

## 中文摘要

长久以来,翻译一直被看作是只发生在两种语言间的行为。这种假设不仅引发了旷日持久的直译和意译之争,而且成为二十世纪五十年代以来翻译的语言学研究的基础。在过去的几十年里,随着翻译研究的文化转向,翻译作为跨文化行为的性质也越来越引起翻译研究者的注意,怎样有效地在翻译中传达语言和文化中存在的差异一下子成了翻译界的热门话题,自此,归化异化之争也开始浮出水面。

国内外的翻译理论家纷纷对归化异化之争发表自己的看法。通过仔细研究,我们发现他们的分歧主要在于翻译过程中归化异化的选择问题。在争论的早期,学者们倾向于把归化和异化看作是完全对立的两个翻译策略,所以他们往往激烈地批评一种策略,支持另一种策略,而他们的讨论在很大程度上集中在这两个策略的优缺点上。进入二十一世纪后,在不断涌现的新的翻译理论影响下,学者们对归化异化两种策略的看法也趋于辩证,更多地把两者看成是互补的双方。在国内,近几年讨论的重点已从哪个策略更好转变为在当前的文学翻译中应该更趋向归化还是异化。虽然重点的转变深化了归化异化研究,但当前的研究也存在一定的片面性,因为不同的学者只从某一个角度出发来考察这一争论,这样他们就倾向于过度强调影响翻译策略选择的某些因素,完全忽略其他因素所起的作用。本文对归化异化之争也采取辩证的观点,认为两者各有特点和自己的实用价值,是互补的双方。在此基础上,本文尝试讨论了几种理论学派对归化异化之争所提供的主要视点,并从这些视点出发,在一些国内翻译学者相关研究的启发下,探讨了一些在翻译过程中可能影响翻译策略选择的主要因素。本文在这些方面的尝试希望能克服当前研究的缺点,更综合更全面地考察归化异化之争和它们在实际中的应用。

本文主要从以下几个方面来研究归化异化之争的:首先在介绍部分中,概括陈述了归化异化之争的发端,以及当前的研究现状和本文要到达到的目的;第一章介绍了归化异化的定义并进一步澄清了归化异化之争与直译意译之争的关系;第二章历时地梳理了归化异化在中国和西方国家的研究历史;第三章详细论述了当前的一些翻译理论对归化异化研究提供的新的、特别的视角,这些视角很大程度上扩展了当前研究;在第四章中,通过综合第三章中描述的不同视角并受一些国内翻译学者相关研究的启发,本文总结了一些翻译过程中影响策略选择的主要因素,并对其进行了详细研究;在最后一部分,本文得出了一些尝试性的结论,并对本文存在的局限和不足进行了陈述。

本文是对归化异化之争进行的一次尝试性研究,并不希望能给这对争论提供

一个终结性的答案,只希望这项研究能为翻译工作者在翻译实践中应对这对棘手的策略提供一定的启发,并为进一步研究尽一份微薄之力。

**关键词:** 归化; 异化; 辩证研究; 不同视角; 影响因素

## Abstract

For centuries it has been assumed that translation only takes place between languages and this assumption unleashed the literal and free translation debate in traditional translation theory and lies at the heart of a series of linguistic approaches to translation that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s. In the past decades, with the cultural turn in the translation field, the relationship between translation and culture began to attract more and more attention. Therefore, how to effectively deal with the linguistic as well as cultural differences in translation, or in other words, whether we should adopt domestication or foreignization, becomes a hot button in the translation field.

Many translators both at home and abroad have flooded translation journals with their opinions about this dispute. Observing closely, we have found that their pinions diverge most in the selection of domestication and foreignization in the translating process. At the early stage, they tended to view the two strategies as incompatible and denounced one in favor of the other and their discussions were largely about the advantages and disadvantages of the two strategies. On the threshold of the 21st century, the focus of the discussion about the two translation strategies in China has shifted from which one is better to which one should be the dominant strategy in the current literary translation in China. Although the current focus of discussion takes a more dialectic attitude towards the two strategies and different opinions may be justified in some ways, their studies are still one-sided in some ways because they each try to study the problem only from one perspective. They tend to overstress one strategy and ignore the positive and indispensable role of the other or overemphasize some factors and totally exclude the other. The present study attempts to hold a dialectic position on this dispute and claims that domestication and foreignization are both justified and valuable. On this basis, this thesis elaborates on different perspectives provided by different translation theories and attempts to probe into some main constraining factors in the choice of translation strategies. By making these attempts, the present thesis is intended to overcome the weak points of the current studies in this aspect and give this dispute a more comprehensive and overall study.

This thesis is mainly divided into the following parts: in the introduction part, the emergence of the controversy over domestication and foreignization is generally studied and the current research in this respect and what this present thesis is intended

to achieve are briefly presented; chapter one probes into the definitions of domestication and foreignization and clarifies the relationship between this dispute and the old debate of literal & free translation; chapter two gives a diachronic study of domestication and foreignization both in China and western countries, which is hoped to be of help to the further study of the two in the following chapters; chapter three elaborates some new and special perspectives on the study of domestication and foreignization provided by some translation theories, which have largely broadened the study; in chapter four, by combining different perspectives studied in chapter three as well as drawing on the studies of some Chinese translation theorists, the present paper sums up some factors influencing the selection of domestication and foreignization and gives a detailed study of them; in the final part, some tentative conclusions are drawn and the limitations of this study and its implications for the further study about this topic are briefly presented.

This study, with its tentative characteristic, is not intended to give a final answer to this controversy but rather to provide some implications for the handling of the two strategies in actual practice and the further study of them.

**Key words:** Domestication; Foreignization; a dialectic study; different perspectives; constraining factors

## 学位论文独创性声明

本人所提交的学位论文是我在导师的指导下进行的研究工作及取得的研究成果。据我所知，除文中已经注明引用的内容外，本论文不包含其他个人已经发表或撰写过的研究成果。对本文的研究做出重要贡献的个人和集体，均已在文中作了明确说明并表示谢意。

作者签名: 吕小勇 日期: 2005.6.15

## 学位论文使用授权声明

本人完全了解华东师范大学有关保留、使用学位论文的规定，学校有权保留学位论文并向国家主管部门或其指定机构送交论文的电子版和纸质版。有权将学位论文用于非赢利目的的少量复制并允许论文进入学校图书馆被查阅。有权将学位论文的内容编入有关数据库进行检索。有权将学位论文的标题和摘要汇编出版。保密的学位论文在解密后适用本规定。

学位论文作者签名: 吕小勇

日期: 2005.6.15

导师签名:

日期:

丁  
2005.6.15

吕玉勇硕士学位论文答辩委员会成员名单

姓名	职称	单位	备注
张春柏	教授	华东师大英语系	主席
侯敏跃	副教授	华东师大英语系	
张锴	副教授	华东师大英语系	

## Acknowledgements

During the course of writing this thesis, I profited greatly from the help of many teachers, friends and my family members. Here I wish to express my gratitude to them:

First of all, I am greatly indebted to my supervisor, Professor Chen Shu, who, in spite of his being fully occupied, devoted all his care to revising and commenting on this thesis. Without his strict guidance, constant encouragement and insightful suggestions, this thesis would never have come to the present stage.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to all the teachers who have taught me in the English Department. Their enlightening lectures have been of great help to completing this thesis.

In addition, I am also grateful to my classmates and roommates for their constant encouragement and help for three years, which I will treasure all my life.

Last but not least, my heartfelt thanks also go to my dearest father, whose keen dream of seeing one of his eight children wearing the cap and gown is a constant impetus to my three years' study here and my working on this thesis meticulously, and to my husband, who makes me understand there is always a way out in any difficulty.

# A Dialectic Study of Domestication and Foreignization

## Introduction

For centuries it has been assumed that translation only takes place between languages and this assumption unleashed the literal and free translation debate in traditional theories and lies at the heart of the concept of equivalence (Snell-Hornby 1988: 39) and a series of linguistic approaches to translation that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s. It is also apparent in various definitions of translation made by different translators or dictionaries. For example, *Encyclopedia Britannica* defines translation as “the act or process of rendering what is expressed in one language or set of symbols by means of another language or set of symbols” (Cited from Snell-Hornby 1988: 39). And Eugene Nida thinks “translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” (Nida and Taber 1969: 12). In *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Catford claims “Translation may be defined as the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)” (Catford 1965: 20). Therefore, both the past translation researches and translation criticisms have always focused on the linguistic comparative analysis between the source and target languages and between originals and translations.

With the economic globalization and the increase of cultural communication between different countries, culture has increasingly become the focus of the humanities and social science and continued to permeate in other fields and the translation field is no exception. More and more attention begins to be paid to the close relationship between language and culture and further between translation and culture. According to Nida, it's quite impossible to deal with any language as linguistic signals without recognizing immediately its essential relationship to the cultural context as a whole and language can not be discussed as though verbal communication occurred in a cultural vacuum. The Soviet semiotician Juri Lotman states, “No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language.” (Cited from Bassnett 1980: 22) The close relation between language and culture also finds full expression in the metaphor made by Susan Bassnett: “Language, then, is the



heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy” (ibid). The interdependent relationship between language and culture undoubtedly implies the close relationship between translation and culture.

In 1990, in their introduction to the collection of essays *Translation, History and Culture*, Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere criticize linguistic theories of translation, which they think, “have moved from word to text as a unit, but not beyond” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 4). They also dismiss the painstaking comparisons between originals and translations because they do not consider the text in its cultural environment. Bassnett and Lefevere go beyond language and pioneer the study on the relation between translation and culture, on the way in which culture impacts and constrains translation and on ‘the larger issues of context, history and convention’ (Munday 2001:127). The move from translation as text to translation as culture and politics is called by Mary Snell-Hornby as “the cultural turn” of translation. Translation is increasingly regarded as a cross-cultural activity. Christiane Nord (1991) suggests using the term “intercultural communication” in the place of translation. Andre Lefevere (1992) views translation as “acculturation” and R. Daniel Shaw (1988) coins the term “transculturation” to refer to translation. (郭建中 1998) Thus, the close relationship between translation and culture has begun to gain more notice and how to transfer the cultural elements embedded in the originals into the target language has become the focus of the controversy of the modern translation study.

Culture is usually viewed as consisting, with some slight variations, of the following four subsystems: techno-economic system; social system, ideational system and linguistic system (郭建中 1999: 143). Human beings, whatever languages they happen to speak and wherever they happen to live, have a great deal in common in the above-mentioned subsystems of culture. According to Nida, “even though specific behavior within any one area of life may differ, the range of common human experience is sufficiently similar to provide a basis for mutual understanding. Certainly the similarities that unite mankind as a cultural “species” are much greater than the differences that separate.”(Nida 1964: 55) So Nida holds that cultural universals in the world far outweigh the cultural divergences because there is a common core of culture in the human society, which constitutes a basis for cross-cultural communication and makes cross-cultural translation possible. The

shared cultural experiences are represented in different languages by a sort of commonness in the diction, linear collocation, application of figures of speech and the habit of choosing cultural images and so on. Therefore, the shared cultural elements will not pose difficulties for translation.

In spite of the cultural common core, every country has its special geography, climate and history and so on, which results in the fact that every country has its own cultural peculiarity. Such cultural peculiarity may lead to cultural differences or gaps, which have posed a major obstacle to cultural communication and are also where the most knotty translation problems arise. Nida claims, "In fact, differences between cultures cause many more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure."(1964: 161) and Nida and Reyburn (1981:2) also rightly points out: "Difficulties arising out of differences of culture constitute the most serious problems for translators and have produced the most far-reaching misunderstandings among readers" (Cited from 郭建中 1999: 158). For example, to express the same message, English has "A burnt child dreads the fire" and Chinese has "一朝被蛇咬, 三年怕井绳". It is here that the problem arises: when we translate this idiom from English into Chinese, shall we retain its images by rendering it as "烧伤过的孩子常怕火" and awaken Chinese people to different cultures or just adapt it to Chinese culture by replacing it with "一朝被蛇咬, 三年怕井绳"? In other words, when dealing with cultural differences in translation, shall we take the source culture-oriented strategy to keep them in the target text or adopt the target culture-oriented strategy to adapt them to the target culture? Different translation theorists present their points of view, which are generally summarized as the two large categories: domestication and foreignization.

Heated discussion about this controversy between domestication and foreignization has flooded leading translation journals both at home and abroad in the past ten odd years. Opinions of different translation theorists diverge most in the selection of the two translation strategies in the literary translating process. Why choose one strategy instead of the other and what factors influence the choice in translating process are among the questions they try to answer. At the early stage, they tended to view the two strategies as incompatible and denounced one in favor of the other and their discussion was largely about the advantages and disadvantages of the two strategies. In western countries, Eugene Nida, from the angle of intercultural communication, strongly advocates domestication while Lawrence Venuti, from a

wider social, cultural and political angle, proposes foreignization to resist domestication. In China, Liu-Yingkai (刘英恺 1987, 1997), etc., drastically criticize domestication and advocate foreignization while Qin Hongwu (秦洪武 1997), Feng Jianwen (冯建文 1993), etc., call for domestication. In 1998, Guo Jianzhong, mainly drawing on skopos theory, studied the two strategies from four aspects: purpose of translation, text type, writer intention and reader's need and drew the conclusion that the two strategies are both justified and are complementary. His study casts some new light on the selection of the two strategies.

Since the cultural turn of translation, in western countries many new translation theories, for example, text typology, skopos theory, polysystem theory, the ideological approach to translation and the post-colonial translation theories, have provided many new perspectives on the study of domestication and foreignization. In China, on the threshold of the 21st century, application of these theories to studying domestication and foreignization becomes popular and stimulates another round of dispute over the two strategies. For example, Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002, 2003) applied Lefevere's ideology approach, Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2000) adopted polysystem theory and Ge Xiaoqin (葛校琴 2002) paid attention to the post-colonial context of this dispute and so on. The new round of discussion begins to shift its focus from which strategy is better to which one should be the dominant strategy in the current literary translation in China. For example, Chen Lili (陈丽莉 1999), Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002, 2003), and Liu Yanli & Yang Zijian (刘艳丽&杨自俭 2002), etc., call for the dominance of foreignization while Cai Ping (蔡平 2002), Ge Xiaoqin (葛校琴 2002), etc., call for the dominance of domestication. For the present, it is apparent that the voice of advocating the dominance of foreignization is much louder. Although the current focus of discussion takes a more dialectic attitude towards the two strategies and different opinions may be justified in some ways, their studies are still one-sided in some ways because they each try to study the problem only from one perspective. They tend to overstress one strategy and ignore the positive and indispensable role of the other or overemphasize some factors and totally exclude others. Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2002) and Yuan Xiaoning, et al (袁晓宁等 2003), study this problem from different perspectives. Although their studies are by no means final, they have proposed a brand-new angle about the study and enlightened the present thesis a lot. This present paper holds a dialectic attitude towards this controversy and claims that domestication and foreignization are both justified and valuable. In order to overcome

one-sidedness of the current studies in this aspect, the present thesis approaches this controversy by combining different perspectives and attempts to sum up some main factors constraining the selection of the two in the translating process in a more comprehensive way. Since literary translation is where the dispute of domestication and foreignization most often arises, this study will mainly focus on the choice of strategies in literary translation while touching upon the translation of other subject matters. This study, with its tentative characteristic, is not intended to give a final answer to this controversy but rather to provide some implications for the handling of the two strategies in actual practice and the further study of them.

## **Chapter one**

### **Domestication and foreignization**

The very terms domestication and foreignization were first coined by Lawrence Venuti in his book *The Translator's Invisibility* in 1995. He borrowed the idea from the German philosopher and translator Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834). In an 1813 lecture named "On the different methods of Translating", Schleiermacher said, "In my opinion there are only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him. Or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him." (Cited from Lefevere 1972: 148) Venuti named the former foreignization and the latter domestication.

#### **1.1 Introduction of domestication**

Drawing on Schleiermacher's idea, Lawrence Venuti defines domestication as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home" (Venuti 1995: 20). Mark Shuttleworth and Moira Cowie, by adapting Venuti's definition, define domestication as "a term used by Venuti to describe the translation strategy in which a transparent, fluent style is adopted in order to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for the TL readers." (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 43-44) This involves erasing the linguistic and cultural differences of the original text and adapting them to the norms and conventions of the target culture. This target-culture-oriented approach makes the foreign familiar and avoids cultural conflicts and communication barriers.

However, building on his study of western translation history, Venuti holds that domestication has negative connotation "as it is identified with a policy common in dominant cultures which are 'aggressive monolingual, unreceptive to the foreign,' and which he describes as being 'accustomed to fluent translations that invisibly inscribes foreign texts with [target language] values and provide readers with the narcissistic experience of recognizing their own culture in a cultural other" (ibid.). The following steps will be included in an approach based on domestication: "the careful selection of texts which lend themselves to being translated in this manner, the conscious adoption of a fluent, natural-sounding TL style, the adaptation of TT to conform to target discourse types, the interpolation of explanatory material, the

removal of SL REALIA and the general harmonization of TT with TL preconceptions and preferences.” (ibid) Thus, for Venuti, domestication is far more than a strategy only for the sake of facilitating target readers’ understanding of translated texts. Placing translation under the wider social, cultural and political context, Venuti reveals that the adoption of domestication is deeply rooted in the inequality between cultures and the exclusionism of the dominant cultures. According to him, when the works of weak cultures are translated into strong cultures (mainly English), the original language, culture and even message will undergo adaptation and domestication so as to conform to the taste of the target readers of the strong cultures. Therefore, apart from functioning as a strategy facilitating cultural communication, domestication also serves as a tool with which strong cultures attain their goal of colonizing weak cultures and maintain their dominant status in the world.

Eugene Nida is widely considered as the advocate of domestication who lays much emphasis on the communicative function of translation. In his translation theories, he advocates dynamic equivalence between the source and target text at all levels, for example, semantic equivalence, linguistic equivalence, and stylistic equivalence and so on.

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message. (Nida 1964: 159)

In such a translation, “the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message.” (Nida 1964: 159) A translation of dynamic equivalence directs its focus of attention not so much toward the source message as toward the receptor response. Influenced by the Reception Aesthetics proposed by German historians and theorists Robert Juass and Wolfgang Iser, Nida attaches great importance to equivalence of reader response that means, “The receptors of a translation should comprehend the translated text to such an extent that they can understand how the original receptors must have understood the original text.”(Venuti 1995: 22) In order to achieve equivalence of response, the translation does not insist that the target receptor understand the unique cultural patterns of the source-language context to comprehend the message and the translator will “draw aside the curtains of linguistic and cultural differences so that people may see clearly the relevance of the original

message.”(Venuti 1995: 21) Naturalness is a key requirement for Nida’s approach of domestication, which considers adaptations of grammar, of lexicon and of cultural references to be essential. Thus the message has to be tailored to the receptor’s linguistic needs and cultural expectation. And the TT language should not show interference from the SL because the “foreignness” of the ST is minimized. A dynamic equivalent translation shifts the focus from verbal comparison between the originals and translation to readers’ response. According to Nida’s approach of domestication, the Chinese idiom “智者千虑，必有一失” will be translated into English as “Homer sometimes nods” and the English idiom “cast pearls before swine” will be translated into Chinese as “对牛弹琴”.

Besides Nida, many other translation theorists also favor the domesticating strategy. For example, Susan Bassnett proposes the equivalence of cultural functions and approves of employing domestication to handle linguistic and cultural differences in translation. Studied diachronically (refer to Chapter two), domestication has enjoyed great popularity among translators and translation critics in the translation history. The popularity of domestication is justified mainly in the following aspects:

- ① Domestication does not impose the original language conventions and culture on the target language and culture because such practice is regarded as both impractical and dangerous. “To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture onto the TL culture is dangerous ground...” (Bassnett 1980: 30). Therefore domestication adapts the original language conventions and culture to those of the target culture to overcome the barriers brought about by the differences both in language and culture.
- ② Domestication erases the linguistic and cultural foreignness and strangeness of the original text or reduces them to a minimum because translation is an indispensable medium of communication and the translator should facilitate the cross-cultural communication by avoiding cultural conflicts and misunderstanding. Translator should not expect too much of the target readers’ intelligence and imagination and force them to understand the original language patterns and culture with which they are totally unfamiliar.
- ③ A natural and fluent translation of domestication can make the target reader feel like that he is reading an original instead of a translation and bring the world reflected by the source text as close to the target reader as possible.
- ④ Domestication, according to Venuti’s study, can strengthen the cultural

conventions and norms of the target culture.

(郭建中 1998; Bassnett 1980; Venuti 1995)

## 1.2 Introduction of foreignization

Foreignization, according to Venuti, is “an ethnodeliant pressure on those [target-language cultural] values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.”(Venuti 1995, 20) This source-culture-oriented approach respects the foreignness of the source language and culture and tries to retain the foreign linguistic forms and cultural differences in the target text so that it enables the target readers to gain “an alien reading experience”(Venuti 1995: 20), know the cultural other and promote cultural communication. Such a strategy will involve not only “a freedom from absolute obedience to target linguistic and textual constraints, but also where appropriate the selection of a non-fluent, opaque style and the deliberate inclusion of SL REALIA...” (Schuttleworth & Cowie 1997: 59)

However, for Venuti, foreignization is more than a simple approach that tries only to keep the foreign elements in the target text. Departing from the perspective of unequal cultures, Venuti proposes the adoption of foreignization in “aggressively monolingual” cultures (such as the Anglo-American culture) where the prevailing approach is domestication. According to Venuti, foreignization “designates the type of translation in which a TT is produced which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the foreignness of the original” (ibid.).And it “highlights the foreign identity of the ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture.” (Mundy 2001: 147) Thus, foreignization, like domestication, in addition to being regarded as a simple strategy dealing with the linguistic and cultural differences, is endowed by Venuti with a cultural and political connotation.

No doubt Venuti is the most well-known representative of the approach of foreignization. Venuti sees its origin in Schleiermacher’s lecture and following Schleiermacher, he also views this as a preferred translation strategy. Venuti’s proposal of foreignization is based on his critical study of the western history of translation from the 17<sup>th</sup> century until the present day. He reveals that the basic reasons for the dominant priority of the natural translation, that is, domestication, in the history of western translation are to form a norm for foreign literature in English



on the basis of the western ideology. Venuti concludes that the past translation tradition in the western countries attempts to recreate the foreign text according to ethnocentrism and imperialistic cultural values. So he puts forward what he calls at different times “foreignizing translation” or “abusive fidelity”.

By foreignizing he means any translation strategy that resists domestication, fluency, and transparency. By abusive fidelity he means much the same thing: the translator seeks to reproduce those very features of the foreign text that “abuse” or resist the prevailing forms and values in the receiving culture, thereby allowing the translator to be faithful to aspects of the source text, but still participate in effecting cultural changes in the target language. (Gentzler 2001: 39)

According to Venuti, such strategies will play an important role in preventing cultural hegemony and enhancing the status of foreign culture in the target culture. Venuti suggests that the translators should retain some important cultural factors that are frequently erased, elided, smoothed over or adapted to the point that they are no longer recognizable. In order to expose the illusion of transparency in domesticating translation, Venuti also advocates that the practicing translators “foreground the play of the signifier, puns, neologisms, archaisms, dialects, satire, fragmented syntax and experimental forms, all of which result in discontinuous, fragmented and less than unified final texts.” (ibid) Therefore, according to Venuti’s approach of foreignization, “Homer sometimes nods” can be translated as “荷马也有打瞌睡的时候” and “对牛弹琴” can be foreignized as “To play the lute to a cow”.

Compared with the overwhelming dominance of domestication in the translation history, foreignization has occupied a relatively marginal status. However, many other translators, besides Friedrich Schleiermacher and Lawrence Venuti, also actively call for the adoption of foreignization primarily for the following reasons:

- ① It’s necessary for the target reader to acquaint himself with the foreign culture. As a matter of fact, to seek the foreign culture is usually one of the purposes of many target readers reading a translation. Bringing the facts of the original language and culture as they are to the target reader instead of concealing or erasing them through domestication can ultimately facilitate the cross-cultural communication.
- ② Translator should trust the target reader’s intelligence and imagination to understand the peculiarities of the original language and culture.
- ③ Foreignizing approach that transplants the original culture into the target

culture will serve to enrich the target culture and the ways of expressions of the target language.

- ④ Foreignizing translation proposed by Venuti seeks to “restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation”(Venuti 1995:20), so when adopted in the translation from weak cultures into a strong or dominant culture, it can serve to literate the weak cultures and restore their cultural identities in the dominant culture and function as a tool of cultural de-colonization or avoiding being colonized culturally.

(郭建中 1998; Venuti 1995; Schleiermacher 1813)

### **1.3 Foreignization & domestication and literal & free translation**

The emergence of the dichotomy of foreignization and domestication has caused much confusion in its relationship with the old debate of literal and free translation. For example, Liu Yingkai (刘英恺 1987) holds domestication as “the extreme of free translation” and Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002) thinks that “foreignization is equal to literal translation while domestication is equivalent to free translation.” None of these attitudes will do any good to the study of both the pairs. Here the present thesis intends to make a contrastive study of the two pairs in order to clear up the confusion and misunderstanding in hopes that it will be conducive to the further research and proper application of the two strategies.

The debate of literal and free translation is a product of the old assumption that translation takes place only between languages. Qiao Zengrui (乔曾锐 2000) defines literal translation as “conforming to the linguistic conventions of the target language, the target text seeks to be faithful to the source text by retaining the forms (ways of expression) of the original text so as to keep the original content and style” (在合乎译文语言的全民规范的情况下, 译文刻意求真, 通过保留原作形貌(表达方式)来保持原作的内容和风格) and free translation as a method which “employs the ways of expression of the target language functionally same or similar to that of the original language to substitute for the interrelationship between the form and content of the original text which can not be retained because of the differences between the two languages, trying to achieve the ideal that although the original forms are lost, the original content and style can still manage to be in agreement under different contexts.” (使用译文语言中功用与原文相同或相近的表达方式, 以代替原作中因

两种语言不同而无法保留的内容和形式之间的相互关系，力求做到虽失原作形貌，但从不同范围的上下文来看，仍不失原作的内容而且与原作的风格相适应。) From their definitions, we can know that literal translation tries to be faithful to the original content by adhering to the original forms while free translation tries to be faithful to the original content by substituting the target forms for the original forms. For example:

1) All this time I had gone on loving Dora harder ever. Her idea was my refuge in disappointment and distress and made some amends to me ever for the loss of my friend. (C. Dickens, David Copperfield)

Dong Qiusi's version: 在这全部期间，我愈来愈爱朵拉了。她的影子是我在失望和痛苦中的避难所，甚至补偿了我在朋友方面的损失。

Zhang Guruo's version: 在所有这个时期里，我对朵罗的爱却一直地与日俱增。我意念中的她就是我失意烦恼中的慰藉；即使好友失去，都可以此消忧解愁。(Cited from 刘艳丽&杨自俭 2002)

Through the comparison between the original text and the two Chinese versions in both linguistic forms and contents, it is clear that the two versions are different in many aspects. The first one is more literal because it tries to reproduce the original forms by adhering to the original word order to a maximum and keeping the original ways of expressions like "harder ever", "refuge" and "made some amends" and so on. However, the second version adopts Chinese ways of expression like "与日俱增", "慰藉" and "消忧解愁" and so on and, in addition, the word order is much adapted to Chinese so it is more likely to be called free translation. Therefore, the debate of literal and free translation focuses on the rendering of the original form and content: should the original form be adhered to or adapted in order to fully convey the original content? Literal translation holds that form also bears meaning and form must be retained to fully convey the original content while free translation argues that because of linguistic differences, the adherence to the original form certainly will damage the conveyance of the content so form must be changed and adapted.

Compared with the debate of literal and free translation, the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization is the product of the cultural turn of translation. The cultural turn of translation is only a shift in focus of research, which means, apart from going on studying how to successfully render the original linguistic differences, translation now lays more emphasis on the transfer of cultural differences. So domestication and foreignization, as their respective definitions show, attach

importance to the transfer of both the linguistic and cultural differences in the original text, but compared with literal and free translation, they attach more importance to that of the cultural differences. For example:

2) 真是“天有不测风云，人有旦夕祸福”。(曹雪芹 1982: 156)

Yang's version: "Truly 'the storm gathers without warning in nature, and bad luck befalls men overnight'..." (杨宪益 1994: 155)

Hawkes's version: "I know the weather and human life are both unpredictable." (Hawkes 1980: 231)

From the linguistic angle, Yang's version tries to retain the original ways of expression like the word order and the symmetric structure while from the cultural angle, Yang's version has kept the unique analogy between the phenomenon of nature and human life in Chinese culture displayed by this proverb. However, Hawkes's version only keeps the original content without retaining its ways of expression by only paraphrasing it without reproducing the Chinese cultural elements. Therefore both from the linguistic and cultural angle, Yang can be said to have adopted mainly the foreignizing strategy while Hawkes can be said to have employed, to a large extent, the domesticating strategy.

Many translation theorists have tried their hands at distinguishing the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization and that of literal and free translation. Wang Dongweng (王东风 2002) thinks that the former is the extension of the latter and a product of the development of translation. Other translators like Liu Yanli & Yang Zijian (刘艳丽 & 杨自俭 2002) trace the origins of all these terms respectively and try to make a comprehensive study of the differences between the two pairs. According to the present author's own study and enlightened by the researches made by the translators mentioned above, here we tentatively distinguish the two pair as follows:

① The debate of literal and free translation is derived from the old assumption that translation takes place only between languages and emerges from the talk about the different structures and characteristics of the two languages concerned so emphasis of the discussion is laid more on the relationship between form and content in translation. In contrast, domestication and foreignization are two strategies proposed after translation study is broadened and put under the wider social and cultural context and they pay attention to the treatment of both linguistic and cultural foreignness of the original text, though more attention to that of the cultural strangeness. Besides, they care more about the impact of choosing different strategies

on the target language and culture.

② Literal and free translation are translation methods while foreignization and domestication are translation strategies (刘艳丽&杨自俭 2002). Under the guidance of translation strategies, the translator may choose literal translation, free translation, adaptation, literal or free translation plus various compensation methods, and so on. “Literal and free translation are different mainly in ways of expression while the differences between domestication and foreignization can be reflected not only in ways of expressions and the treatment of cultural elements but also in all levels from the rendering of phonetics all the way to textual translation” (ibid).

On the whole, domestication & foreignization and literal & free translation share some overlapping parts and are closely related but there also are distinct differences between them. They will co-exist in translation studies and the former pair will never replace the latter. Compared with the debate of literal and free translation, the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization is undoubtedly a deepening of translation studies.

Before the emergence of domestication and foreignization, translation theorists adopt other similar notions like communicative and semantic translation (Peter Newmark, 1981, 1988), overt and covert translation (House, 1977, cited from Peter Newmark, 1981) and instrumental and documentary translation (Nord, 2001) and so on to indicate the target culture-oriented and the source culture-oriented translation strategy. Compared with them, domestication and foreignization are more embedded under a wider social, cultural, political and ideological context.

## Chapter two

### A historical study of domestication and foreignization in China and western countries

A historical study of domestication and foreignization in China and western countries will provide us with a glimpse of their diachronic development, which will be of great help to the further study of the two in the following chapters. As we have learned in the previous chapter, although there are distinctive differences between the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization and that of literal and free translation, they also overlap in many important ways and, besides, the former is deeply rooted in the latter, so when we trace the history of domestication and foreignization, it is unavoidable that the history of literal and free translation will be relevantly discussed. Therefore, for the convenience of discussion, we will not distinguish the two pairs clearly in the following parts.

#### 2.1 A historical study of domestication and foreignization in China

China's translation history has witnessed roughly four waves of translation activities. The first wave of translation activities in China came in the wake of the spread of Buddhism and lasted from the Eastern Han Dynasty to the Northern Song Dynasty, represented by the translation of Buddhist sutras into Chinese. The second peak period lasted from the Late Ming Dynasty until the Opium War characterized by the Chinese translation of western technical and scientific works and some Christian scriptures. The third climax took place after the Opium War and lasted till the May Fourth Movement involving large-scale translation of western thoughts and literature. And the fourth wave of translation activities began after May Fourth Movement and continued right into the present period, during which translated works had covered a large range of fields.

As early as the first wave of translation activities, the dispute over the rudiments of domestication and foreignization had begun, known as the dispute over "simple translation" (文) and "sophisticated translation" (质) of Sutra scriptures which Liang Qichao referred to as the debate of literal and free translation. (陈福康 2000: 8) According to Zhi Qian's preface to *Dhammapada* (《法句经序》), the first recorded statements on translation in China, at that time translators held Buddhist sutras as holy

and insisted that Buddha's words or teachings should be rendered unadorned. Therefore, at the early stage, the translation usually followed exactly the literal meaning without any literary embellishment and the "simple" school prevailed. In the Eastern Jin Dynasty, Shi Dao'an (314-385) continued the "simple" theory and advocated that the translators of Buddhist sutras should adhere to the original text without any alteration. The simple school continued to be dominant until Kumarajiva (344-413) put forward his opposition to it. He claimed that as long as the translation did not diverge from the central theme, its wordings might not exactly match that of the original. So he advocated that the text could be rendered with the target language usage and the draft could be polished for the literary quality. Thus he was viewed as a "free" translator and in his period the sophisticated school prevailed. In the Tang Dynasty, Xuan Zang (602-664) tried to combine the two schools and regulate the literal and free translation. He adhered to the literal translation and supplement it with the free translation when necessary, thus reaching the height of Buddhist translation in China. After him, the Buddhist translation gradually declined in China, so did translation activities in China.

The second wave of translation, mainly the rendering of western technical and scientific works, is not our main concern here. After the Opium War, western countries carved up China and China was experiencing a severe national crisis. Many scholars and innovators viewed the introduction and translation of western literature as a tool of educating the public. The late 19<sup>th</sup> century, especially the 1910s witnessed a large-scale translation of western thoughts and literature. At that time, because western literature was regarded as a tool of social reform, translators did not care so much about being faithful to the source text as about how to conform to the social and cultural trend of the late Qing Dynasty and cater for the taste of the readers. Therefore, domestication prevailed in the literary translation of this period until the May Fourth Movement. Yan Fu and Lin Shu are two representatives of the translators adopting domestication at this historical period.

After the May Fourth Movement, another round of dispute over domestication and foreignization arose in the 1920s and 1930s, which took the form of debates about the dichotomy of "faithfulness" and "smoothness". In the 1920s, enlightened Chinese scholars proposed to translate western works into China with a view to creating a new culture. Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai, as representatives of the "faithfulness" school, declared "rather to be faithful (in thought) than to be smooth (in language)". They

upheld the literal translation with the purpose of enriching the Chinese language by introducing new ways of expressions as well as retaining the foreign flavor. However, Liang Shiqiu and Zhao Jingshen, as representatives of the “smoothness” school, declared “rather to be smooth (in language) than to be faithful (in thought)” and maintained that the principle of “smoothness” should be followed because the target reader preferred a translation easy to read. It was right in this period that the concepts of domestication and foreignization stood out more clearly than any period before. For example, Lu Xun, when translating the Russian work *Dead Souls* (《死魂灵》) into Chinese, said that “before translating, [the translator] has to make a decision: either to domesticate the original text or to retain the foreign flavor as much as possible?” (动笔之前, 就先得解决一个问题: 竭力使它归化, 还是尽量保存洋气呢?) (罗新璋 1984: 301) During this debate, the “faithfulness” school took the upper hand and many translators consciously adopted foreignization. Their efforts introduced many foreign words and imported many western grammatical structures. Foreignization in this period had enriched the Chinese vocabulary and contributed to the diversity of Chinese ways of expressions, which had eventually facilitated the development and maturity of the vernacular Chinese. In addition, the foreignizing strategy also introduced some new literary forms like free verse, prose poem and short story and so on into China. Despite the advantages of foreignization mentioned above, it has many insurmountable disadvantages. For example, unidiomatic ways of expression made the target text difficult to be understood. So since the late 1930s, domestication seized the dominant status again in literary translation. Zhang Guroo, Zhu Shenghao and Fu Donghua are the most well-known representatives of translators adopting domestication in this period. Fu Lei’s “spirit resemblance” (神似说) in the 1950s and Qian Zhongshu’s “Hua” or “sublimation” (化境说) in the 1960s are the most representative viewpoints of translation supporting domestication.

Fu Lei argued that “as far as the effect of translation is concerned, translation should be like copying a painting, seeking resemblance in spirit rather than in form.” (以效果而论, 翻译应当像临画一样, 所求得不在形似而在神似) (陈福康 2000) According to him, “the ideal translation should sound as if it were written by the ST writer in Chinese.” (理想的翻译仿佛是原作者用中文写作). Following his principle, Fu Lei’s translated works are in very natural and fluent Chinese, revealing few traces of foreignness. When Qian Zhongshu commented on Lin Shu’s translations, he said that the ideal of literary translation should be “hua” or “sublimation”. By “hua”, he



meant, “when a work is translated from one language into another, [the translated version] should not only retain the original flavor but also show no unnaturalness caused by the linguistic differences between the two languages.” (把作品从一国文字转变为另一国文字, 既不能因语文习惯的差异而露出生硬牵强的痕迹, 又能完全保存原有的风味)(罗新璋 1984: 696). Translation which has achieved “sublimation” is likened to be “the transmigration of souls” (灵魂的再生) which means that the spirit remains the same as the original with only changed physical appearance. In other words, “the target text should be so faithful to the source text that it does not read like a translation at all”(译本对原作应该忠实的以至于读起来不像译本) (ibid) . Therefore, domestication dominated the literary translation of this period. Although some translators like Dong Qiusi and Bian Zhilin adhered to foreignization in theory and practice, their voices were largely drowned in the overwhelming popularity of domestication.

Domestication dominated the Chinese literary translation nearly half of the century until Liu Yingkai directed his spearhead towards domestication again in 1987 in his article: *Domestication: The Wrong Track in Translation* (《归化——翻译的歧路》). He sharply criticized the prevailing practice of domestication in Chinese translation field like the overuse of Chinese four-character phrases, of Chinese archaisms, of the “abstract method”, of the substitution method and the groundless use of images and idioms and so on. He takes a negative attitude towards domestication, thinking that domestication “changes the facts of the original text, erases its national identity, imposes the target conventions on them and adapts them to the target language. Therefore, it will inevitably distort the original.” (改造外国……的客观事实, 抹杀其民族特点, 迫使它们就范, 同化于归宿语言, 因此也就必然是对原文的歪曲). Since then, a new round of dispute over domestication and foreignization arose. Many Chinese translators hold their own stands towards this dispute. Some (杨自俭, et al. 1994:169-182) followed Liu Yingkai in favor of the foreignizing strategy. However, others (秦洪武 1997; 冯建文 1993, 许渊冲 1993) preferred domestication. Take Xu Yuanchong as an example. He takes translation as a competition between the source and target language and culture and insists that the translator should bring the strengths of the target culture into full play. In this debate, they tended to view the two strategies as incompatible and denounced one in favor of the other and their discussions were largely about the advantages and disadvantages of the two strategies. There are also a few (王佐良 1989; 郭建中 1998) who hold a

dialectic attitude towards the two, but their voices are largely drowned out. On the threshold of the 21st century, influenced by newly-emerging translation theories, another round of debate about domestication and foreignization begin to shift its focus from which one is better to which one should be the dominant strategy in the current literary translation in China. For example, Chen Lili (陈丽莉 1999), Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002, 2003), and Liu Yanli & Yang Zijian (杨艳丽&杨自俭 2002), etc., call for the dominance of foreignization while Cai Ping (蔡平 2002), 葛校琴 (2002), etc., call for the dominance of domestication. For the present, it is apparent that the voice of advocating the dominance of foreignization is much louder. Although the current focus of discussion takes a more dialectic attitude and different opinions may be justified in some ways, their studies are still one-sided in some ways because they each try to study the problem only from one perspective. For example, Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002, 2003) applied Lefevere's ideology approach and claimed that the current ideology and poetics in china calls for the priority of foreignization. Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2000) adopted polysystem theory to study translators' choice of strategies in different historical periods and tried to justify the current appeal for the dominance of foreignization. However, Ge Xiaoqin (葛校琴 2002) paid attention to the post-colonial context of this dispute and warned the researchers at home of the contemporary postcolonial context. She held that the selection of either as a translation strategy should take into careful consideration the particularities of specific social situations in the postcolonial context and argued that the current social situation in China demands that we should privilege domestication translation over foreignization. Inevitably, the one-sidedness of each perspective will result in the one-sidedness of their positions on this dispute. Therefore, they tend to overstress one strategy and ignore the positive and indispensable role of the other or overemphasize some factors and totally exclude the other. In contrast to their studies, Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2002) and Yuan Xiaoning, et al (袁晓宁等 2003), study this problem from a range of different perspectives, providing some new angles and being of great help to the further study of this knotty controversy.

## **2.2 A historical study of domestication and foreignization in western countries**

According to *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* edited by Mona Baker, "domesticating strategies have been implemented at least since ancient

Rome.”(1998: 240) In 300 BC, when Rome just began to rise and the Greek culture was thought as superior to Roman culture, the Greek source texts were held as holy by the Roman translators so they adhered strictly to the source texts with the only purpose of conveying the original content and imitating the original style. Thus “the Romans took over wholesale many elements of Greek culture, including the whole religious apparatus.” (Newmark 1981: 3) Later, as Rome conquered Greece militarily, they began to hold translation as ‘a form of conquest’. (谭载喜 1991: 22.) “As a result, Latin translators not only deleted culturally specific markers but also added allusions to Roman culture and replaced the name of the Greek poet with their own, passing the translation off as a text originally written in Latin.” (Baker 1998: 241) Later, Cicero (55BC) first supported sense against words and said a translator must be either an interpreter or a rhetorician. Others, like St. Jerome (400), Luther (1530), etc. all favored natural renderings. (Newmark 1981: 3) By studying the western translation history, Venuti has found that domestication find its strongest and most influential advocates in the French and English translation traditions, particularly during the early modern period. For example, Perrot d’Ablancourt, a prolific French translator of Greek and Latin, was famous for translating Tacitus’s works into French. He advocated to render freely, “with the insertion of explanatory phrases and the deletions of digressions so as ‘to avoid offending the delicacy of our language and the correctness of reason’.”(Baker 1998: 241) In order to cater to the taste of the readers of his time, he always added contents to the original, omitted some of the contents or altered the original wherever he viewed necessary and exerted his own writing talent in the translated versions. In British translation tradition, for example, under the influence of D’Ablancourt, the English translator Sir John Denham adopted heroic couplets when rendering Book 2 of the Aeneid, argued that “if Virgil must need speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this Nation, but as a man of this age.” (Baker 1998: 241) As with Denham, Dryden’s domesticating translation method in his version of Book 2 of the Aeneid is so complete that fluency is seen to be a feature of Virgil’s poetry instead of the strategy implemented by the translator. (Venuti 1995: 63-64) After Dryden, from Alexander Pope’s multi-volume *Homer* (1715-1726) to Alexander Tytler’s *Essay on the Principle of Translation* (1791), domestication dominated the theory and practice of English translation in every genre. “By the turn of the nineteenth century, a translation method of eliding the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text was firmly entrenched as a canon in

English-language translation...” (Venuti 1995: 76) And this domesticating canon continued into the present day and is further reinforced by Nida’s “dynamic equivalence”.

“As a theory and practice of translation, however, a foreignizing method is specific to certain European countries at particular historical moments.” (Venuti 1995: 20) “A foreignizing strategy in translation was first formulated in German culture during the classical and Romantic periods, perhaps most decisively by the philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher.” (Baker 1998: 242) In an 1813 lecture named “On the different methods of Translating”, Schleiermacher said, “In my opinion there are only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him. Or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him.” (Lefevere 1992: 148) The two methods are termed respectively as foreignization and domestication by Venuti. Schleiermacher advocated foreignization since he thought that his language, German, “can thrive in all its freshness and completely develop its own power only by means of the most many-sided contacts with what is foreign.” (Lefevere 1992: 164-165) Venuti holds that “Schleiermacher’s translation theory rested on a chauvinistic condescension toward foreign cultures, a sense of their ultimate inferiority to German-language culture, but also on an anti-chauvinistic respect for their differences, a sense that German language culture is inferior and therefore must attend to them if it is to develop.” (Venuti 1995: 99). Schleiermacher suggests, “The foreign in foreignizing translation meant, first of all, a specific selection of foreign texts and also means a development of discursive peculiarities that oppose the dominant discursive strategies. For him, a translation can be foreignized only by approximating the play of signifiers in the foreign text.” (Venuti 1995, 116-117) Schleiermacher’s views have influenced a number of translators in the nineteenth century and they have experimented with this theory in their translation practice. For instance, when F. D. Newman translated *Homer*, he insisted on the reproduction of the peculiarities of the original as much as possible by using ballad metre and “Saxon-Norman” language in order to represent the primitiveness of *Homer*; Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) used Germanic structures when he translated German works into English. In the nineteenth century, the important essays and references by Goethe (1813, 1814), Humboldt (1816), Novalis (1798), and Nietzsche (1882), etc. inclined towards more literal or foreignizing translation strategy. (Newmark 1981: 4) The foreignizing translation

continued to be popular from the early 19th century to the first half of the 20th century. Walter Benjamin, Ezra Pound and Vladimir Nabokov, among others, carried this trend into the twentieth century. For example, Nabokov insisted that only a word for word translation, i. e. a literal translation, was valid in literary translation, while Pound rendered a number of works into English by resorting to foreignization. Although during this period other translators like Edward Fitzgerald (1809-1863), a British translator known for his rendering of *The Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam, has advocated a very free translation that might alter the original so as to keep its liveliness. But their voices were drowned in the great emphasis on literalism and foreignization that continued until the 1940s when domestication became popular again. (马会娟 2003: 53-57) In 1995, in his book *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti gave a symptomatic study of western translation history and revealed the roles played by domestication in the dominant cultures when translating from other weak cultures, that is, to recreate the foreign text according to ethnocentrism and imperialistic cultural values which advocate the fluent translation strategy. So he proposed foreignization or abusive fidelity to resist the target conventions and liberate the foreign languages and cultures in the target text. Venuti's proposal sparked another round of controversy over domestication and foreignization after more than half a century's domination of domestication in western translation circle. Venuti's unique perspective has attracted attention internationally, as Gentzler puts it,

Venuti's international following is quite strong, particularly in Europe and Latin American. The publishing industry in the United States, which currently is increasingly open to finding new ways to introduce cultural difference into Anglo-American society, will soon follow. They are already experimenting with new forms of presenting translations, including using additional supplementary material such as prefaces, introduction, interviews, footnotes, to help the readers adjust to the foreign ideas and structures. (Gentzler 2001: 43)

### 2.3 Summary

From the historical study of domestication and foreignization in China and western countries, we can tentatively draw the following conclusions:

First, many translators and theorists, from their respective angles, tend to favor one strategy and exclude the other. Schleiermacher believed that "The two roads

(domestication and foreignization) are so completely separate that the translator must follow one or the other as assiduously as possible, and any mixture of the two would produce a highly undesirable result, so much so that the fear might arise that author and reader would not meet at all.” (Cited from Lefevere 1992: 149) In his opinion, a translator should stick to one strategy all through the text and cannot shift to the other one so he thinks that they are incompatible. As we know, Shleiermacher is a strong advocate of foreignization, which means he suggests that translators should stick to foreignization all through the rendering of a whole text. When Nida first proposed his “dynamic equivalence”, or rather, the domesticating strategy, he confined the “formal equivalence” or foreignization to “translations of certain types of messages for certain types of audiences” (Nida 1964: 166) instead of describing it as a complementary strategy for the “dynamic equivalence”. In China, Zhang Guroo advocated rendering the native original language with native target language and Zhu Shenghao clearly expressed his opposition to reproduce the original words and sentence structures and advocated to retain the original “spirit” or “verve”. The same is true of the translation views of Fu Lei and Qian Zhongshu.

Second, from the diachronic study of the two in both China and western countries, it is found that the choice of translation strategies takes on a historical tendency. Although, whether in China or in western countries, domestication has largely dominated literary translation most of the time, foreignization has also occupied a dominant status in a certain historical period and in a certain country. This provides much food for thought: there must be some historical factors influencing the tendency of the choice of domestication and foreignization.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Different perspectives on the study of domestication and foreignization**

In the recent years, the rapid emergence of new translation theories has widened the horizons of translation studies with a wealth of new insights and provided many special perspectives on the study of domestication and foreignization as well. Although many other theories within and outside the translation field may also complement the study, because of the limitation of space, this present paper will only elaborate on the perspectives provided by text typology theory, skopos theory, polysystem theory, ideological approach to translation, or rather, Andre Lefevere's ideology theory and post-colonial translation theories, which the author thinks are more directly helpful to the study of domestication and foreignization and worth expounding here.

#### **3.1 Text typology theory**

Text typology theory is first proposed by the German translation theorist Katharina Reiss and further developed by the British translation theorist Peter Newmark on the basis of the functions of language proposed by Karl Buhler: "language serves simultaneously to represent (objectively), express (subjectively) and appeal (persuasively)." (Reiss 1971: 25)

The founder of the functional translation approach, Katharina Reiss builds her works in the 1970s on the concept of equivalence but views the text as the level at which communication is achieved and at which equivalence must be sought. Reiss holds that "the type of text is the primary factor influencing the translator's choice of a proper translation method" (Reiss 1971: 17) and suggests "specific translation methods according to text type" (Reiss 1976: 20, cited from Munday 2001: 75). She borrows Karl Bulher's three functions of language and categorizes the texts as the expressive, the informative, the operative and the audio-medial text. The last one is always ignored since it concerns something far beyond the written text. She thinks that the translation of the informative text should be "in plain prose", transferring the full referential or conceptual content of the source text, that of the expressive text should adopt the "identifying" method, conveying the aesthetic and artistic form of

the source text and that of the operative text should employ the “adaptive” method, producing the desired response in the target text receiver. Here the “plain prose” method tries to transfer the sense of the original text and the “adaptive” method lays more stress on the target reader’s response so the description of the two largely resembles the domesticating strategy while the “identifying” method pays attention to conveying the original aesthetic, linguistic and cultural forms, thus bearing great similarities to the foreignizing strategy.

Reiss’s ideas about the relationship between the text types and the choice of translation strategies are greatly shared and further developed by Peter Newmark. Newmark thinks all the past translation theories try to propose a single translation method to solve all the translation problems and in his opinion, this is almost impossible. He holds that the choice of translation strategies or methods should depend on the types of text and other factors.

Whilst principles have been, and will be, proposed for dealing with recurrent problems (translation rules), a general theory cannot propose a single method (e. g. dynamic equivalence), but must be concerned with the full range of text-types and their corresponding translation criteria, as well as the major variables involved. (Newmark 1981: 12)

Newmark also borrows and adapts Bühler’s statement about the functions of language and categorizes the texts according to the three functions of languages, that is, the expressive function, the informative function and the vocative function. So his categories of texts are almost equivalent to Reiss’s. According to Newmark, before deciding on his translation strategy, the translator may assign his text to the three text categories. Very roughly, the translation theorist can assign such text-categories as serious literature, authoritative statement and personal or intimate writing and so on to the expressive function; journalism, reporting, scientific and technical papers and most non-literary work, where the facts are more important than style, usually to the informative function and advertising, propaganda and popular literature, or notice, instructions, rules and regulations and so on, all these, to persuade the reader or to direct the reader, to the vocative function (Newmark 1981: 21). Carrying the text typology theory further than Reiss, Newmark have proposed two methods of translation that, he think, are appropriate to any text: (a) communicative translation, which tries “to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original” (Newmark 1981: 39), and (b) semantic translation, which



tries “to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.” (ibid) Here, we will find Newmark’s communicative translation is much similar to Nida’s dynamic equivalence while his semantic translation is almost equivalent to Venuti’s foreignization except that the latter two are more embedded under the social and cultural context. Newmark holds that the expressive components of expressive texts like unusual syntactic structures, collocation, metaphors, words peculiarly used, neologisms and so on should be rendered closely and the cultural components tend to be transferred intact in expressive texts, in other words, the expressive texts should be translated semantically or foreignizingly. When translating the informative and vocative texts, Newmark says, the translator tends to convey only the sense, normalize or tone down some unusual ways of expression or strangeness, transfer and explain the cultural components with culturally neutral terms in informative texts and replace them by cultural equivalents or simply erase them in vocative texts if they are not significant, that is, to employ the semantic or domesticating strategy. (Newmark 1988: 47)

The doubt “whether text types can really be differentiated” (Munday 2001: 76) has constituted the main criticism for Reiss’s whole theory and Newmark has also been criticized for “his strong prescriptivism,” (Munday 2001: 46) because, just as Newmark himself admits, “all texts can have aspects of the expressive, the informative and the vocative function.” (Newmark 1981: 21) So here the three text categories merely illustrate the main emphasis of the texts and the relationship between the text types and the translation strategies is more a matter of tendency than a one to one correspondence. From what we have observed, we can safely say that there is no one foreignizing or one domesticating method when translating a text since in one text there are often sections that must be domesticated and others foreignized. But a translation can be said to be more domesticating or foreignizing, and the priority of which one may partially depend on the text types.

Reiss and Newmark have established a general correlation between the text types and the translation methods or strategies, which, to a large extent, has offered a guiding principle for the choice of the translation strategies, here domestication and foreignization. Some translators in China, like Jia Wenbo (Jia Wenbo 2004), have made some fruitful studies in this respect. However, according to Munday, “The translation method employed depends on far more than just text type. The translator’s

own role and purpose, as well as socio-cultural pressures, also affect the kind of translation strategy that is adopted.” (Munday 2001: 76)

### 3.2 Skopos theory

Skopos theory is an approach to translation that was proposed and developed in Germany in the late 1970s and early 1980s by Katharina Reiss and her student Hans Vermeer. As early as 1971, in her book *Possibilities and Limitations in Translation Criticism*, Reiss proposed to develop text functions as a model of translation criticism and the special purpose of the translation activity as a new norm of translation theories. Because she takes equivalence as the basis of her theory, the relationship between the source text and the target text in her theory is largely the functional equivalence. Later, in 1978, Vermeer abandoned the source-oriented equivalence and set up skopos theory. Vermeer’s skopos theory is greatly influenced by action theory which defines human action as intentional, purposeful behavior that takes place in a given situation. Thus in skopos theory, translation is viewed not as a process of transcoding between languages but as a special form of human action with its own purpose or “skopos” in German. Skopos theory emphasizes, above all, the purpose the target text is intended to fulfill in the target context. Vermeer demands that in general it should be the intended purpose of the target text that determines translation methods and strategies. It follows that the translator should use the translation strategies which are most suitable for achieving the purpose for which TT is intended, whether they are considered to be the “standard” way in a particular translation context or not. This is summarized as the top-ranking rule for any translation, the “skopos rule”, which says that a translational action is determined by its skopos or what Reiss and Vermeer call “the end justifies the means” (Reiss and Vermeer 1984: 101, cited from Nord 1997: 29). Besides the “skopos” rule, there are another two rules in skopos theory, one is the “coherence” rule which means that the receiver should be able to understand the target text, the other is the “fidelity” rule which means that the target text should be faithful to the original text. But the “fidelity” rule is considered subordinate to the “coherence” rule and both of them are subordinate to the skopos rule. The skopos rule is intended to solve the eternal dilemmas of free & literal translation, dynamic & formal equivalence and the like because it allows the possibility of the same text being translated in different ways according to the purpose of the target text.

Studying domestication and foreignization from the perspective of skopos theory, we may conclude that a particular translation task may require a domesticating or a foreignizing translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose the translation is intended to attain. Some translators (Guo Jianzhong 1998, Wen Jun, et al, 2003) in China, have applied skopos theory to studying the controversy of domestication and foreignization and provided some new and insightful angles:

1) Purpose of translation: As we know, in skopos theory, different purposes may justify the phenomenon of the same source text being translated in different ways. Therefore, knowing why a source text is to be translated and what functions the target text will serve is crucial for the translator. The purpose of translation may be decided by the initiator of the translation who needs a text for a particular purpose and offers as many details as possible about the purpose to the translator or by the translator himself when the initiator has only a vague or even incorrect idea of what kind of text is needed. In many cases, an experienced translator is able to infer the purpose from the translation situation itself and decides on what strategies to employ by taking into consideration the target readers, time, place, occasion and medium of the intended communication and the function the text is intended to have and so on.

2) Text type: In the framework of skopos theory, since functional equivalence is no longer regarded as the normal aim of translation, the analysis of text types can no longer provide the decisive standards for the choice of translation strategies. Therefore, in skopos theory the correlation between text type and translation strategies established by Reiss and Newmark is restricted only to the special case of functional sameness between the source and target text. According to skopos theory, "The overall frame of the reference for the translator should not be the original and its function, as equivalence-based translation theory have it, but the function or set of functions the target text is to achieve in the target culture"(Vermeer, cited from 贾文波 2004). In other words, skopos theory, to some extent, has complemented and expanded the text typology theory by explaining some knotty problems that text typology alone can not explain.

3) The target readers: "In the framework of skopos theory, one of the most important factors determining the purpose of a translation is the addressee, who is the intended receiver or audience of the target text with their culture-specific world-knowledge, their expectations and their communicative needs." (Nord 1997:12)

That is because in skopos theory, to translate is defined as “to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addresses in target circumstances” (Vermeer 1987, cited from Nord 1997: 12) It follows that every translational action is directed at an intended audience. Thus, when a translator decides which translation strategy to be chosen, the target reader is one of the main factors which should be taken into consideration. Detailed information about the target-text addressee like their socio-cultural background, expectations, needs or world knowledge is of crucial importance for the translator. (Nord 1997: 22)

Skopos theory has shifted the focus from the source-text reproduction to the target-text production, which has brought innovation to translation theory. But at the same time, it has also been mainly criticized for its loose definition of translation: as long as its purpose is achieved, a translation is legitimate regardless of what strategies to be chosen, that is, the end justifies the means. Therefore, studying domestication and foreignization from the angle of skopos theory may provide us with some insightful angles mentioned above but because of its inherent defects, it by no means can offer a final answer to the controversy between the two.

### **3.3 Polysystem theory**

The term “polysystem” was coined by Israeli scholar Itamar Even-Zohar in the early 1970s to refer to the entire network of correlated systems, literary and extraliterary, within a society. He borrowed a lot from the ideas and concepts of the later Russian formalists of the 1920s, especially those of Jurij Tynjanov about the hierarchical literary system. In 1990, the so-called “polysystem hypothesis” began to develop into an approach called “polysystem theory”, which tries to explain the function of all kinds of writing within a given culture ---- from the central canonical texts like poetry to the most marginal non-canonical texts like children’s literature and popular literature ---- and analyze the intrasystemic relations between them. In polysystem theory, all the interconnected literary elements will change and mutate as they interact with each other and that is also what Even-Zohar claims “‘polystystem’ was meant to foreground ‘the conception of a system as dynamic and heterogeneous’” (Even-Zohar 1990, cited from Hermans 1999: 106). For example, in the literary polysystem of a given nation, the continuous tension between various literary models, genres and traditions will result in the evolution of the whole polysystem: the most

accepted, conservative and canonized forms will always try to maintain their prominent and influential position, whereas the other newly emerging, innovative and non-canonized genres will attempt to seize their central position. In such a dynamic literary polysystem, translated literature, which has always occupied a peripheral position, began to be incorporated and studied.

It is necessary to include translated literature in the polysystem. This is rarely done, but no observer of the history of any literature can avoid recognizing as an important fact the impact of translations and their role in the synchrony and diachrony of a certain literature. (Even-Zohar, 1978, cited from Gentzler 2001: 116)

Gentzler (1993) holds that although Even-Zohar took translated literature only as one aspect of his investigation, his study in this respect is “more than marginal, for his data showed that translated literature functions differently depending upon the age, strength, and stability of the particular literary ‘polysystem’” (Gentzler 2001:114). Through the analysis of the relationship between translated works and the literary polysystem, Even Zohar has found that translations were constantly categorized as secondary and marginal systems, but his study also shows the relationship between the translated works and the target literary polysystem can not be categorized as simply either primary or secondary, but as variable. It follows that translated literature, which usually occupies a peripheral position, can sometimes assume a more influential and primary role, depending on the specific circumstances within the literary system. Even-Zohar summarized three social circumstances where translation assumes a primary position: “when a literature is ‘young’, or in the process of being established; when a literature is ‘peripheral’ or ‘weak’ or both; and when a literature is experiencing a ‘crisis’ or turning point.” (Gentzler 2001: 116) In the first case, since the young literature cannot create all forms and genres, translation serves as the most important source for as many different kinds of writing as possible. The same holds true in the second situation, when a weak literature is unable to produce innovations and tends to depend on translation to introduce new ideas and new forms of writing for “creative” writers in the native language to imitate. In the third case, established literary models no longer stimulate the new generation of writers and both established and pioneer writers produce translations, through which new elements are imported into a literary system that would otherwise fail to appear. In these ways, translation has occupied a primary status in the target literary polysystem. The social conditions beyond the above-mentioned three, according to Even-Zohar, govern the situations

where translation is of secondary importance to the polysystem. In these situations, the literary polysystem possesses well-developed literary traditions and various kinds of writing and can produce innovations in ideas and forms independent of translation, relegating translations to a marginal position.

“Even-Zohar suggests that the position occupied by translated literature in the polysystem conditions the translation strategy.” (Munday 2001: 110) When translated literature assumes a primary position, its function is to introduce new ideas and forms into the receiving culture so translators tend to produce a target text that is “a close match in terms of adequacy” (ibid), reproducing the terms, ways of expression and textual relations of the source text, that is, to adopt the foreignizing translation. When translation occupies a secondary or marginal position within the target polysystem, translators tend to use ready-made models or existing forms that function as equivalents in the target text, that is, to employ domestication, so as to conform to the preestablished norms of the target culture by sacrificing innovative forms and reinforce the current prevailing aesthetics instead of importing new ideas and techniques.

Polysystem theory analyzes translation in its social, cultural and historical context, thus providing us with a descriptive and historical perspective about the selection of translation strategies. Gentzler praises polysystem theory as an approach which “moves away from the isolated study of individual texts towards the study of translation within the cultural and literary systems in which it functions” (Munday 2001: 111). Applying polysystem theory to translation has led to many fruitful studies. For example, Chinese translator Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2000), by applying polysystem theory, has found that the cultural status of translated literature in the target literary polysystem may result in the dominance of a certain translation strategy in a certain historical period. However, polysystem theory is also criticized for its hypothetical nature, “its forbidding level of abstraction” (Dieter Schwanitz, cited from Lefevere 1992: 11) and its “overgeneralization to ‘universal laws’ of translation based on relatively little evidence” (Gentzler, cited from Munday 2001: 111). According to Wang Dongwen’s study, because of the overgeneralizing nature of polysystem, it fails to explain some exceptions like the 1920-30s in China when both strategies have been present side by side. Therefore, he claims that polysystem theory has drawn our attention to the role played by the factor of the cultural status of translated literature in the translator’s selection of translation strategy but at the same time, the translator’s

cultural attitudes is another factor which can not be ignored. (王东风 2000)

### **3.4 Ideological approach to translation**

The subject of ideology, or more specifically the ideology of power relations, has been proved to be a very important area of study with the development of cultural studies and claims about ideology proliferate in many fields. The field of translation studies, an increasingly acknowledged cross-cultural practice, is no exception to this general trend. Many translation theorists have tried their hands at this aspect and among them Andre Lefevere has proved to be a very influential figure in adopting an ideological approach to translation.

Lefevere holds that there is a double factor controlling the literary system and translation. The first factor, represented by the "professional" like the critics, reviewers, teachers, translators, etc. controls the literary system from the inside. They see to it that certain works of literature will not too conspicuously go against the dominant concept of what literature should (be allowed to) be --- its poetics--- and of what society should (be allowed to) be --- ideology. And the second control factor, operating mostly outside the literary system, is known as "patronage" or "something like the powers that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature." (Lefevere 1992: 15) Lefevere claims that patronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature while the professional is more concerned about poetics. Therefore, in the final analysis, it is ideology and poetics that really control the literary system and translation. According to Lefevere, "on every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out." (Lefevere 1992: 39)

Two factors basically determining the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. These two factors are, in order of importance, the translator's ideology and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made. The ideology dictates the basic strategy the translator is going to use and therefore also dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the "universe of discourse" expressed in the original and the language the original itself is expressed in. (Lefevere 1992: 41)

In other words, when dealing with the "universe of discourse" expressed in the original, that is the foreign thoughts and ideas like the "objects, concepts, customs

belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original” (ibid.) and the original language like ways of expression or grammatical structures and so on, the translator’s ideology plays an important role in the translator’s selection of translation strategy. Here the translator’s ideology is whether he/she willingly embraces the dominant ideology, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage. The ideology is mainly determined by the patronage and it constrains and guides the work of translators mainly through politics, economy and social status, etc. According to Lefevere, the translators can choose to translate or rewrite the source text until they are deemed acceptable to the dominant ideology of a certain time and place or they may choose to translate the works of literature in such a manner that they do not fit in with the dominant ideology. Lefevere studies the link between ideology on the one hand and translation strategies on the other. He borrows what John Hookham Frere terms two mutually incompatible strategies available to translators: faithful translation and spirited translation. With the benefit of hindsight, he has linked each type of translation to a certain ideology. Through careful observation, we found that the faithful translation and spirited translation mentioned by Lefevere are more or less the equivalents of foreignization and domestication we are concerned about here. Therefore, his studies in this respect have provided a very special angle about the study of domestication and foreignization: the choice of the two strategies or the priority of either one will be, to a certain extent, influenced by the dominant ideology of the target culture.

Besides, Lefevere states that “a poetics, any poetics, is a historical variable: it is not absolute. In a literary system the poetics dominant today is quite different from the poetics dominant at the inception of the system” (Lefevere 1992: 14). As poetics is historically variable, so is the ideology, which influences the poetics from outside of the literary system. Therefore, we can safely say that a foreignized or a domesticated translation, which is acceptable to the dominant ideology of one time, does not necessarily fit in with that of another time.

Approaching translation from the ideological angle has recently become a hot topic in translation circle. Sun Zhili (孙致礼 2002, 2003), Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2003), Wang Yougui (王友贵 2003), Jiang Xiaohua (蒋晓华 2003) and Li Xia (李霞 2003), etc., have offered many insightful ideas and opinions in this respect. The ideological approach to translation is based on the polysystem theory at the beginning and later distances itself from it, so they share something in common: they hold that



translation does not take place in a vacuum and it should be studied under its social, cultural and ideological context. However, like polysystem theory, it tends to study translation from a more macro level and thus ignores some specific factors. For example, Theo Hermans criticized that “most of Lefevere’s case studies highlight the power of patronage exercised through ideological constraints... leave underexposed the fact that these constraints must operate within and through specific social and institutional structures” (Hermans 1999: 129) and he claims that “the one-sidedness may stem from Lefevere’s tendency to flit from one case study to another without ever digging very deep, but perhaps also from an inconsistency in his own theory.”(ibid) Besides, Lefevere absolutizes the impact of ideology on translation from the very beginning. He is convinced that the influence of ideology on translation can be felt everywhere so that translators, at every stage of translation, is under the total constraints of ideology. Lefevere’s absolutization of the impact of ideology has denied the translator’s subjectivity and to a larger extent denied the creativity of translators, the translating profession and translated literature (蒋骁华 2003). This will inevitably lead to one-sidedness of this ideological approach, which is what we should watch out for when studying translation or the dispute of domestication and foreignization from this angle.

### **3.5 Post-colonial translation theories**

Post-colonial theory, a western theoretical trend of thought, emerged in the wake of the disintegration of European colonial system from the 1940s to 1960s. As a cultural and political theory as well as a method of criticism, it mainly studies the power relations between the cultures of the colonizer and that of the colonized and the new presentations of many problems such as racism, cultural imperialism, national cultures and cultural identities in the post-colonial context. So to speak, the main concern of post-colonial theory is the status of different cultures and the power struggle between different cultures in the post-colonial context. As the post-colonial theory permeated through the humanities and social science, many scholars in Britain and America began to break down the manacles of linguistics-based translation theories and tried to study translation from a post-colonial perspective. The post-colonial translation studies began in the late 1980s. “The central intersection of translation studies and postcolonial theory is that of power relations.” (Munday 2001:

134) Post-colonial translation studies have probed into the translation practice embedded in their different historical periods and took an interest in the power conflicts between different cultures hidden behind the translation distortion and substitution. They drew the conclusion that there have always been power imbalances between different cultures and there has never been an equal communication between different cultures. Thus, post-colonial translation studies further refuted the utopian theoretical assumptions about linguistic and cultural equality held in the traditional translation theories and inevitably denied the ideal of semantic or linguistic equivalence. The implications of studying translation from a post-colonial perspective are that post-colonial translation studies think of translation as a product of cultural colonization, as a tool used by the imperialist power politics and cultural imperialism to expand their colonial rules over other countries and as a product of an unequal communication between the strong culture and weak culture. Such a perspective tries to reset translation practice in their real cultural and historical context, which is what traditional translation has ignored in their static comparison analysis of the two texts.

(王东风 2003a) A post-colonial perspective foregrounds the asymmetrical relationships between cultures involved in translation, which can be seen from aspects like disproportionate translation fluxes between the strong and weak cultures, the prevailing stereotypes in choosing the source texts from the weak cultures and the selection of translation strategies and so on. (梁志芳&刘军平 2004) Our main concern here is to study the selection of translation strategies and the different impact of choosing different strategies on the target culture from the post-colonial perspective.

In post-colonial translation theories, the selection of translation strategies is thought to be related to the colonizing and decolonizing process in significant ways.

(王东风 2003a) In the post-colonial translation theory, domesticating translation is closely related to imperial conquest and colonization. According to Venuti's study, when translating the foreign works into English, especially those of weak cultures, the Anglo-American translators, by applying the domesticating strategy to both the selection of the source texts and the translating process, reduce and elide the linguistic and cultural differences, reconstitute the foreign text "in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the target language" and "bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar" (Venuti 1995: 18) . According to Venuti, such domesticating translations have violent effects which can

be felt in the English-speaking countries as well as abroad. He states that on the one hand such translations contribute to “the construction of national identities for foreign cultures”, and hence they “potentially figure in ethnic discrimination, geopolitical confrontations, colonialism, terrorism, war” (Venuti 1995: 19) and on the other hand they “enlist the foreign text in the maintenance or revision of literary canons in the target language.”(ibid) Therefore, domestication, as a translation strategy, serves to further confirm and consolidate the canon and value of the strong cultures and the hierarchies of dominance and marginality between the strong cultures and the weak cultures, thus facilitating the colonizing process. With the collapse of the worldwide colonial system, many post-colonial theorists maintain that, in order to reconstitute their national identities and resist the intrusion of the hegemonic cultures, it is strategic for the weak cultures to employ foreignization when translating into the dominating cultures like Anglo-American cultures (王东风 2003a) . Thus, under the advocacy of Lawrence Venuti and the support of the post-colonial translation theorists, foreignization has come to be a very popular translation strategy in the decolonizing process of the colonized countries or in the translation from weak cultures to strong cultures.

Therefore, in post-colonial translation theories, domestication and foreignization have been endowed with a cultural and social function. However, the decolonization of the colonized cultures is not as simple a matter as can be solved by adopting a certain translation strategy instead of another. Although the respective roles played by domestication and foreignization in the process of colonization and decolonization remain yet to be further explored, the post-colonial translation theories have undoubtedly complemented the social, cultural and political perspective provided by polysystem theory and ideology theory. Chinese translators like Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2002, 2003a), Liang Zhifang & Liu Junping (梁志芳&刘军平 2004), Ge Xiaoqin (葛校琴 2002) and so on have some insightful discussions in this respect.

### **3.6 Summary**

In the past few years, the application of different perspectives elaborated in this chapter to the study of domestication and foreignization is very frequently found in the translation journals. These theories, distancing themselves from the linguistically

oriented translation approach based on the equivalence concept, attach greater importance to embedding translation in the cultural and historical context and pay increasing attention to the functions and roles of translation strategies in the target culture. Besides, as we have studied, the perspectives provided by polysystem theory, the ideology approach and post-colonial translation studies are greatly related to each other and here only for the convenience of discussion, they have been studied separately. Since, as revealed by some researches made by some domestic translators, it is inevitably one-sided to study the two strategies only from one perspective, this present thesis attempts to take a dialectic stand and combine the different perspectives in order to give an overall picture of the study of domestication and foreignization. All these perspectives together have greatly broadened the study of domestication and foreignization.

## Chapter Four

### Factors constraining the choice of domestication and foreignization

As is showed in the historical study of domestication and foreignization, opinions of different translation theorists diverge most in the selection of the two strategies in the translating process. Departing from different perspectives, they try to find what factors may have played a role in the translator's choice of strategies. For example, Guo Jianzhong (郭建中 1998), drawing on skopos theory, studied domestication and foreignization from the purpose of translation, text type, the intention of the author and the readership and concluded that both domestication and foreignization may be justified in their own right and they are two compatible strategies. Wang Dongfeng (王东风 2000) claimed that polysystem theory has drawn our attention to the role played by the factor of the cultural status of translated literature in the translator's selection of translation strategy but at the same time, the translator's cultural attitude is another factor which can not be ignored. Studies like these are undoubtedly fruitful but also one-sided because of the limitations of each perspective. Here in this chapter, enlightened by studies of some domestic translation theorists, we will attempt to combine different perspectives elaborated in chapter three and tentatively sum up some factors constraining the selection of domestication and foreignization as follows:

Purpose of translation;

Text type;

Reader's reception;

Translator's cultural attitude

Cultural status of translated culture in the target culture;

Ideology

#### 4.1 Purpose of translation

According to Skopos theory, translation is an intentional interaction and a translational action is determined by its purpose, that is, "the end justifies the means". In other words, a particular translation task may require either the domesticating strategy or the foreignizing strategy, depending on the purpose the translation is intended to attain. Take the Bible translation in the late twentieth century as an

example. In the late twentieth century, many English versions of the Bible make their appearance in the United States and the Chinese renderings of the Bible emerged in a great number as well. Compared with the King James Version (KJV), the authorized English version of the Bible published in 1611, these new versions adopt a more domesticating translation strategy. Here we will compare some examples from Today's English Version (1976) and Today's Chinese Version (1979).

1) KJV: And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places... (Amos 4: 6)

TEV: I was the one who brought famine to all your cities...

TCV: 是的，是我把饥荒降到你们的城里，使你们绝粮的。

2) KJV: Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. (Romans 12: 20)

TEV: Instead, as the scripture says: "if your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him a drink; for by doing this, you will make him burn with shame."

TCV: 如果你的仇敌饿了，就给他吃；渴了，就给他喝；你这样做会使他羞愧交加。

(Cited from 马会娟 2003: 128-137)

Compared with the KJV, which acknowledgedly sticks to the original language and culture, the TEV and TCV try to translate fluently and naturally to avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding. In the first example, KJV's literal rendering of "cleanness of teeth" may cause misunderstanding among the English readers because they may understand it wrongly as "to keep the teeth white and clean" instead of understanding it correctly as "lack of food or famine". So both TEV and TCV remove possible ambiguity caused by the original idiom and only render the sense. The same holds true of the second example. "Heap coals of fire on his head" is a Semitic idiom which means "to make a person ashamed of his behavior with one's kindness and warmth". The TEV and TCV both convey the sense of the original respectively as "make him burn with shame" and "使他羞愧交加", preventing the target reader from misinterpreting it as "a way of torturing people to death". (Nida and Taber 1969: 2) Thus the awkwardness and unnaturalness in the foreignized versions is erased in the new versions. Examples like this can be found everywhere in the translation of the Bible. For example, J. B. Phillip translated the Greek Original "greet one another with a holy kiss" in Roman 16:16 of the New Testament as "give one another a hearty

handshake all around” (Nida 1964: 160) to avoid the conflict caused by different customs. The domesticating strategy adopted in the Bible translation is largely justified by the missionary goal the Bible translation and translators intend to achieve: to convey the message of God to the ordinary people all over the world and convert them to Christianity. In order to attain such a goal, the Bible translators lay emphasis on the immediate access to meaning by “dispelling the mystery, solving the ambiguities, and reducing the complexities for simple consumption.” (Gentzler 1993: 57)

The purpose of translation can partially explain the employment of the foreignizing and domesticating strategies respectively by Yang Xianyi and David Hawkes when translating *Hong Lou Meng* into English. Yang’s purpose of translating Chinese classics into English is to “be faithful to the core of Chinese culture and the spirit of Chinese civilization” and “introduce them to the foreign readers as they are” (任生明 1993) while Hawkes’s purpose of translating *Hong Lou Meng* is to “convey to the reader even a fraction of the pleasure this Chinese novel has given me (Hawkes).” (林以亮 1978: 8) Therefore, Yang’s version tries to stick closely to the source book, its culture and even ways of expression while Hawkes’s version adopts domestication by inserting lots of explanations or making lots of adaptation. For example:

3) 凤翥龙翔。

Yang’s version: ... like a phoenix or dragon in flight.

Hawkes’s version: Like stately dance of simurgh with his mate. (Cited from 冯庆华 2002: 156)

In this example, the cultural images like “feng” (凤) and “long” (龙) hold connotations in the western cultures totally different from or even opposite to those in Chinese culture. They are symbols of auspiciousness in Chinese while in the western cultures, phoenix means immortality and dragon is the symbol of evil. Therefore, Yang’s literal conveyance of the two into English may expect the western readers to have access to the true Chinese culture while Hawkes, caring more about transferring the sense to the target readers, changes the confusion-causing cultural images of phoenix and dragon into an image of two simurghs dancing in pair and at the same time inserts “stately” to make meaning more clear and specific. Here is another example:

4) 又有贾政至帘外问安，贾妃垂帘行参等事。

Yang's version: Chia Cheng from outside the door-curtain asked after the health of his daughter, and she in turn paid her respects.

Hawkes's version: Then there was her interview with Jia Zheng, which had to take place with her father standing outside the door-curtain of the room in which she was sitting. Now that she was the Emperor's woman, this was the nearest to her he could ever hope to get. (Cited from 冯庆华 2002: 137)

This example concerns the hierarchy in the feudal China, where the father, an official, can only exchange some courtesy greetings with his daughter, now the emperor's concubine, with a curtain between them instead of just sitting together and conversing in a casual way. Yang transfers this sentence as well as this cultural element into English literally without any additional explanation. Therefore, western readers may get confused first about what is going on and then, after referring to other materials about Chinese feudal culture, will get a deeper understanding of this novel and Chinese culture. In contrast, Hawkes's version does not make many demands on readers by clearing the possible confusions and what readers are left to do is experience the pleasure of reading an exotic story. Which strategy is better to translate *Hong Lou Meng* is not a simple question to answer because both the two translators have fulfilled their goals.

#### 4.2 Text type

According to the text typology theory of Reiss and Newmark, the priority of either strategy in a specific translation may largely depend on the text types. Therefore, generally speaking, informative texts and evocative texts usually are domesticated in order to convey clearly the facts and information or direct and persuade the readers while expressive texts need to be translated closely and the personal character of the author and the cultural elements should be kept in order to transmit the aesthetic and artistic form of the source text. For example:

1) “烟水苍茫月色迷，渔舟晚泊栈桥西。乘凉每至黄昏后，人依栏杆水拍堤。”这是古人赞美青岛海滨的诗句。青岛是一座风景秀丽的海滨城市，夏无酷暑，冬无严寒。西起胶州湾入海处的团岛，东至崂山风景区的下清宫，绵延 80 多华里的海滨组成了一幅绚丽多彩的长轴画卷。

Qingdao is a beautiful coastal city. It is not hot in summer and not cold in winter. The 40-km-long scenic line begins from Tuan Island at the west end to Xia-qing Gong



of Mount Lao at the east end.

This example is an excerpt from a tourist material which usually informs the travelers of a certain scenic spot and tries to attract the attention of potential tourists as well. So it is typical of the informative text type although it may also serve a vocative function. The poems at the beginning and the metaphorical expressions like “绚丽多彩的长轴画卷” may evoke very poetic feelings in the Chinese readers. However, they may not provoke the same feeling among the English readers when translated closely into English because they do not have the same cultural background knowledge about the Chinese poems and Chinese painting. So the rendering omits these culturally loaded words and only conveys the sense to the target reader so that they can clearly get the information about Qingdao.

According to the text typology, literary works belong to the expressive type and need to be foreignized in order to retain the cultural elements and the aesthetic form of the original. For example:

2) 这件事,除了他三儿子和几个经手的人以外,谁也不知道。他也不对任何人提起。 哑巴吃黄连,有苦说不出。(周立波,《上海的早晨》)

No one knew of these transactions apart from his youngest son and the few people who had handled them, nor was he going to mention the matter to everyone else. He was like the dumb man eating the bitter herb: he had to suffer the bitterness of it in silence. (Cited from 冯庆华 2001: 142)

3) 群山肃立,江河挥泪,辽阔的祖国大地沉浸在巨大的悲痛之中。(《敬爱的周恩来总理永垂不朽》电影解说词)

The mountains are standing in solemn silence; the rivers are shedding bitter tears; our vast motherland is soaked in enormous grief.

(Cited from 冯庆华 2001: 152)

In the second example, the Chinese folk wisecrack (歇后语) “哑巴吃黄连,有苦说不出” more vividly express the hero's pain which can not be made public and in the third example personification, a figure of speech, fully reveals the grief of the whole country over Premier Zhou Enlai's death. Their translations retain these figurative uses in the target texts so that foreign readers can not only appreciate the author's artistic language but also get familiar with the Chinese culture.

But the co-existence of different functions within the same source text and the use of the same source text for a variety of purposes have proved the fuzzy nature of the correspondence between the text types and their functions proposed by Reiss and

Newmark. (Munday 2001: 76) So Newmark holds that there is not a single method of translating a text and Skopos theory also thinks that when deciding on the translation strategy, the translator should refer to the function or set of functions the target text is to achieve in the target culture. For example, a translator may render an advertisement closely instead of domesticating it because the translator may only want to show the readers what it really is in the original rather than evoking the act of purchase in the readers. So it is not surprising that in the field of literary translation, it is quite common that a literary work has two or more translation versions with different translating strategies, which is well illustrated by the English translation of *Hong Lou Meng*, the Chinese rendering of *Gone with the Wind* and Shakespeare's works and so on. Therefore, we can safely conclude that although the text type does play an important role in translator's deciding on a strategy, the translation method employed finally depends on far more than just text type.

#### 4.3 Reader's reception

"The intended target reader is the addressee of the translation and is thus a decisive factor in the production of the target text" (Nord 1997: 22). In Chinese translation field, many translation theorists attach great importance to target readers. Mao Dun divides readers into average readers and readers seeking literary aesthetics. Lu Xun advocates dividing readers roughly into educated readers and those with limited literacy (罗新璋 1984: 275). Qin Hongwu (秦洪武 1999) thinks we should divide readers into professional and average readers. In the 1960s, influenced by reception aesthetics represented by German literary historians and theorists Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, the focus of emphasis in the translation field has began to shift to the target reader. A case in point is Eugene Nida's dynamic equivalence that combines the principle of equivalence effect and reception aesthetics and tries to achieve the equivalence of response between the source and the target reader.

All in all, the target reader is a factor that translators cannot afford to ignore in the translating process. Both domestication and foreignization take target readers, their cultural backgrounds, their expectation and the time they are in and so on, into consideration but with different focuses of emphasis. For example, when translating *Gone with the Wind*, Fu Donghua claims that this novel, as a light fiction, should not be rendered literally as if it were a classic because it may bore readers very much (傅

东华 1979: 《译序》). So he adapts the names of the characters and places to Chinese style “to save the readers’ energy” (ibid). He translated “Red Butler” as “白瑞德”, “Scarlett O’ Hara” as “郝思佳”, “Melanie Hamilton” as “韩媚兰”, “Jeems”, a black servant’s name, as “阿金”, “Atlanta” as “饿狼陀” and so on. He domesticates the conversations and substitutes the Chinese humorous, acid-tongued and indecent fixed phrases for the original ones so as to make Chinese readers feel as if they heard them with their own ears. For example, he adopts the traditional Chinese expressions like “竖起牌楼来”, “小白脸”, “大地主”, “营丁” and the four-character phrases like “一箭双雕”, “顺手牵羊” and so on. Besides, Fu abridges whole paragraphs of verbose description or psychological analysis that he considers boring as well as irrelevant to the development of the plots. Fu’s domesticating strategy is made more apparent when compared with another Chinese version of this novel by Dai Kan, et al, which tries to adhere to the original more closely. For example:

1) Scarlett O’Hara was not beautiful, but men seldom realized it when caught by her charm as the Tarleton twin were. (*Gone with the wind*: 1)

Fu’s version: 那郝思嘉小姐长得并不美, 可是极富于魅力, 男人见了她, 往往要着迷, 就像汤家那一对双胞胎兄弟似的。(傅东华 1979: 1)

Dai’s version: 思嘉·奥哈拉长得并不漂亮, 但是男人们一旦像塔尔顿家那对孪生兄弟为她的魅力所迷住时, 但看不到这一点了。(戴侃, et al 1990: 1)

2) Although they considered themselves Scarlett’s favored suitors, they had never before gained tokens of this favor so easily. (*Gone with the wind*: 12)

Fu’s version: 他们在郝思嘉的追求人当中, 虽然自问还算受欢迎, 可是从来没有象今天这样百依百顺过。(傅东华 1979: 11)

Dai’s version: 尽管他们把自己看作思嘉所嘉许的追求者, 可是从前他们还从来没有这么轻易得到这一嘉许的表征。(戴侃, et al 1990: 12)

In the above examples, Fu not only employs the Chinese expressions “汤家”, “百依百顺” and so on but also breaks a long sentence into short sentences so that his version is as fluent as a novel originally written in Chinese. All these characteristics make Fu’s version a representative of domesticating translations while Dai Kan, et al, take the foreignizing strategy because they assume that “a masterpiece like this suits both the refined and popular tastes and should not be freely abridged in plots or supplemented and added in language” (戴侃, et al 1990: 《序言》) that is, their translation takes a wider readership into account and adheres more closely to the original. In addition, Dai Kan, et al, by taking into account the readers who are

already familiar with Fu's version, retains Fu's renderings of the book title and four main characters.

When translating the title of *Hong Lou Meng* into English, Hawkes adopts its another Chinese title and translates it as *The Story of the Stone*, because the term "hong", which means "red" and recurs again and again in the novel as a symbol sometimes of spring, sometimes of youth, sometimes of good fortune or prosperity, has no corresponding connotations in English apart from the rosy cheeks and vermeil lip of youth (林以亮 1978: 45). In order to avoid misunderstanding among western readers and maintain consistency, he chooses to erase "red" and different shades of "red" or use other colors as substitutes in the whole translation. For example, he translates "悼红轩" as "Nostalgia Studio", "怡红院" as "The House of Green Delights", "赤霞宫" as "Sunset Glow Palace" and so on.

On the other hand, the factor of reader's reception can also explain the translator's switch in the translation strategy in a particular text. For example, on the whole, in translating *Hong Lou Men*, Yang Xianyi sticks to the foreignizing strategy and tries to convey Chinese cultural elements and Chinese ways of expressions into English, but sometimes he will also switch to the domesticating strategy when he thinks necessary like in the following examples.

3) 将道人肩上褡裢抢了过来背着, ... (*Hong Lou Meng*: 19)

Yang's version: He transferred the sack from the Taoist's shoulder to his own, ... (Yang: 17)

Hawkes's version: But Shi-yin merely snatched the satchel that hung from the other's shoulder and slung it from his own ... (Hawkes: 65)

4) 情人眼里出西施。 (*Hong Lou Meng*: 145)

Yang's version: (a case of) "Beauty is in the eye of the beholder." (Yang: Vol.2: 681)

Hawkes's version: (a case of) "Beauty is in the eye of the beholder." (Hawkes: 152) (Cited from Guo Jianzhong 1998)

in 3), "褡裢", a bag-like daily necessity used in ancient China, is even hard for modern Chinese readers to understand, let alone foreign readers, so Yang simply adopts the common term "sack" instead of retaining it. In 4), "西施" is a culturally loaded word, if translated literally without explanation, foreign readers will find it confusing but if translated with a long explanation, the beauty of the proverb will be damaged. Taking the target readers into consideration, Yang just drops the cultural

word and substitutes an English proverb for it. Here we find Yang's version and Hawkes's version share a lot in common.

Besides, different translators translate one single text in two drastically different ways because they have different potential readers in mind and correspondingly they orient their versions towards them. For instance:

5) Hamlet. Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue; but if you mouth it as many of your players do, I had as lief the town-crier spoke my lines.

Zhu Shenhao's version: 哈姆雷特: 请你念这段剧词的时候,要照我刚才读给你听的那样子,一个字一个字打舌头上很轻快地吐出来;要是你也像多数的伶人们一样,只会拉开喉咙嘶叫,那么我宁愿叫那宣布告示的公差念我这几行词句。

Bian Zhilin's version: 哈姆雷特: 念这段台词,我请你们,要念得像我念给你们听的那样,轻溜溜的,从舌尖上吐出来。要是你们把它从喉咙里吼出来,像许多演戏的惯常做的那样呢,我倒宁愿叫宣布告示的公差来念我的词句了。

(Cited from 冯庆华 2001: 202-203)

Zhu's translation is oriented to a wider readership, who read his translation for appreciation of Shakespeare's works instead of doing some research while Bian's version is largely directed to a particular group of readers who focus more on the formal beauty of the original work for research.

As we know, readers' tastes are subject to change with the development of the society, which can also account for the different strategies adopted for the same original in different times. For example:

6) She was a striking looking woman, a little short and thick for symmetry, but with a beautiful olive complexion, large dark Italian eyes, and a wealth of deep black hair. (Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Naval Treaty*)

Cheng Xiaoqing's version: 安娜貌颇丽,肤色雪白,柔腻如凝脂,双目点漆,似意大利产。斜波流媚,轻盈动人,而鬓发压额,厥色深墨,状尤美观。形体略短削,稍显美中不足。

Jiang Xiaohua's version: 她是一个异常引人注目的女子,身材略嫌矮胖,显得有些不对称,但她有美丽的橄榄色面容,一双乌黑的意大利人的眼睛,一头乌云般的黑发。

(Cited from 蒋晓华 2003)

When translating the novel in 1916, Cheng Xiaoqing transformed the Southern European beautiful woman with a strong character into a Chinese traditional beauty with typical characteristics like cream-like white skin, a black bang covering the

forehead and so on which largely fit in with the taste of Chinese readers in late Qing Dynasty. Eighty years later, Chinese readers' taste has changed a lot so Li Jiayun adopted foreignization to retain the original differences, which has been widely accepted by modern Chinese readers.

From the above analysis, we find that the factor of the potential reader has some bearing on the purpose of and translation and the function the target text will perform and thus influences the choice of translation strategy in many aspects.

#### **4.4 Translator's cultural attitude**

In a certain cultural context, translator's subjective cultural attitudes towards the target culture and the source culture play an important role in their selection of translation strategy and translators with different cultural attitudes tend to produce translations with different stylistic values (王东风 2000). When the translator views the source culture as inferior to the target culture, he tends to adapt the original ways of expression or cultural elements to the target culture by employing domestication. Otherwise the situation tends to be reverse. For example, Edward Fitzgerald, translator of the *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam, wrote to his friend once in 1857: "It is an amusement for me to take what Liberties I like with these Persians, who (as I think) are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them." (Lefevere 1992: 80) Reading between the lines, we can sense his strong negative attitude towards Persians, their literature and culture. He depreciated the Persian poets as "not poets enough" to prevent him from taking liberties with their works. His maintenance that English was a superior language while Persian was an inferior language made him hold an imperialistic notion of translation and drastically domesticate the Persian works. Another case in point is Shleiermacher. In his 1813 lecture, he claims that "our language (German), which we exercise less than other nations do theirs, ... can thrive in all its freshness and completely develop its own power only by means of the most many-sided contacts with what is foreign" (Lefevere 1992: 164-165). Shleiermacher realized his German culture at that time was inferior and viewed translation as an important practice to "enable German culture to realize its historical destiny of global domination" (Venuti 1995: 99). Therefore, he strongly advocated foreignizing strategy to introduce new ideas and styles. Besides, when Venuti proposed foreignization against domestication

and other post-colonial translators, following him, advocate foreignization in retranslating their literatures which were drastically distorted and domesticated by the colonizer or imperial cultures, they represent another kind of cultural attitude. They are fully conscious of the unequal relationship between their culture and the dominant or imperial culture and decide to fight against it.

Generally speaking, the cultural and historical backgrounds in which a translator lives will largely influence or decide his cultural attitude towards the relationship between the two cultures concerned. But it does not follow that in a certain historical period, all translators will share the same cultural attitudes. Sometimes, their attitudes diverge so drastically that they broke into two rival schools, which results in the co-existence of domestication and foreignization in a particular historical period. For example, in the 1920s-30s of China, leftist progressive forces, represented by Lu Xun, realized that the feudal culture could no longer meet the needs of the time and new ideas as well as new ways of expression were needed to be introduced from other cultures not only to create a new culture but also to contribute to the development and maturity of the vernacular Chinese. Thus they fervently advocated the foreignizing strategy when translating from other cultures. Whereas, rightist conservative forces, represented by Liang Shiqiu, were sentimentally attached to the traditional feudal culture and endeavored to maintain the feudal values and aesthetics by advocating domestication in translation. Translators' different cultural attitudes, among other factors, largely account for the co-existence of two strategies in this period. After the reform and opening up of China, Chinese culture and western cultures are once again undergoing another round of collision. Now in China, there still exist two conflicting cultural attitudes among translators, one is the western culture-oriented school (西学派) who has been largely exposed to the western latest science and technology and humanities theories and holds that we should learn from the western cultures and the other is the Chinese culture-oriented school (国学派) who insists that Chinese culture should be the best and self-sufficient so we need not learn from others. The conflicting cultural attitudes, to a large extent, account for the two translation strategy orientations in the present time. For example:

When their promised visit to the park and consequent introduction to these young ladies took place, they found in the appearance of the eldest, who was nearly thirty, with a very plain and not a sensible face, nothing to admire; but in the other, who was not more than two or three and twenty, they acknowledged considerable beauty; her

features were pretty, and she had a sharp quick eye and a smartness of air, which though it did not give actual elegance or grace, gave distinction to her person. (Jane Austin, 1983: 103)

Wu Lili's version: 当达什伍德小姐们履行诺言访问并被介绍给两位年轻女士时,她们从那位年长的女士的外表上没发现什么可称赞的东西。她将近三十岁了,长着一张非常平板、不机灵的面孔。但是达什伍德小姐们承认另一位女士长得相当美。她不过二十二、三岁,长着一张漂亮的小脸蛋、一双锐利、敏捷的眼睛。她的外观活泼伶俐;这一点虽然没说明她却是优雅,但说明她长得确实出众。(吴力励 《理智与情感》: 120)

Sun Zhili's version: 他们按照事先的许诺来到巴顿庄园,并被介绍给两位小姐。她们发现,那姐姐年近三十,脸蛋长得很普通,看上去就不明睿,一点也不值得称美。可是那位妹妹,她们都觉得相当俏丽。她不过二十二、三岁,面貌清秀,目光敏锐,神态机灵,纵使不觉得真正高雅优美,也够得上人品出众。(孙致礼译《理智与情感》: 135) (Cited from 王东风: 2000)

The first one obviously adheres closely to the original ways of expression and adopts the foreignizing strategy while the second one adapts the original ways of expression to the target ones, which makes it a rather fluent and natural version.

#### **4.5 Cultural status of translated literature in the target culture**

“Since translation is a means of cultural interaction, the cultural position of a nation and/or of translated literature in a given literary polysystem in relation to the source culture may exert strong influence on the translator's selection of strategy.”(王东风 2000) In polysystem theory, “Even-Zohar suggests that the position occupied by translated literature in the polysystem conditions the translation strategy.” (Munday 2001: 110) As we have discussed in chapter three, to put it simply, when translated literature assumes a primary status, translators tend to adopt foreignizing strategy while when it is secondary or marginal, translators tend to employ domesticating strategy. Post-colonial translation theory also suggests that the cultural status of translated literature in the target culture is largely affected by the inequality between the source culture and the target culture that in turn is influenced by the economic and political imbalance.

In the western world, the translation practice in many historical periods can well illustrate these hypotheses of polysystem theory and the post-colonial translation



theory. During the rise of the Roman Empire, compared with the time-honored Greek culture, Roman culture was rather weak and its literature was still “young” so Roman translators just turned to the “older” Greek literatures for ready-made models. They adopted the foreignizing strategy and adhered strictly to the source text with the only purpose of conveying the original content and imitating the original style. Later, however, as Rome conquered Greece militarily, both its culture and literature began to assume a more primary status and they came to hold translation as ‘a form of conquest’ and domestication began to prevail. (Cited from 谭载喜 1991: 22)

According to Venuti’s study, since World War Two, translated literature in Britain and America has occupied a definite marginal status with the number of translations remaining roughly between 2 and 4 percent of the total book production (Venuti 1995: 12-3). During this period, domestication is the prevalent strategy when translating from other languages only to reinforce their cultural, political and economic hegemony in the postwar period. Therefore, the domesticating strategy adopted by David Hawkes in translating *Hong Lou Meng* can be explained, on the one hand, by his purpose and his sensitivity to potential reader’s reception and, on the other hand, by the social and cultural factors prevalent in the American culture.

In China, we will take the third wave of translation activities as an illustration. The Opium War has resulted in the transformation of both Chinese society and Chinese culture. After the Opium War, the door of China was opened up by the foreign forces and the strong western cultures were introduced into China, which disturbed the stability of Chinese culture and the primary status of Chinese culture was greatly challenged. According to polysystem theory, a surge of large-scale translation activities can be predicted because a nation is “at a turning point” or “in a literary vacuum”. But contrary to the hypothesis that translators in such a cultural context tend to adopt the foreignizing strategy, translators at this period of time mostly employed the domesticating strategy, which can be explained by the cultural status of translated literature in China. At that time, Chinese feudal culture represented by Confucianism and complemented by Taoism still firmly occupied the primary status and the western cultures were not strong enough to marginalize it and substitute for it. Therefore, facing the challenge of the western cultures, Chinese translators took an anti-alien attitude by domesticating the original structures and foreign ways of expression and even the foreign ideas. For example, they adopted the “章回体” structure, the third person and “archaizing Chinese used before the Han dynasty” and

so on, all of which are characteristics of Chinese literary forms at that time. A case in point is Yan Fu's rendering of Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*. For example:

1) It may be safely assumed that, two thousand years ago, before Caesar set foot in southern Britain, the whole countryside visible from the windows of the room in which I write, was in what is called "the state of Nature". (Huxley, *Evolution and Ethics*)

赫胥黎独处一室之中。在英伦之南。背山而面野。槛外诸景。历历如在几  
下。乃悬想二千年前。当罗马大将恺彻未到时。此间有何景物。计唯有天造草昧。  
人工未施。(严复 《天演论》, cited from 王东风 2000)

But after the May Fourth Movement, the status of translated literature in Chinese culture began to change. During the May Fourth Movement with its agenda of "importing" a new culture into China, the proposal of "wholesale Westernization of China" called for not only social and political revolution but also the transformation of the whole Chinese culture. According to the polysystem theory, the Chinese literature was experiencing a 'crisis' or "turning point" at which established literary models or old literary forms no longer stimulated the new generation of writers and the translated literature was easier to assume primacy. Enlightened Chinese scholars proposed to translate western works into China with a view to creating a new culture. Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai, as representatives of the "faithfulness" school, declared "rather to be faithful (in thought) than to be smooth (in language)" and upheld the foreignizing translation with the purpose of enriching the Chinese language by introducing new ways of expressions and retaining the foreign flavor at the same time. At this time, many foreign books were translated into Chinese literally. For example,

2) 两人贪婪地吸了没有盐的刁沙弥。一看见乏透了的可怜的毕加的模样，  
美谛克总不得不记起曾使他心醉的坐在幽静的芦荡旁边的那闲静的，爽朗的老人的  
形相来。毕加就好像用了自己的压碎了似的深情，在映发没有休息和救援的这  
寂寞的不安和空洞。(鲁迅译 《毁灭》，1931：82, cited from 王东风 2000)

After the 1930s, China regained its stability and Chinese culture accordingly restored its primary status and marginalized the translated literature. The change of the cultural status of the translated literature has led to the change of translation strategy prevalent in this period of time. The domesticating strategy again took the priority status and has dominated Chinese translation circle until the 1970s.

## 4.6 Ideology

Ideology is the product of a certain society and culture. Ideology came with the emergence of society and culture. Translation, as a cross-language and cross-cultural interaction, inevitably bears the imprint of ideology. A translator, when introducing the concepts and notions embedded in the source texts into the target culture, will necessarily evaluate them and decide whether conveying them without modification or adapting them to the target culture, that is, deciding to adopt either foreignization or domestication(王东风 2003).

Ideology can be understood in its narrow sense as a political term. But in the present thesis as well as in Lefevere's approach, ideology is taken as a term in its broad sense. Lefevere accepts Jameson's concept of ideology --- "that grillwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions"(Jameson, cited from Lefevere 1992: 16) and defines ideology as "a conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time, and through which readers and translators approach texts." (Bassnett and Lefevere 2001: 48) According to *An Unabridged Chinese Dictionary* (《辞海》), ideology is the prevalent beliefs in a country or community, the systematic viewpoints and opinions on the world and society held by a certain class, a certain party and professionals (usually intellectuals) and so on and, in addition, philosophy, politics, arts, aesthetics, religion and ethics and so on are the concrete representations of ideology (蒋骁华 2003). Translation activities involve the ideologies of both the target culture and the original culture, which are either compatible or mutually exclusive. Translation is basically to import the ideology of the foreign culture into the target culture. This import means cultural infiltration, cultural subversion and a test on the target culture. Generally speaking, translators tend to adopt the target culture-oriented strategy, trying to delete, add or alter the original parts which conflict with the target ideology so as to meet the expectation of the patrons or powers and maintain the stability of the whole target ideological system.

"The intervention of ideology, especially the dominant ideology in translation is most typically illustrated by the practice of deletion and alteration." (翻译中的删改, 是意识形态, 特别是主流意识形态干预翻译的最典型的例证) (许钧 2003: 220) Translation has been required to be faithful to the original text and fully convey the original content, but under the direct or indirect interference of ideology, the

phenomena of deletion, abridgement and alteration frequently occur. For example, when translating British writer Haggard's novel *Joah Haste* in late Qing Dynasty, Pan Xizi (潘溪子) deleted the plots like Joah and Henry's first meeting, Henry's falling in love with Joah regardless of his parents' oppositions and Joah's premarital pregnancy and so on because these plots didn't conform to the Chinese feudal ideology at that time. As a consequence, his version was very popular among the readers. Later, in 1904, Lin Shu and Wei Yi (魏易) retranslated the book and retained all the plots deleted by Pan Xizi. Their version, as soon as it was published, was severely criticized by both the readers and critics. Some people clearly pointed out that it was more proper to delete what was put under taboo in the Chinese society. Therefore, the drastically different treatment Lin and Wei's version received can be well justified by its defiance against the dominant ideology at that time (蒋骁华 2003; 李霞 2003). Another example is Yan Fu's translating of Huxley's *The Evolution and the Ethics*. In his book, Huxley has mentioned the name of Hamlet and because it is a household name in the western countries, he made no further explanation. When translating it, Yan Fu added some explanation about Hamlet to facilitate Chinese reader's understanding like "Hamlet, a filial son. In order to revenge his dead father, he killed his stepfather and insulted his mother and then committed suicide." (罕木勒特, 孝子也。乃以父仇之的, 不得不杀其季父, 辱其亲母, 而自刃于胸) (王克非 1997: 122) But observed closely, it has revealed the intervention of ideology in translation: when Hamlet was evaluated as a filial son, he was much domesticated to a Chinese man with traditional Chinese ethics and morals. (李霞 2003)

In the western world, the presence of the western dominant ideology in translation can also be solidly evidenced. In *Lysistrata*, a famous play of the great Ancient Greek playwright Aristophanes, when the heroine asks "peace", an allegorical character played by a naked lady of great beauty, to bring the Spartan peace emissaries to her, she says "En me dido ten cheira, tes sathes age", which is translated literally into English as "if he doesn't give you his hand, take him by the penis". In order to avoid the impact of this "indecent" term on social ethic, many English translators have euphemized the line. For example:

- 1) If he doesn't give you his hand, lead him by the nose. (By W. J. Hickie, 1902)
- 2) If they don't give a hand, a leg will do. (By A. S. Way, 1934)
- 3) If he won't give his hand, then lead him by the prick. (By Sutherland, 1961)

- 4) If hands are refused, conduct them by the handle. (By D. Parker, 1964)
- 5) Nut if they don't give you their hands, take them and tow them politely, by their ... life-lines. (By P. Dickenson 1970)
- 6) Take them by the hand, or by anything else if they seem unwilling. (By D. Fitts, 1974)

(Cited from Lefevere 1992: 41-42; 蒋骁华 2003 )

Lefevere thinks these ways of treatment are “to no small extent indicative of the ideology dominant at a certain time in a certain society” and “the translation projects a certain image of the play in the service of a certain ideology”(Lefevere 1992: 41-42). Lefevere also quoted the translations of Anne Frank's diary in many languages as an example of the intervention of ideology. He found that some translations had omitted the plots about Anne's awakening sexuality or her writings about the problem of the emancipation of women. Besides, other plots or descriptions, which conflicted with the dominant ideology, were transformed, weakened or simply omitted. More cases can be found in the western translations of other weak cultures. When Evan King translated Chinese writer Lao She's novel *Camel Xiangzi* (《骆驼祥子》) into English, he changed the original tragic ending into a happy one. This book was translated in the early 1940s, when on the one hand the second world war was not over and the ethical conflicts became tense, and on the other hand, the rising popular culture in American took the maintenance of social stability as its purpose and tried to hide the bitter reality and all kinds of severe conflicts from the readers. Therefore, Evan King's alteration of the ending of *Camel Xiangzi* enabled the readers to be immersed in a kind of false harmony and perfect happiness and to a large extent catered to the dominant American ideology at that time (李霞 2003).

In addition, the dominant ideology is subject to change with the development of society, history and political situation and so on (许钧 2003: 220). What can be accepted or even held as classical or popular by the target ideology in a certain historical period may be denounced at the other period and vice versa.

#### 4.7 Summary

From what we discussed above, we can conclude that translator's choice of strategies is influenced by a whole range of factors and, in addition, these factors exert their influence at different levels. Purpose of translation, text type, reader's reception

and the translator's cultural attitude operate largely under the control of translators while the other factors like ideology and status of translated literature constrain the translator's practice from a social and cultural level. Different dominant ideologies and different status of translated literature at different historical periods may affect both the practice of each translator and the historical tendency of translation strategy selection at that time. However, despite of the influence of the social and historical factors, a translator can still bring his own subjectivity into full play in respect of selecting translation strategies. By analyzing various factors like purpose of translation, the potential target readers and the function or functions the text is to achieve, a translator will independently decide on what original cultural elements must be retained, how to retain them and what source cultural elements must be omitted or adapted to the target culture. He can choose to conform to the historical tendency or go against it and in a particular text he can also switch between the two strategies or find a balance between the two. In addition, it must be made clear that the factors listed here are far from exhaustive but they are by all means very important ones worth mentioning here. There may be other factors like the cultural distance between the two cultures, the authority of the source writer, translator's attitude toward the source text and his language level and so on, which need to be further explored. Finally, the influence of these different factors on a translator's practice is not as clear-cut as we have classified and exemplified. For example, Hawkes's selection of domesticating strategy in translating *Hong Lou Meng* into English may be explained by his purpose or his consideration for western readers, the dominant ideology or even the status of translated literature and so on. In the present thesis, the clear-cut classification is only for the convenience of discussion. Anyway, we can safely say that every translation is the product of a combination of various factors although one or two or even more factors will play a leading role in the translating process.

## Chapter Five Conclusion

From what we have studied above, we tentatively draw some conclusions about the study of domestication and foreignization from the following aspects:

### 5.1 The relationship between domestication and foreignization

#### 5.1.1 The complementary relationship between domestication and foreignization

In the past history of translation studies, many translation theorists hold a one-sided attitude about domestication and foreignization by viewing the two as incompatible and denouncing one in favor of the other. Among the most famous, Shleiermacher (1813), Venuti (1995, 1998), Lu Xun, Qu Qiubai, Guo Moruo, Liu Xingkai (1987, 1997) and so on advocate the foreignizing strategy while Nida (1964, 1969), Liang Shiqiu, Qian Zhongshu, Fu Lei, Xu Yuanchong and so on believe that the domesticating strategy is an ideal strategy to deal with linguistic and cultural differences in translation. However, from what we have discussed, the selection of translation strategy is not decided by which one is superior but by the combination of various factors operating at different levels because both strategies have their respective advantages. They respectively serve different translation purposes and meet the needs of different text types and readerships. Besides, they have played their respective indispensable roles in different historical periods.

As a matter of fact, the drastic criticisms on either of domestication or foreignization can only do harm to the study of the two strategies rather than advancing the research. Therefore, given the different factors influencing the selection of the two strategies, the objective existence of cultural and linguistic differences and the indispensable roles respectively played by either in cultural communication and exchange, a dialectic and complementary relationship should be established between the two. There is no absolute domestication or foreignization in rendering a particular text and every version is a result of seeking a balance between the two. Actually, the two strategies largely represent two general orientations rather than two absolute techniques, so between the two opposite extremes there are a number of intervening grades, all of which represent acceptable methods of translation. For example, transliteration plus footnotes is a largely foreignization-oriented translation method while cultural substitution is largely a domestication-oriented method.

### 5.1.2 The degree of domestication and foreignization

The dialectic study of domestication and foreignization in the present thesis has proved that both the strategies are very valuable and indispensable, but in actual translation practice, we should also warn against overusing either one, in other words, we should avoid over-domestication and over-foreignization. For example:

1) Unless you've an ace up your sleeves, we are dished.

除非你有锦囊妙计，否则我们输定了。

2) Spring, the sweet spring is the year's pleasant king.

春，甘美之春，一年之中的尧舜。

3) Speak of the devil and he will appear.

说曹操，曹操到。

4) 他以为阿 Q 这回可遭了瘟。

They were sure that A Q had met his Waterloo.

5) 更有一种风月笔墨， ...

Even worse are those writers of the breeze-and-moonlight school, ... (Yang: 4)

6) ... 眠花卧柳

... sleeping with flowers under willow trees. (Hawkes)

The first four examples are typical of over-domestication. In the first three examples, the adoption of the terms with striking Chinese characteristics like “锦囊妙计”，“尧舜”，and “曹操” not only hides the foreign cultural elements from the Chinese readers and but also puzzles the Chinese readers who do not expect the foreign writers to know these Chinese historical figures, idioms or phrases. The same holds true with the fourth example. We will find it rather ridiculous to relate A Q to Napoleon's destiny-deciding Waterloo war. In the last two examples, because the translators blindly employ foreignization, the readers will find it hard to catch even their basic meanings, let alone to appreciate the cultural elements loaded in the sentences. Such translations have totally betrayed the ultimate intention of the cross-cultural translation: to promote and facilitate the cultural communication and understanding between different cultures and different languages.

If we give a detailed study about some translation theorists' severe criticisms about either of the strategies, we will find what they are strongly opposing is not so much domestication or foreignization as over-domestication or over-foreignization. Liu Yingkai's “five overuses” is a case in point. (刘英恺 1987) Therefore, the degree of domestication and foreignization becomes a matter of strategic importance in



actual translation practice. When adopting domestication, the translator should avoid using the terms with obvious characteristics of the target culture because they may make the translation read unlike a translation and confuse or even bore the readers who want to get something foreign from a translation. As far as foreignization is concerned, translators should take the tolerance of the target culture and the capability of reader's reception into consideration. When the translator senses that the drastic differences between the two cultures have greatly hindered the reader's understanding, he should take some measures to compensate, or take domestication as a complement. Actually, the degree of domestication and foreignization is not an objective matter which can be clearly defined but a subjective one largely at the mercy of the bilingual and bicultural translator.

## **5.2 Implications for the present study of domestication and foreignization in China**

As to the present study of domestication and foreignization in China, we should admit that, on the one hand, the two strategies will co-exist harmoniously because cultural transplantation always calls for various methods and patterns and, on the other hand, the selection of domestication and foreignization takes on a historical tendency, as is evidenced by the translation history of both China and the western countries. With the enforcement of the reform and opening up policy in China and with the economic and cultural globalization worldwide, the Chinese anti-foreign feudal ideology has been replaced by a more open one and Chinese readers have a increasing longing for cultural diversities and differences (许钧 1996). So both Chinese translators and readers have begun to tolerate and respect linguistic and cultural foreignness in translation. Therefore, the source culture-oriented foreignizing strategy will be increasingly adopted and the dominance of foreignization becomes the requirement of the modern time. So the present thesis holds that at the present time China's literary translation should take foreignization as the dominant strategy and domestication as the complementary strategy.

However, the advocacy of the dominance of foreignization in China's literary translation today cannot afford to ignore two things:

Firstly, we should realize the imbalance between the theoretical study between domestication and foreignization. Compared with the time-honored tradition of domestication, the study of foreignization is still in its infancy. Supported by Nida's

dynamic equivalence, domestication has a systematical theoretical basis and methods of implementation from the word level, above word level, grammatical level all through to the textual level. (Nida and Taber 1964; Nida 1969) As far as foreignization is concerned, Schleiermacher and Venuti, its most influential advocates, only propose it as an alternative to domestication and go no further about its effective implementation in actual translation practice. For the present, the theoretical basis of foreignization still stops at Venuti's accusation against domestication and its application to practice never goes beyond literal translation plus various compensation methods. The difficulties in applying foreignization and the fear that foreignized works will go unpublished and go unpopular among the readers make many translators hesitant to adopt foreignization as a dominant strategy and always ready to switch to domestication whenever meeting with linguistic and cultural gaps. All this makes the present advocacy of the dominance of foreignization in literary translation rather pale and unconvincing. Therefore, the possibility of taking foreignization as the dominant strategy in literary translation must be presupposed by a systematic study of foreignization in both theory and practice. Besides, even when foreignization is taken as the dominant strategy, domestication will forever serve as its indispensable complement because of the insurmountable weaknesses of foreignization.

Secondly, we must bear in mind the post-colonial context of foreignization and domestication, especially foreignization. The domestic advocacy of the priority of foreignization is, on the one hand, the requirement of the modern society for cultural communication and, on the other hand, is greatly influenced by the rise of foreignization in western translation theories. Foreignization, according to Venuti, is more a political strategy by which weak cultures resist strong cultures and restore their cultural identity than a cultural strategy for equal cultural communication. And that's also why the foreignizing strategy has been adopted by some colonized countries to fight against post-colonialism and liberate their cultures that have been long erased and constrained. In China, we should take foreignization as a translation strategy based on equal cultural exchange and avoid politicalizing the strategies but because translation is not carried out in a vacuum, we should also be alert to the political connotation and functions of these translation strategies in the translation between the Chinese culture and foreign cultures.

### **5.3 Limitations of the present thesis**

The present thesis tries to hold a dialectic attitude towards the dispute over domestication and foreignization and study the relationship between the two from different perspectives provided by different theories and probe into different factors influencing the choice of translation strategy in translating process. Therefore, this is largely a study from the macro level with its main focus on why one strategy is chosen instead of the other and what factors play a major part in the translator's choice. Therefore, the concrete methods to implement the two strategies are not elaborated on and illustrated here and, as we know, discussing them will be undoubtedly very helpful to the translator's practice. Besides, because of limitation of space and the present author's ability, some parts did not get thoroughly studied. For example, chapter three and chapter four give an impression that this present author is unduly ambitious to cover so many perspectives and factors, which each can otherwise constitute a very broad area of study. It is hoped that those who are interested in this topic will try to overcome these weaknesses and further this study.

## Bibliography

- Austen, Jane. (1983). *Sense and Sensibility*. Bantam Books.
- Baker, Mona. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press & Routledge.
- Baker, Mona. (ed.) (1998) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere (eds) (1990) *Translation, History and Culture*, London and New York: Pinter.
- Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere (eds) (2001) *Constructing Cultures*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gentzler, Edwin. (2001). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Hawkes, David. (1973, 1977, 1980). *The Story of the Stone*, Vols. 1-3, Penguin Books.
- Hermans, Theo. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Lefevere, Andre. (ed.) (1992). *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Lefevere, Andre. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Mitchell, Margaret (1936). *Gone with the wind*, New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Munday, Jeremy. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Newmark, Peter. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nida, Eugene A. (1964): *Toward a Science of Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

- Nida, Eugene A. (1993): *Language, Culture and Translating*, Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nida, Eugene A. (2001). *Language and Culture --- Contexts in Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nida, Eugene A. & Taber, Charles R. (1969): *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nord, Christiane. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Reiss, Katharina. (1971). *Translation Criticism: The Potentials & Limitations*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Schuttleworth & Cowie. (1997) *Dictionary of Translation Studies [Z]*. STJE Rome Publisher, Manchester, U. K.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. (1988) *Translation Studies, an Integrated Approach*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Toury, Gideon. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge, London.
- Yang, Xianyi & Yang, Gladys. (1994). *A Dream of Red Mansions*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing.
- 蔡平 (2002), “翻译方法应以归化为主” [J], 中国翻译, 第5期。
- 曹雪芹, 高锸 (1982), 红楼梦。北京: 人民文学出版社。
- 陈福康 (1992), 中国译学理论史稿[M]。上海: 上海外语教育出版社。
- 陈丽莉 (1999), “翻译的异化和归化” [J], 中国科技翻译, 第2期。
- 戴侃, 李野光, 庄绎传译 (1990), 飘[M]。北京: 人民文学出版社。
- 冯建文 (1993), “译文归化与保持异域情趣” [J], 外语教学。
- 冯庆华 (2001), 实用翻译教程[M]。上海: 上海外语教育出版社。
- 冯庆华 (2002), 文体翻译论[M]。上海: 上海外语教育出版社。
- 傅东华译 (1979), 飘[M]。杭州: 浙江人民出版社。
- 葛校琴 (2002), “当前归化/异化策略讨论的后殖民视阈---对国内归化/异化论者的一个提醒” [J], 中国翻译, 第5期。
- 郭建中 (1998), “翻译中的文化因素: 异化和归化” [J], 外国语, 第2期。
- 郭建中 (1999a), 当代美国翻译理论[M], 武汉: 湖北教育出版社。
- 郭建中 (1999b), 文化与翻译[M], 北京: 中国对外翻译出版社。

- 贾文波 (2004), “文本类型的翻译策略导向---- ‘异化’ ‘归化’ 讨论后的思考” [J], 上海科技翻译, 第3期。
- 蒋晓华 (2003), “意识形态对翻译的影响: 阐发与新思考” [J], 中国翻译, 第5期。
- 李霞 (2003), “权力话语、意识形态与翻译” [J], 西安外国语学院学报, 第2期。
- 梁志芳, 刘军平 (2004), “后殖民翻译研究以及中国语境” [J], 外语与翻译, 第1期。
- 廖七一 (2000), 当代英国翻译理论[M], 武汉: 湖北教育出版社。
- 林以亮 (1978), 红楼梦西游记[M]. 台湾: 联经出版事业公司。
- 刘军平, 梁志芳 (2003), “权力话语与翻译: 中国近当代翻译策略的主体演变” [J], 外语与翻译, 第2期。
- 刘艳丽&杨自俭 (2002), “也谈‘归化’与‘异化’” [J], 中国翻译, 第6期。
- 刘英恺 (1987), “归化——翻译的歧路” [J], 现代外语, 第2期。
- 刘英恺 (1997), “试论奈达‘读者反映’论在中国的负面作用” [J], 上海科技翻译, 第1期。
- 罗新璋 (1984), 翻译论集[M]. 北京: 商务印书馆。
- 马会娟 (2003), 奈达翻译理论研究[M]. 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社。
- 马祖毅 (1984), 中国翻译简史: “五四”运动以前部分[M]. 北京: 中国对外翻译出版公司。
- 孟志刚 (1999), “论翻译中‘异化’和‘归化’的辩证统一” [J], 西安外国语学院学报, 第4期。
- 乔曾锐 (2000), 译论[M]. 北京: 中华工商联出版社。
- 秦洪武, 李海青 (1997), “论归化的可行性” [J], 外语与翻译。
- 秦洪武 (1999): “论读者反应在翻译理论和翻译实践中的意义” [J], 外国语, 第1期。
- 任生名 (1993), “杨宪益的文学翻译思想散记” [J], 中国翻译, 第4期。
- 孙致礼 (2002), “中国的文学翻译: 从归化趋向异化” [J], 中国翻译, 第1期。
- 孙致礼 (2003), “再谈文学翻译的策略问题” [J], 中国翻译, 第1期。
- 谭载喜 (1991), 西方翻译简史[M]. 北京: 商务印书馆。
- 王东风 (2000), “翻译文学的文化地位与译者的文化态度” [J], 中国翻译, 第4期。

- 王东风 (2002), “归化与异化: 矛与盾的交锋?” [J], 中国翻译, 第 5 期。
- 王东风 (2003a), “翻译研究的后殖民视角” [J], 中国翻译, 第 4 期。
- 王东风 (2003b), “一只看不见的手---论意识形态对翻译实践的操纵” [J], 中国翻译, 第 5 期。
- 王克非 (1997), 翻译文化史论[M]。上海: 上海外语教育出版社。
- 王友贵 (2003), “意识形态与 20 世纪中国翻译文学史 (1899-1979)” [J], 中国翻译, 第 5 期。
- 王佐良 (1989), “严复的用心”, 翻译: 思考与试笔[M]。北京: 外语教学与研究出版社。
- 文军, 高晓鹰, (2003), “归化异化, 各具一格----从功能翻译理论角度评价《飘》的两种译本” [J], 中国翻译, 第 5 期。
- 许崇信 (1991), “文化交流与翻译” [J], 外国语, 第 1 期。
- 许建平, 张荣曦 (2002), “跨文化翻译中的异化和归化问题” [J], 中国翻译, 第 5 期。
- 许钧 (1996), 文字·文学·文化: [红与黑] 汉译研究[M]。南京: 南京大学出版社。
- 许钧 (2003), 翻译论[M]。武汉: 湖北教育出版社。
- 许渊冲 (1993), “文学翻译是两种语言的竞赛” [J], 外国语, 第 3 期。
- 杨自俭, 刘学云编 (1994), 翻译新论: 1983-1992。武汉: 湖北教育出版社。
- 袁晓宁, 刘成 (2003), “关于翻译中归化和异化的哲学思考” [J], 外语与外语教学, 第 2 期。