disappear but new differences will emerge, and the world will always be a place of rich diversity. This does not mean that one should ignore the unequal power relations that characterize our world and that clearly influence the way different translation traditions position themselves. However, with increased exchange and mutual understanding, the geosocial, cultural and ethnological borders of different traditions may gradually become less divisive. So when people accept or reject certain ideas or theories on translation, they will not do so because the ideas or theories in question belong to a particular ethnological tradition, but because they agree or do not agree with their content.

There are other fundamental reasons for proposing such an ethnoconvergent view. These relate back to the way in which we regard the ‘Chineseness’ of Chinese translation theory, and to the nature of (Chinese) translation studies.

Few would dismiss outright the traditionalist insistence that Chinese translation theory should carry its own characteristic features, but one should note two points: first, we should distinguish between what Zhu Chunshen calls ‘translation studies in China’ and ‘Chinese-related translation studies’, or what Chang Nam Fung calls ‘Pure Translation Studies’ and ‘Chinese Translation Studies’; second, we should distinguish between phenomena that exist in the Chinese tradition and features that are to be purposely built into it.

In Zhu’s distinction, ‘translation studies in China’ refers to “a self-contained system ... with China construed as a geopolitical body”, and ‘Chinese language/culture-related [i.e. Chinese-related] translation studies’ refers to “an open system ... with the Chinese as a nation, a linguistic and cultural entity in an anthropological sense” (Zhu 2004:332). Chang Nam Fung holds a similar view on this distinction. He argues that China should borrow ‘Pure Translation Theories’ from foreign traditions because it does not have any of its own and because traditionalist scholars’ search for ‘translation standards’ has led them into ‘a dead end’. Chang has criticized calls among traditionalist Chinese scholars to establish a ‘Chinese Translation Studies’ based on ‘traditional Chinese translation theories’. Such an “emphasis on a nation-restricted translation studies is in fact a product of national prejudice”, he argues (Chang 1995:1, 2000:2). According

to him, “without the solid foundation provided by Pure Translation Studies”, applied studies such as those “focusing on methods to produce faithful translations” “cannot develop properly” (Chang 1998:40).

I am not sure whether ‘Pure Translation Theories’, ‘Pure Translation Studies’, ‘Applied Translation Theories’ and ‘Applied Translation Studies’ are the right categories to borrow from the West, but I do agree that there are distinctions to be made between different types of translation studies. I have argued for this on a number of occasions (Tan 1988, 1997, 2000) and see such distinctions as based on the model suggested by James Holmes (1972). However, as Toury has pointed out (1995:9), “the main merit of Holmes’ program has always lain in its convincing notion of *division*; and not as a mere necessary evil, that is, but as a basic principle of organization”. It is this idea of ‘division of labour’ in translation studies, and not Holmes’ specific proposal of the ‘Pure’ vs. ‘Applied’ and ‘Theoretical’ vs. ‘Descriptive’ branches of translation studies, that I have found most useful. To me, the best ‘division of labour’ is between the branches of ‘general’ and ‘language-specific’ translation studies. General translation studies aims at developing theories regardless of the language in which the theories are developed. It acknowledges national, ethnological and socio-cultural constraints, but assumes that it is possible to transcend these constraints in its search for general principles. Oscar Wilde, too, probably had this kind of ethnoconvergent view in mind when he delivered one of his famous lectures to art students on ‘English music’. He said: “[S]uch an expression as ‘English art’ is a meaningless expression. One might just as well talk of ‘English mathematics’. Art is the science of beauty, and Mathematics the science of truth: there is no national school of either. Indeed, a national school is a provincial school, merely. Nor is there any such thing as a school of art even. There are merely artists...” (Wilde 1879:72). Of course, it would not be right to take Wilde’s words strictly at face value, because whether he liked or disliked the expression ‘English art’ or ‘English mathematics’, national traditions (including the English tradition) of art and mathematics have existed in history.

The very premise of my use of such terms as ‘Chineseness’ and ‘Western-ness’ indicates that I am not opposed to the validity of the concepts of ‘national’, ‘ethnological’ or ‘geopolitical’ traditions of translation theory. If we place Wilde’s dislike of the expression of ‘English art’ or ‘English mathematics’ within a broader perspective, however, we might say that he probably had in mind more general meanings of ‘art’ and ‘mathematics’. While there is nothing wrong with the idea of an English, Chinese or any other national tradition of art and science, certain aspects and qualities of art and science – the ‘melodiousness’ of music and the general tendency of science to strive for ‘verifiability’, for example – are not confined to individual nations. Just as there are things that are universally true of art and science, there are also things that are universally or generally attributable to the nature of translation, no matter which language pairs are involved.

As I see it, translation studies is a science, though not to the same degree (that is, as close to mathematics or physics, for example) as linguistics. In the same way that there are linguistic universals, which suggest that all languages have nouns and verbs and that all spoken languages have consonants and vowels, there are features which may be generally true of translation irrespective of the languages involved. For example, the various concepts of faithfulness, equivalence, accuracy, **understandability**, readability and acceptability, and so forth, express issues of concern in all translation traditions.⁹ And so, perhaps, are such notions as translation ‘memes’ and ‘norms’.¹⁰ Moreover, as with linguistics, the ways in which these translation

⁹ Baker defines ‘translational universals’ as “features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems” (1993:243). In her view, there are six such features. For a detailed discussion of these, see Baker (1993:243-245).

¹⁰ The notion of memes as basic units of cultural transmission, in the same way as ‘genes’ are basic units of natural or genetic transmission, was first proposed by Richard Dawkins in a book entitled *The Selfish Gene* (1976). The notion was

concepts are verbalized and discussed differ from language to language. For instance, the way Yan talks about ‘faithfulness’ (verbalized as *xin*, 1898) is different from the way that Tytler talks about it when he states that “the translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work” (1790/1997: page no.). It therefore seems reasonable to suggest that although different language/cultural systems all have their own way of discussing translation, there are also features that generally hold for all acts of translation.

Here, I must emphasize neutrality in my use of the terms ‘scientific’ and ‘ethnoconvergent’. Modelling myself on a comment by Tymoczko (2007:143) on the term ‘scientific’ in her ‘scientific’ approach to translation, I would like to spell out my position: to say that something is ‘scientific’ and ‘ethnoconvergent’ is not to valorize it or to say that it is necessarily good. At the same time, neither is it necessarily bad to say that a thing is ‘scientific’ and ‘ethnoconvergent’. No value judgement is intended by my use of these two terms – they simply serve the function of describing translation studies as I see it.

The ethnoconvergent view of translation theory that I propose here does not argue for the use of the term ‘international translation studies’. Some scholars might want to use the term as a reaction against Eurocentrism; but in the final analysis, there is no absolute need for its use. Just as there is no need to have ‘international mathematics’, ‘international music’, or ‘international linguistics’, neither is there need for an ‘international translation studies’. By its very nature, (general) translation studies *is* international.

Parallel to the ‘general’ aspect of translation studies, there is the language-specific or cultural tradition-specific aspect. The ‘Chineseness’ discussed in sections 2 and 3 basically outlines features of this category, though of course ‘general’ meanings can also be abstracted out of these ‘specific’ characteristics. If the focus is on ‘language-specific theories’, research output would naturally bear characteristics of the relevant language or cultural tradition. In fact, even when one works on ‘general translation theory’, the specific language-culture in which one works and the ethnological background to which one belongs will leave indelible traces in one’s theoretical output.

‘Chineseness’, therefore, is not and should not be manufactured. In the development of translation studies, there is no need for central planning. A discipline simply needs space to grow freely. In the process, elements of the environment – such as language, culture, society, ethnological upbringing and even exposure to ‘alien’ influences – will all play a role in shaping the development of that discipline. Let translation studies to grow and the identity of one’s own tradition will emerge.

Having explained what I mean by an ‘ethnoconvergent view’ of translation studies, I will now attempt to answer the question of whether the importation of foreign, especially Western, translation theories in recent years in China has been ‘excessive’ and whether Chinese translation studies has been ‘overwhelmed’ by Western ideas. The answer is no, for three reasons. First, although there have been a few dozen publications of Chinese translations of Western works on translation in the aftermath of the Cultural Revolution, the number is not large in relation to the much larger volume of material written and published across the country on translation and foreign language studies in general.¹¹ Second, the study of foreign translation theories, by itself, is and should be regarded as a component of the envisaged discipline of translation studies. The findings resulting from this study should be treated as valid products within the relevant home

then introduced into translation studies by Chesterman (1996, 1997), and separately by Vermeer (1997). In my view, this is a productive notion in explaining the evolution of translation theory and the spread of translation. Whether one believes that memes are scientific entities or just metaphors of translation, they can nevertheless be regarded as general or ‘universal’ features of translation. The same can be said of the notion of ‘norms’ as discussed by Toury (1980, 1995) and Chesterman (1997, 2000).

¹¹ Rough statistics collected in research for this article put the figure of books (including textbooks) on translation written and published between 1980-1989 by Chinese scholars at more than one hundred and fifty, several times more than translated books published in the same period.

system. From this perspective, the question of whether the importation of foreign theories is ‘excessive’ does not arise. Third, the complaint that too much foreign translation theory has been imported is also ill-grounded, in the economic as well as the cultural sense. In the case of the former, in a globalizing world economy with ever-increasing demands for cultural exchange, it would only be fitting to put the output of translation studies, including both Western and Chinese products, out on the world market. In the case of the latter, blind resistance to incoming ‘non-Chinese’ ideas would mean a return in China to the Cultural Revolution mode of ideology with its irrational anti-foreign sentiment.

Human wisdom belongs to the entire human race. Why should artificial barriers be set up to prevent it from spreading across social, cultural, ethnological and geopolitical borders? In my view, it would not be wrong for Chinese translation studies to translate every worthy foreign work on translation into Chinese, or to import every such work in its original, provided of course that researchers have the resources to do so. As the past few decades of the post-Cultural Revolutionary period have shown, the importation of foreign thoughts and ideas has injected new blood into the age-old Chinese tradition of theoretical thinking about translation; it has provided an impetus to its vigorous development in the present time. The concerns of those who have objected to incoming influences from abroad are ungrounded. Quite the contrary, recent Chinese engagement with foreign translation theories has enriched what can be called ‘Chinese translation studies’; or in the words of Tang (2007:359), it has enriched “the Chinese metalanguage of translation”. This, indeed, is the ethnoconvergent dialectic I have in mind in understanding the role of incoming influences in translation studies in present-day China.

4. Conclusion

One of the reasons some scholars have been overly preoccupied with the need to maintain ‘Chineseness’ in Chinese translation theory is that there has been a lack of understanding of ‘Chineseness’ as a contextualized and relative notion. To remedy the situation, when referring to ‘Chinese translation studies’ a clear distinction needs to be drawn between general translation studies in China and Chinese language-/culture-specific translation studies. The former aims to generate concepts or theories that may be generally applicable; the latter, to create concepts or theories that specifically address problems related to the Chinese translation situation.

Along this line of thought, it would make sense to talk of different traditions of translation practice and theory, and of metalanguage on translation in different traditions. But it should also be recognized that the ‘national’ or ‘language-cultural’ characteristics of translation theory (or of the metalanguage of translation) are but features to be encountered as a phenomenon, not features to be developed deliberately so that a certain idea may bear a certain name. This applies not only to the situation of Chinese translation studies, but also to similar situations in other parts of Asia and in the West.

TAN ZAIXI

Department of English Language and Literature, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong. thtan@hkbu.edu.hk

References

- Amos, Flora Ross (1920) *Early Theories of Translation*, New York: Columbia University Press; reprinted in 1973, New York: Octagon Books.
- Augustine (1428/1997) ‘The Use of Translations’, from *On Christian Doctrine (De doctrina Christiana)*, trans. by Douglas Robinson, in Douglas Robinson (ed.) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; reprinted in 2006,

- Beijing: The Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 31-34.
- Baker, Mona (1993) 'Corporeal Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications', in Mona Baker, Gill Francis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 233-50.
- Benjamin, Walter (1923/1992) 'The Task of the Translator' (*Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers*), trans. by Harry Zohn, in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds) *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 71-82.
- Bruni, Leonardo (1424-26/1997) 'On the Correct Way to Translate' (*De interpretatione recta*), trans. by James Hankins, in Douglas Robinson (ed.) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; reprinted in 2006, Beijing: The Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 57-60.
- Cai Yi (1987) 《文艺翻译与文学交流》 (Literary Translation and Exchange; translation of G.R.Gachechiladze's *Vvedenie v teoiyu khudozhestvennogo perevoda* [An Introduction to the Theory of Literary Translation], 1970), Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- Yu Jie and Duan Jinghua (1985) 《语言与翻译》 (translation of L.S. Barchudarov's *Yazyk I perevod* [Language and Translation, 1975], Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- Chang, Nam Fung (1995) 〈走出死胡同, 建立翻译学〉 (Out of the Dead End and into Translation Studies), *Journal of Foreign Languages* (外国语) 3: 1-3.
- (1998) 〈从梦想到现实—对翻译学科的东张西望建立翻译学〉 (From Dream to Reality – On Translation Studies as an Academic Discipline: East and West), *Journal of Foreign Languages* (外国语) 3: 40-45, 46.
- (2000) 〈特性与共性—论中国翻译学与翻译学的关系〉 (Chinese Translatology and Its Specific Characteristics), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 2: 2-7.
- Chesterman, Andrew (ed.) (1989) *Readings in Translation Theory*, Finland: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- (1996) 'Teaching Translation Theory: The Significance of Memes', in Cay Dollerup and Vibeke Appel (eds) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3, New Horizons*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 63-71.
- (1997) *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- (2000) 'Memetics and Translation Strategies', *Synapse* 5: 1-17.
- Cheung, Martha P.Y. (2002) 'Power and Ideology in Translation Research in Twentieth-century China: An Analysis of Three Seminal Works', in Theo Hermans (ed.) *Crosscultural Transgressions – Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 144-64.
- (2004) 〈对中国译学理论建设的几点建议〉 (A Few Suggestions for the Development of Theoretical Discourse on Translation), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 5: 3-9.
- (2006a) *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation Volume 1 – From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- (2006b) 'From 'Theory' to 'Discourse': The Making of a Translation Anthology', in Theo Hermans (ed.) *Translating Others, Volume 1*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 87-101.
- (2007) 'On Thick Translation as a Mode of Cultural Representation', in Dorothy Kenny and Kyongjoo Ryou (eds) *Across Boundaries: International Perspectives on Translation Studies*, Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 22-35.
- D'hulst, Lieven (1990) *Cent ans de théorie française de la traduction. De batteux à Littré (1748-1847)*, Lille: Presses universitaires de Lille.

- Fang, Mengzhi (1988) 〈发展与完善我国的译学研究—谈建立中国翻译学〉 (Developing and Improving the System of Translation Studies in Our Country: On the Establishment of a Chinese Translatology), *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* (外语教学) 1: 79-82.
- Fu, Lei (1951/1984) 〈《高老头》重译本序〉 (Preface to a *New Translation of Balzac's Pere Goriot*), in Luo Xinzhang (ed.) 《翻译论集》 (An Anthology of Essays on Translation), Beijing: The Commercial Press, 558-59.
- Gui, Qianyan (1986) 〈为确立具有中国特色的翻译学而努力〉 (Working Towards the Establishment of a Translatology with Chinese Characteristics), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 3: 12-15.
- Holmes, James S. (1972) 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies', in James S. Holmes (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 67-80.
- Huet, Pierre Daniel (1661/1997) 'Concerning the Best Kind of Translation' (*De optimo genere interpretandi*), trans. Edwin Dolin, in Douglas Robinson (ed.) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; reprinted in 2006, Beijing: The Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 163-69.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1816/1997) 'The More Faithful, the More Divergent', from the introduction to his translation of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, trans. by Douglas Robinson, in Douglas Robinson (ed.) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; reprinted in 2006, Beijing: The Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 239-40.
- Jing, Di (1998) 《等效翻译探索[增订版]》 (Exploring Equivalent-Effect Translation - Revised Edition), Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- Lao, Long (1996) 〈丢掉幻想, 联系实际—揭破“翻译(科)学”的迷梦(Discarding Illusions and Doing More Practical Work – Stop Daydreaming About “the Science of Translation”)〉, *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 2: 38-41.
- Lefevere, André (1977) *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Liu, Miqing (1989) 〈中国翻译理论的基本模式问题〉 (The Basic Mode of Chinese Translation Theory), *Journal of Modern Foreign Languages* (现代外语) 1: 5-9, 73.
- (1993) 〈中国现代翻译理论的任务—为杨自俭编著之《翻译新论》而作〉 (Tasks of Modern Translation Theory in China), *Journal of Foreign Languages* (外国语) 2: 4-8, 82.
- (2005) 《中西翻译思想比较研究》 (A Comparative Study of Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation), Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- Luo, Xinzhang (1983) 〈我国自成体系的翻译理论〉 (Our Country's Translation Theory: A System of Its Own), *The Translator's Notes* (翻译通讯) 7: 9-13; 8: 8-12.
- (ed.) (1984) 《翻译论集》 (An Anthology of Essays on Translation), Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Mao, Dun (1954/1984) 〈为发展文学翻译事业和提高翻译质量而奋斗〉 (On Literary Translation and Translation Quality), in Luo Xinzhang (ed.) 《翻译论集》 (An Anthology of Essays on Translation), Beijing: The Commercial Press, 501-17.
- Popovič, Anton (1976) *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*, Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Qian, Zhongshu (1984) 〈译事三难〉 (Three Difficulties in Translation), in Luo Xinzhang (ed.) 《翻译论集》 (An Anthology of Essays on Translation), Beijing: The Commercial Press, 23.
- Steiner, Thomas R. (1975) *English Translation Theory, 1650-1800*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Sun, Huijun and Zhang Boran (2002) 〈全球化背景下对普遍性和差异性的诉求—中国当代译

- 学研究走向》(Universality versus Difference – On the Development of Contemporary Translation Studies in China), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 2: 4-7.
- Sun, Huishuang (1988) 《翻译理论与翻译教学法》(translation of Jean Delisle's *Translation: An Interpretive Approach*, 1988), Beijing: International Culture Publishing Company.
- Sun, Zhili (1996) 《我国英美文学翻译概论1949-1966》(1949-1966: On Translations of British and American Literatures of the PRC), Nanjing: Yilin Publishing.
- (1997) 〈关于我国翻译理论建设的几点思考〉(A Few Thoughts on the Development of Our Country's Translation Theory), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 2: 10-12.
- Tan, Zaixi (1984) 《奈达论翻译》(Nida on Translation), Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- (1988) 〈试论翻译学〉(Further Propositions for a Science of Translation), *Journal of Foreign Languages* (外国语) 3: 22-28.
- (1997) 'Reflections on the Science of Translation', *Babel* 43(4): 332-52.
- (2000) *Fanyixue* (The Science of Translation), Wuhan: Hubei Education Press; reprinted in 2005.
- (2001) 'The Chinese and Western Traditions of Translation in Comparison', *Across Languages and Cultures* 2(1): 51-72; collected in Eva Hung (ed.) (2005) *Among the Best: Stephen C. Soong Chinese Translation Studies Awards 1999-2004* (Volume 2), Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 126-53.
- Tang, Jun (2007) 'The Metalanguage of Translation: A Chinese Perspective', *Target* 19(2): 359-74.
- Toury, Gideon (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute.
- (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tytler, Alexander Fraser (1790) *Essay on the Principles of Translation*; reprinted in 1970, New York: Garland; also see excerpts in Douglas Robinson (1997) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; reprinted in 2006, Beijing: The Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 209-212.
- Vermeer, Hans J. (1997) 'Translation and the "Meme"', *Target* 9(1): 155-66.
- Wilde, Oscar (1879) *Essays and Lectures* [electronic resource], Champaign, Illinois: Project Gutenberg; Boulder, Colorado: NetLibrary.
- Xu, Yuanchong (2000) 〈新世纪的新译论〉(New Approaches to Translation in the New Century), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 2: 2-6.
- Yan, Fu (1898/1984) 〈《天演论》译例言〉(Preface to the Translation of Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*), in Luo Xinzhang (ed.) 《翻译论集》(An Anthology of Essays on Translation), Beijing: The Commercial Press, 136-38.
- Yuan, Liangjun (2007) 〈一句并非鲁迅的“名言”〉(A Famous Saying Not Really by Lu Xun), 《新华文摘》(The Xinhua Wenzhai Digest) 21: 33.
- Zhang, Boran and Jiang Qiuxia (1997) 〈对建立中国翻译学的一些思考〉(Some Thoughts on the Establishment of a Chinese Translatology), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 3: 7-9, 16.
- Zhang, Jinghao (2006) 〈主次颠倒的翻译研究和翻译理论〉(Misplaced Priorities in Translation Studies and Translation Theory), *Chinese Translators Journal* 5: 59-61.
- Zheng, Hailing (1999) 〈翻译标准新说: 和谐说〉(A New Criterion on Translation: The Theory of Harmony), *Chinese Translators Journal* (中国翻译) 4: 2-6.
- Zhu, Chunshen (2004) 'Translation Studies in China or Chinese-related Translation Studies:

Defining Chinese Translation Studies', *Babel* 50(4): 332-45.
Zhuang, Yichuan (1987) 《通天塔: 文学翻译理论研究》 (translation of George Steiner's *After Babel*, 1975), Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.