ABSTRACT

The thesis is devoted to a systematic study of the translator's subjectivity in literary translation. In traditional translation theories, translator's subjectivity is seldom discussed and suffers from invisibility caused by the strong sense of self- centeredness of Chinese culture and the traditional translation views. Serious and renewed studies over this problem did not appear on any considerable scale until 1980s when the significant shift of focus in the literary field was introduced to translation studies. With the "cultural turn" in translation studies, proper and increasing attention has been paid to the cultural identity and subject status of the translator.

The paper, based on a survey of the previous studies on translation, and of the retrospect of the "cultural turn" in translation, addresses the subjectivity of the translator and explores the connotation, characteristics and manifestation of the subjectivity of the translator in an attempt to further the research on the subjectivity in translation.

Six chapters are included in this paper. Chapter One is a brief introduction of the significance of studying this topic and basic structure of this paper. Chapter Two starts with a brief survey of the marginalized cultural status of the translator, and analyzes two main reasons that result in the low status of the translator. In Chapter Three, a tentative effort is made to explain the connotation of the translator's subjectivity. Chapter Four is the main body of the paper. The characteristics of the translator's subjectivity are elaborated from three aspects to further explain the connotation: every translator has his own subjective intention in the purposeful activity —translation. But the subjectivity of the translator is not arbitrary, which must be restricted by all kinds of subjective and objective factors. The translator must give full play to his creativity so as to achieve the translation ends. Furthermore, in light of several theories such as Hermeneutics, Cultural Translation theory, the subjectivity of the translator is further explored through analyzing its manifestation in the translation process, in the translator's cultural consciousness and orientation, in the translator's awareness of the readers, in the intertextual relationship between the target text and source text, the target text and target literature, and in the inter-subjectivity of translation between the translator, the author and the reader. In Chapter Five, the author puts forward two suggestions: that the translators' consciousness of creativity shall be integrated with their self-restraint; that translation criteria and principles shall be further understood in hope of promoting the development of translation practice and studies. Chapter Six is a brief retrospective summary of the main idea discussed in the foregoing parts.

Chapter One   Introduction

For a long time, translation studies have put too much emphasis on the nature, criteria and techniques of the translation, exploring "how translation is practiced" both at home and abroad. However, systemic studies of practitioner of translation— the translator have not been adequately performed. The previous research conducted is mainly focused on the introduction of translators' translation activities and translation viewpoints, but translators' cultural orientation, aesthetic consciousness and personalities as well as the influence of their translation on the target culture (TC) have not drawn enough attention.

The cultural turn in Translation Studies in the West since the 1970s has brought about new dimensions and approaches. With the growth of the descriptive translation in the 1970s and 1980s, and later as the culture – oriented translation studies prevailed, the translator's subjective role in the act of translation became visible. The influence of ideology and literary concepts on the translation at a particular time is mainly manifested through particular translators. On the contrary, translators' choices of translation materials and strategies may reflect the social and cultural contexts in a particular era. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct research on translators themselves in order to reveal the relationship between translation and the target culture. We can say that the translator's subjectivity is discovered thanks to the cultural turn in translation studies. Besides, the target- oriented approach resulting from this shift brings the cultural identities and roles of translators in the translation process to the foreground. Therefore, their subjectivities including their cultural and aesthetic tendencies have become necessary and important research subjects for translation researchers.

Though studies on translators in China claim a long history, a systemic study of the translator-oriented approach did not start until the 1980s. In recent years, the translator's subjectivity has begun to draw greater attention, which can be seen in the papers of Tian Debei (2000), Zha Mingjian (2003), Yuan Li (2002) and Xu Jun (2003). Tian's paper discusses the translator's role as a reader, a creator, a writer and a researcher. In Zha's opinion, the translator is the main role of the translation subjects, with the others are the author and the target text reader. Yuan thinks that only the translator is the translation subject. Xu recommends paying much more attention to the study of translators, not only their important roles but also their ideas and opinions. Comparing with traditional translation studies, these researchers examine translators

from new perspective and obtain more scientific understanding of the role of translators played in translation activity.

Based on the result of the previous studies on the translator, this paper takes the discussion of the subjectivity of the translator in literary translation as a central task. The purpose is to reveal the significance of the translator in translation for cross-cultural communication.

There are six chapters included in this thesis. The exploration begins with the retrospection of the marginalized cultural status of the translator in Chapter Two, and analyzes two main reasons that result in the low status of the translator, that is, the subjectivity of the translator is obscured in the strong sense of self- centeredness of Chinese culture and in the traditional translation views. And then the cultural turn of translation studies is introduced to provide the background in which the translator study has begun to draw great attention. Some researchers gradually recognize the subject status and special cultural identity of the translator, which makes it possible and necessary to conduct researches on the subjectivity of the translator.

In Chapter Three, the comprehension of the subjectivity of translation is clarified, and then the subjectivity of the translator is explained in detail.

In Chapter Four, the study of the characteristics and manifestation of the translator's subjectivity is the focus of the whole paper. The characteristics of the translator's subjectivity are discussed from three aspects. First, the skopos of the translator: according to the Skopostheorie, translation is purposeful creativity; every translator has his own particular intention. And the process of translation is actually the process of the translator's choice and decision. When choosing what to translate and how to translate, the translator inevitably conceives some subjective ideas— the translator has his own attitude toward the source text (ST) and the author, and he can presuppose the "intended readers" and adopt different attitudes to the target culture according to his own purpose. However, the subjectivity of the translator is not arbitrary, it is usually restricted by all kinds of subjective and objective factors such as the difference between languages and cultures, the translator's individuality, specific translation views and strategies in certain era, and all these may exert certain influence on the translator. Limited by all kinds of factors, the translator has to work creatively in order to achieve his translation purpose. Thus it constitutes the third and most important characteristic of the translator's subjectivity— the creativity of the translator, which is manifested in various translation works. Translation, as we all know, is a special kind of

creation.

In the second part of Chapter Four, the manifestation of the translator's subjectivity is explored in detail too. First, the translator's subjectivity is manifested in translation process, which is the most evident. In the process, the translator must bring his multiple identities— as a reader, interpreter and writer into full play. The translator exchanges views with the author and the source text, makes full use of his aesthetic ability and imagination to concretize the indeterminacies and blankness in the ST. When coming to the stage of presentation, the translator has to reproduce not only the meaning but also the aesthetic information and the flavor of the original. Second, the translator's subjectivity is manifested in the translator's cultural consciousness and orientation. Since translation is a kind of cultural communication, it is crucial for the translator to have a keen sense of cultural awareness so as to make successful communication. Three cultures are generally interacting in the process: (1) the source language culture, (2) the receptor culture and (3) the translator's culture. Since the translator plays a dynamic role in the process of translation as a mediator with keen sense of cultural awareness, his attitude towards different cultures is of vital importance to the understanding and reproducing of the source text. The cultural orientation of the translator usually takes on three typical models: (1) The target culture oriented model, in which the translator places the target culture in the dominant place. (2) The source culture oriented model in which the translator gives priority to the source culture. (3) The integrating model in which the translator shows respect to both the target culture and source culture without upsetting the target culture norms. Third, the translator's subjectivity is also embodied in his consciousness of the "intended readers". In order to make the translation accepted in the TC so as to achieve his translation ends, the translator has to concern about the readers' horizon of expectation and adopt corresponding translation strategies. Fourth, the translator's subjectivity is manifested in the intertextual relationship between the TT and the ST, the TT and target literature. The translated work is actually an "afterlife" of the ST with independent value. So the TT isn't subordinate to the ST, but an intertext of the ST. As the TT enters into the target culture, it will be part of the target culture and will form an intertextual relation with the target culture. Fifth, the translator's subjectivity is manifested in the inter-subjectivity of translation. The translator and the author coexist in the translation process; they conduct a dialogue on translation and finish the translation task together. So the translator is not subordinate to the author but deserves an equal status to him. Besides, the translator's cultural purpose that contained

in the TT including the preface and postscript of the TT needs to be understood and accepted by readers in the TC.

Through the exploration of the translator's subjectivity, two suggestions are put forward in the last chapter, i.e. to unite the translator's consciousness of creativity and self- restraint, and to further understand the translation criteria and principles, hoping to promote the translation practice and studies in the future.

Chapter Two   Translator: From Invisibility to Visibility

2.1 The Marginalized Cultural Status of the Translator

Translation has been playing an increasingly important role in exchanges across diverse cultural boundaries in the world, employed mostly to promote multi-cultural assimilation and exchanges across different languages. However, the translator, the key figure and absolute subject in translation process, is excluded from sharing a correspondingly prominent social and economic status, and shamefully put into a shadowy condition. We can see their "marginalized status" from the following metaphors, such as "mouthpiece", "matchmaker", "craftsman", "servant with two masters", "traitor", "fettered dancer", "translating machine". The various descriptions of translators just reflect the images of translators in people's minds, which manifest the nature and difficulties of translation on one hand, and reflect the public's comments on the value of translation and translator on the other hand.

By invisibility, I mean a humble and modest translator who tries every effort to conceal his/her identities so as to produce a false impression of absence and presence of originality. To a great extend, an extremely strong sense of self- centeredness and the conventional concept "faithfulness" proves to be the big bondages to translator's conscious assertion of identities.

Since the marginalized cultural status of the translator was formed over a long time in cultural development and traditional translation studies. Here we can explore this problem in accordance with Polysystem theory, in the hope of shedding light on the reasons that resulted in the marginalized status of the translator in Chinese cultural context.

In the global cultural polysystem, Chinese culture has a long distinct history, and enjoys powerful position most of the time, that is, Chinese culture influenced other cultures more than it was influenced in turn. Therefore, it was difficult for foreign cultures to participate in the "Primary Mode" construction of Chinese culture. (Zhang Nanfeng 2001). The powerful position of Chinese culture led to a strong self-centered cultural concept. Three translation climaxes have appeared in the history of China, i.e. large-scale translation of Buddist works in the ancient times; translation of works of natural sciences, social sciences and humanities in early modern times, and translation of works of literature and science and technology in contemporary times. As we all know, these three translation activities have had far-reaching influence on the development of Chinese culture. However, these three cultural introductions on a large

scale all were conducted under the dominion of self-centered Chinese culture. "Culture filtering and appropriation" (Zha Mingjian, 2003) were made when foreign cultures were introduced to China.

Although translational culture has greatly enriched Chinese culture, by contributing to the construction of subjective culture, with an extremely strong sense of self-centeredness, it has been difficult for people to consider translation as an indispensable part of the subjective culture development. Importance attached to the translator's contribution to the Chinese culture and his role as a creator has been far from adequate.

In addition, the subject of translation was obscured by traditional views of translation. There are many kinds of ideal translation criteria in traditional translation studies. Apart from the criteria of "faithfulness, expressiveness, elegance", the most influential criteria are "transmigration", which requires that the translated text should produce the same effect as the original text when read. The translator must overcome the difficulties caused by discrepancies between languages to enable the translated text to be read as fluently as the original text and at the same time be true to original style. The counterpart of "transmigration" in west is the view of the "invisibility of the translator/ translated text". The "invisibility theory" considers the ideal translated text should be like a piece of glass, which makes the readers of a translated text believe that they are reading the original text. Actually, the "transmigration" and the view of the "invisibility of the translator/ translated text" are both idealized translation criteria that cannot be entirely achieved by translators.

The other prevailing opinion in the traditional translation study is that the value of translation is inferior to the original act of composition/creation. In this view, translation is a form of imitation, and a translated text is the copy of original text and lack creation. Even though some people concede that translation is also a creative process, they consider it to be a "parasitical art" and believe that its creative and literary value cannot be compared to that of the original work.

The traditional translation criteria to translated text imply the awkward situation and low status of translators. First, translators are supposed to produce transparent versions that aim at utmost fidelity or equivalence. The consciousness of invisibility is typically represented in George Mountin's Les Bells Infideles "The ideal target text should look like a piece of glass, which is so transparent that readers cannot feel its existence." (1995:111) Translators feel honored if critics do not feel their existence,

because their absence implies their success. Second, translators are considered as servile lackeys to the authors. For instance, John Dryden maintains that translators should follow whatever the original author does and compares them to slaves who toil in the master's field, and whose harvested gains belong to masters. Yang Jiang, a well-known Chinese writer and translator, also holds the similar view. She says that translators at the command of the ST cannot make their own decisions. They have to attend to two lords at the same time: one is the source text; the other is the target readership. The translator's docile obedience to the conventional faithfulness without questioning its rationality constrains translators to live under the author's shadows and dominant authorities, resulting in self-denial of translator's own identities.

From the above analysis, it is clear that the translator was obscured in the strong sense of self-centeredness of Chinese culture and traditional view of translation, which led to the marginalized cultural status of the translator. As a result, the research on the translator was neglected in translation studies. Only if the nature and cultural function of translation were fully recognized, the translator, as the subject of translation will become visible and the translator study will be put on the agenda of translation studies.

2.2 The Cultural Turn

In recent years, more and more theorists have come to the recognition that the study of literary translation should not be treated as a separate discipline, but rather as an interdisciplinary study. It should bring together works in a wide variety of fields such as linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology, economics and so on. On the other hand, cultural problems confronting each translator have been given special emphasis.

The cultural orientation averts the perspective of translation studies from its invariable labyrinth to the approach stressing target- oriented, dynamic description in the context of history, society and culture. The shift of translation studies from language to culture is what theorists call "culture turn" in translation. The turn is a revolution having a far-reaching significance in translation history because it breaks the boundary set by traditional paradigms, liberating translator from an inferior and subordinate status to a freer and more independent position, expanding translation to a broader cultural scope.

Many target culture oriented translation theories and schools are formed during the "culture turn", among them the most influential are the polysystem school represented

by Itamar Evan-Zohar and Gideon Toury and the manipulation school represented by Andre Lefevere, Lawrence Venuti, Susan Bassnett and TheoHermans. Polysystem theories provide the theoretical framework for TC-oriented translation studies, while manipulation theories offer a new perspective for the cognition of translation. Among the most important works are Andre Lefevere's *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, Susan Bassnett's *Translation, History and Culture* and Lawrence Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, etc.

Polysystem theory is a radical development because it shifts the focus of attention away from arid debates about faithfulness and equivalence towards an examination of the role of the translated text in its new context. Significantly, this opened the way for further research on the history of translation, leading also to a reassessment of the importance of translation as a force for change and innovation in literary history. In 1995, Gideon Toury published Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond, a book that reassesses the polysystem approach disliked by some scholars for its over-emphasis on the target system. Toury(2001:23-28) maintains that since a translation is designed primarily to fill a need in the target culture, it is logic to make the target system the object of study. He also points out the need to establish patterns of regularity of translational behavior, in order to study the way in which norms are formulated and how they operate.

The polysystem theory fills the gap that opened up in the 1970's between linguistics and literary studies and provides the base upon which the new interdisciplinary translation studies could build. It stretches the study of Early Translation Studies, and suggests translation studies should be put in a larger literary, social and cultural frame, inaugurating a new-brand dynamic paradigm of literary translation study.

In the 1990s, Lefevere pulished his *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. He published this book with the aim to expatiate on two main reasons—ideology and poetics—for the translator's manipulation of the source text. Lefevere states that there is a double control factor that drives the translator to manipulate the source text. One control factor belongs squarely within the literary system; the other is to be found outside of that system. The first factor controls the literary system from the inside within the parameters set by the second factor. In specific terms, the "professional" represents the first factor. Inside the literary system the professionals are critics, reviewers, teachers and translators. These people will occasionally repress

certain literature that is blatantly opposed to the dominant views on what literature should(be allowed to) be and on what society should (be allowed to) be. In other words, ideology and poetics are two points they concern. The second factor, which operates outside the literary system as such, will be called "patronage" here. It means something like the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature. Patronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics

These two translation schools both emphasized the role of the translator in the translation process and visibility of the translator. The characteristics of these new translation theories can be concluded in two points: firstly, translators are active participants; secondly, the focus has moved from the "meaning" itself to the meaning-producing field.

2.3 Visibility of the Translator's Subject Status

After the "cultural turn", the translator's status is promoted to a great extend. The translators is no longer considered to be inferior to the author of the original, instead he is an indispensable participant in the process of translation, who act not only as the receptor of the source text but also the producer of a target text. This part will primarily deal with the influence imposed upon translation practices by the theoretical rethinking of the translator's roles and his subjectivity. The prompt result of such a theoretical rethinking results in the collapsing of faithfulness and loyalty to the original. The translators' crucial roles are recognized as follows.

Hermeneutics emphasizes the translator's active interpretation of literary texts. According to this theory, the translator is not a passive recipient of meaning but an active and creative subject in creating meaning. The translator cannot be excluded from his pre-understanding structure in the complex process of interaction with the source text. Inevitably a translator will feed his own beliefs, experiences and attitudes into the processing of a text, so that any translation, to some degree, will reflect the translator's own mental outlook and his idiosyncrasies despite of impartial intention.

Scholars in translation studies have shed new light on the status of the translator, who has increasingly become more empowered and respected. One representative, Theo Hermans, holds that translation is a copy of original textual manipulation (this school is also called the Manipulation School). Hermans writes: "From the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a

certain purpose."(1985:9) They also regard translation as "rewriting", which is explained by Andre Lefevere, to mean that, as a kind of rewriting, translation is a kind of processing and representation of the source text. Scholars of translation studies began to show that the target text performs a more important function than that of the original, for it turns into a constructing force that helps to shape the development of the receptor culture. This understanding has allowed the study of translation to shift orientation from the ST to the TT and offered a refreshing angle to consider the relationship between the source text and the target text.

Feminist translation theory also focuses its attention on the TT as well as the translator and distrusts the utmost authority of the source text. This theory prevails in Canada and its representative theorists are Barbara Codard and Sherry Simon. Traditionally translation is regarded as women who can hardly meet men's (the source text's) need: the beautiful one is not faithful and vice versa. This opinion is violently attacked by feminists, who claim that this misunderstanding of treating the source text as man and translation as woman not only devalues the translator and translation but also implies discrimination against women. Feminist theorists advocate the visibility of translators and liberate them from the yoke of the original text. For instance, "Barbara Godard argues that a feminist translator should 'flaunt' the signs of her manipulation of the text, her 'woman-handling' strategies… many translators have deliberately chosen to assert themselves very visibly indeed in the text they produce. "(Bassnett,2001:25)

Scholars of Post-colonialism compare translation to Cannibalism, i.e. the translator produces the received text only after they have devoured and digested the original text. So, the process of translation involves a high degree of active manipulation of the source text. This view highlights the translator's active role, and it no longer considers translation as a secondary and derivative genre.

Deconstructionist further subverts the translator's marginalized position. Walter Benjamin declares that the target text is the after-life of the source text, and both texts are the fragments that reflect "pure language". As Bassnett interprets his opinion:" He claims that translation provides the life-hereafter of a text, enabling it to survive and sometimes even resurrecting it… The task of the translator is simply a different kind of writing task, and it follows on from the primary task of reading."(Bassnett, 2001:66) The target text is the reincarnation of the source text, and it provides a means of survival for the source text. Without its after-life, the original text cannot survive and thrive in a new cultural system, and the translator is at least as equally important as the original

author. This view greatly justifies the translator's authority and autonomy, broadening the scope of translation studies.

From the above, we can see that the translator's humble position has been raised to a great extend in contemporary theories. The translator's subject status has become visible in translation studies.

With the "cultural turn" in translation studies, increasing attention has been paid to the subject status of the translator, who not only influences translation by his visual threshold, choice and thinking, but also participates in and contributes to the construction of a nation's culture. The culture turn not only provides new dimension and approaches for translation studies, but also develops new space for research. As a result, the exploration of the subject of translation— the translator has been put on the agenda of translation studies. And such problems as the cultural identity and the subjectivity of the translator have become very important subject.

In recent years, some research articles on the translator have appeared in China, which sang high praise of translator' outstanding achievements, and highlighted translator' great contributions to Chinese culture and literature. Provided the exploration of the translator' contribution to target culture and literature is a kind of "external" study, and then the exploration of the translator' subjectivity is "internal" study. Only combining the "external" and "internal" studies, can the culture identity and subject status of the translator be fully revealed.

Chapter Three   Connotation of the Subjectivity of the Translation

3.1 Subject and Subjectivity of the Translation subject in philosophy and translation

3.1.1 subject in philosophy

Subjectivity comes from the philosophical term "subject". Ancient philosophers, beginning with the Presocratics, established a tradition of metaphysical speculation that continued through the Middle Ages. They were primarily concerned with questions about the nature of existence, the categories of things that exist, their essences, their unity and diversity and so on. With Descartes, the locus of philosophical concern changed from the issue of what there is to what we know. (Baghramian,1999:xxx) Philosophers then were concerned with questions such as "how can we know anything at all?" and "what justification do we have for our claims to knowledge?". Under the circumstances, the word "subject" is used as a philosophical term referring to "the person carrying out an action rather than the object which is being acted upon. The term is often used as a synonym for 'human being', or the consciousness of a human being."

3.1.2 Subject in Ttranslation

Subject in translation is just borrowed from philosophy(52) . However, the question on who is (are) the subject(s) of translation is disputable. No consensus has been reached yet both at home and abroad, which results from different understandings of the connotation and the subject of translation. "If the word 'translation' refers not only to the translating process, but also all the elements involved in the whole process of translation, then the subjects must include the translator, the author and readers of both languages. Consequently to study the subjectivity of translation in this case means to study the intersubjectivity of all the subjects."(2003) In the abstract of his article "Revisiting the Subject of Literary Translation", Yang Wuneng(   ) points out that "Literary translators are the subjects of literary translation" (, 2003). Many other translators and theorists have put forward other answers to the question. Xu Jun (   ) once summarized those different points of view as the following: 1) The translator is the subject of translation; 2) The author and the translator are the subjects of translation; 3) The translator and readers are the subjects of translation; 4) The author, the translator and readers are the subjects of translation.(2003:10) It is obvious that three parties are involved in the operation of translation. As Chen Daliang (   ) proposes, "the translator is the subject of translation, the author is the subject of literary

creation, and the reader is the subject of acceptance" (2004:6)

In view of the complexity of translation activity and the correlativity of different factors in it, the understanding that the translator, the original author and the reader are all the subjects of translation, will be adopted in this thesis. But it must be pointed out that the subjectivity of the translator is manifested in the translation activity, but the subjectivity of the author and reader is only manifest in some different parts of this activity. Besides, this thesis will focus its study on the subjectivity of the translator, so the subject of translation mentioned in this thesis is confined to the translator, and the subjectivity of translation refers to the subjectivity of the translator. As for the subjectivity of the author and reader, it will only be discussed briefly in Chapter Three.

3.2 subjectivity in philosophy and translation
3.2.1 subjectivity in philosophy

What is the subjectivity of the translator? To answer this question, we must make clear the concept of subjectivity.

Subjectivity should be defined as the nature of a subject that is embodied in the subject's activities. Mr.Wang (,1995) once gives the definition as follows:

Specifically, subjectivity is the materialization of the subject' s natural power embodied in its activities during which the subject rebuilds, influences and controls the object. Besides, the subject also makes the object serve itself.

Subjectivity inclues the subject's purpose, self-determination, initiation and creation, etc. Among them, creation is the most prominent feature of subjectivity. It reflects the essence of subjectivity. At the same time, limitations and constraints on subjectivity are inevitable. When subjectivity acts, it would be limited by the environment and the object on which it is about to exert. Therefore limitation is another feature of subjectivity. Wei Xiaoping (1998) considers that limitation is the base of creation:

It (subjectivity) is presented by both the human being's dependence on the object and the limitations imposed by the object.

Mr.Wang (,1995) also comments on the importance of limitation:

Creation is based on the premise of limitation; reconstructing and influencing the object is based on the premise of conforming to the objective laws and being limited by the object.

So it is bound to result in the subject's blindness and arbitrariness and even the failure in objective activity, suppose that too much emphasis is laid on the subject's creativity without taking restrictions into account. The other important characteristic of subjectivity is the subject's intention in its activity, which reflects the purpose and orientation of the subject when giving full play to its creativity.

3.2.2 subjectivity in translation

Based on three features mentioned in philosophic connotation of subjectivity, we can get the following points in terms of the subjectivity of the translator: 1) As the subject in the process of translation, the translator targets the source text as his/her main object, which needs to be transferred from the source language to the target language. That is, as the subject of translation, the translator must give full play to his/her subjective creativity to act on the object (the original text) in order to accomplish the translation tasks. During the process, creativity is undoubtedly paramount. 2) The translator's is restricted by such factors as characteristics and habits of two languages, the objective rules in language transformation, cultural and aesthetic features in the original language, the translator's specific social context, and the specific translation view of his times. The restriction just suggests that the translator' creativity is not arbitrary or beyond any limitation. Thus, activity of translation would fail and end up producing mistranslation if the subjectivity of the translator only emphasizes the aspect of creation and neglects that of limitation. 3) In view of "translation is a purposeful activity"(Christiane Nord,2001:1), any translation activity has its own specific purpose. Linguistic transfer is only the external form of literary translation, but not the ultimate purpose. The translator's ultimate purpose is to provide new discourse to support or subvert the dominating ideology through translation at the cultural level; and to support or reform the existing literature, ideology and discourse-producing model in target language at producing mode level.

Although there is no unanimous agreed definition of the subjectivity of the translator, on the basis of the above analysis, we can attempt to define the subjectivity of the translator as: the subjective creativity that the translator (as the subject of translation) displays in the translation activity to achieve his translation purpose, on the premise of respecting the translation object (the original text), which mirrors the translator's

cultural awareness and personality, as well as his cultural and aesthetic creativity.

With regard to the rich connotation and characteristics of the subjectivity of the translator, they will be explored in the following chapter in detail.

Chapter Four   Characteristics and Manifestation of the Subjectivity of the Translator

4.1 Characteristics of the Subjectivity of the Translator

4.1.1 Skopos of the Translator

The famous Translator Ye Junjian said," the role of the translator's individual factors in translation by no means can be neglected." As an active subject, the translator always consciously or unconsciously brings his own world outlook, value orientation, mode of thinking, cognitive manner, and aesthetic sentiment into his translation action and results. Since the translator is not a machine, and has his own thought and emotion, any translator will inevitably impose some subjective factors on his translated text.

The most striking manifestation of the translator's subjective factors or his individuality lies in his intention (purpose) and choices in his translation activity. That is, what kind of ends he plans to achieve— be it making money, supporting or subverting a political system or an ideology, or acquiring literary fame, or, as has been the case with many women translators in history, finding a voice when prevented from speaking in their own name. In each of these cases, translators choose from among the range of more or less practicable, and likely options available to them, determining what and how to translate.

According to the Skopostheorie (the theory, proposed by a German translator Hans J. Vermeer, applies the notion of Skopos to translation), the prime principle determining any translation process is the purpose (Skopos) of the overall translational action. And Skopos here is a Greek word for therefore translation itself, may be conceived as an action, as the name implies. Any action has an aim, a purpose. The word *skopos*, is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation. Further: an action leads to a result, a new situation or event, and possibly to a 'new' object." (Christiane Nord, 2001:12) And Vermeer also quoted Hubbell's translation of Cicero's *De inventione*, "genuine reasons for actions can always be formulated in terms of aims or statements of goals" to support his theory. In addition, another German scholar named Holz-Manttari who stretches Vermeer's theory, and defines translation as "a complex action designed to achieve a particular purpose" in her model.

Since translation is a purposeful action, every translator must possess a certain "skopos" when translating, and each of his translated works may serve a given purpose. Therefore, the translator just is the subject who determines the aim of translation and directs his activity at this destination unswervingly. The process of translation is

complex and involves various choices, and the choice of translation (actually the choice of the translator) goes through the whole process of translation activity. It's no wonder that it's been said, "translating is choosing". Thus, as the operator of the translation activity, the translator is confronted with all kinds of choices: at the translation preparation stage, he must decide what to translate, whose works to translate; and during the translation process, he must determine for whom to translate and how to translate among other considerations.

What to translate is the primary question prior to translating. Translators usually pay great attention to the choice of translation text. For example, Fu Lei once compared choosing translation text to making friends. And Liang Qichao considers the choice of translation text as the most important thing in translation action[1]. In this point, Xiao Qian stresses "loving the work", "I prefer to choosing sarcastic literature, feel it is pointedness… this is my personal tendency." Fang Mengzhi also said," A man of insight chooses translation text with the ambition of invigorating his nation and awaking his people, however, a mediocre man chooses translation text for entertainment. The translation text is up to translator to choose, who is the dominator." The above saying shows that translators indeed enjoy freedom of making choices and sometimes decide what to translate with strong personal preferences.

Besides, translators also have their tendencies in choosing whose work to translate, according to their specific translation purpose. Take Cao Ying as an example, who was deeply impressed by Leo Tolstoy's rich humanitarian thought and spent more than 20 years systematically translating and introducing Tolstoy's works to Chinese readers. Ye Junjian chose to translate Andersen's works, simply because he respected Andersen's personality, who "expresses his solicitude to human, expresses his attention to human's dignity, and his eulogy to human's process with great passion" through his creation.

In a word, the translator often select a book in which he is interested or the work of an author who has a particular influence on him to translate. Therefore, the translator's intention and his individual subjectivity pervades in the whole translation process.

During the process of translating, the manifestation of the translator's intention (or subjectivity) lies in the choice of translation strategies and techniques, which often influenced by the "horizon of expectation" of his "intended readers"[2]. The translator can presuppose his "intended readership" according to his translation intention, and adopts corresponding translating strategies and techniques so as to achieve his translation purpose. And the translator usually enjoy relative freedom in his choices. The translator

may have different readers in mind when translating for research purposes, or when translating to introduce new literary forms or expressions. In terms of translation strategies, the argument between domestication and foreignization has always been a hot debate. In a sense, domestication and foreignization as thinking tendency and value orientation are determined by the translator's intentions. Provided a translator aims to introduce the original work and allow the target readers to know the source culture, or to introduce fresh expressions to reform the target culture, the translator may tend to use foreignizing strategy, so as to keep the original flavor and style. If a translator aims to enlighten his people, or to introduce and advanced idea, i.e. to convey his views through the translated text, he is apt to adopt domesticating strategy for the purpose that it is easier for his translation work to approach readers and be accepted by them. Moreover, in the history of translation, some translators took advantage of omission and adaptation to achieve specific translation purposes. Although this practice sometimes is subject to criticism, such examples as Yan Fu, Lin Shu, Zhu Shenghao, Su Manshu, Wu Guangjian, these translators utilized this method in their translation works and obtained significant effects that couldn't be ignored.

The fact mentioned above shows that the translator's intentional choices during the whole translation activity simply reflect their subjective manipulation on the source text, which is a good demonstration of their subjectivity in translation.

4.1.2 Restrictions on the Translator

When we talk about the translation activity is purposeful and the translator's selection in translation is subjective, which often involves the translator's individuality factor, we don't rule out there are some restrictive factors in the translator's selection or decision-making. In truth, the translator cannot break away from limitations in his act of translation, and he merely enjoys relative freedom.

Translation does not take place in vacuum, for an individual is always living in certain social environment. The translator is inevitably influenced by all kinds of subjective or objective factors, such as the demand and the ideology of the society, the writing habit and language characteristic of his time, and the society's attitude to translation literature.

First, the social environment including political, economic, and cultural factors plays a significant role in the translator's choices. The constrictions of social environment on the translator not only are manifested in his choice of translation topic, source text, but also his presentation. Usually, if living in a relatively loose social

environment, and suffering less political, cultural and ethic restrictions, the translator is freer in choosing a source text, and is more flexible in presentation. But the translator, who lives in a specific age or in complex social conditions, is inevitably greatly restricted by the external factor. For example, the famous scholar, Yan Fu, chose to translate the book Evolution and Ethics, for it contained what he considered the essence of western thoughts to serve for China's national awakening. Although on one hand his choice shows his great interest in western thoughts and politics, on the other hand, it reflects the influence of a specific social demand on him. Yan Fu himself was a navy cadet and had been sent abroad to learn the techniques of vessel engineering and skilled in mathematics. Why he chose the western political works to translate instead of works concerning his specialty? The answer can be traced to the social conditions in which he lived: China's defeat in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895 created deep sorrow, shock and despair in China, it simultaneously aroused some patriots' sense of responsibility. They realized the superiority of western economic and political systems, and they desired to introduce new foreign knowledge to save China out of the dangerous condition. Yan Fu was a pioneer among them. Therefore, the purpose of their translation and the works they chose to translate were closely related to the demand of the age they were in. Translation as a holy and difficult career was linked to the fate of the country.

Fifty years later, the constriction of social factors such as the ideology on the translation activity was still very obvious. Within the 17- year period from 1949 to 1966, another translation climax appeared. After analysis, it's not difficult for us to find out that the majority of translations were from Russian works, and only a small number of American and British works were translated during this period. Some scholars who didn't know Russian even strived to translate Russian works in the other language version. This phenomenon occurred because China was greatly influenced by the Soviet Union at the beginning of the founding of the People's Republic of China, China took Soviet Union as an example in every aspect, and thus great importance was attached to the translation of Russian works. However, due to the idea that America and Britain were enemies of the socialist system, their works may have been considered a threat to socialism. Only about 400 English literary works were published in 17 years.

Since "translation is a cross-cultural communication", the cultural factor in translation can by no means be ignored. In view of the fact that the concept of culture has a broad meaning, here the influence of ethic factors was taken as an example to explore the constrictions on translators in certain cultural background is described.

Every person grows up under the care of his family and receives planned training from schools or communities, and forms certain values, which always exerts influence on his behavior. The act of translation is also influenced by a translator's value. When the translator encounters some content of the source text that is not in conformity with the target language culture, he may delete it or remold it. A case in point is Zhu Shenghao, a famous translator, who once rendered "He made you a highway to my bed; but I , a maid, die maiden-windowed." In Remeo and Juliet as "   [   ]

            " Juliet expected it to be dark soon, and then she would hang a rope ladder down from her window so that her sweetheart Romeo might be able to climb by the rope ladder into her room. With the rope ladder still in her hands, she sighed sadly. Another more direct translation is"

            " It is clear that Zhu transformed Juliet's candid expression of her expectation of physical pleasure into expectation of spiritual love just like that by a virtuous Chinese maiden. (Xie Tianzhen, 1999:6-7). Obviously, the translator's ethic value takes control over his translation.

Moreover, every translator lives in a given society with its special social background and specific power system. The translation produced in a particular period, must have been branded with the distinct characteristics of the times, from the thought to the language.

As we know, Yan Fu was the leading figure of the Tong Cheng School in the late Qing Dynasty. His translation of *Evolution and Ethics* is characterized by the embellishment and flowery words present in the style of the Tong Cheng School. Wang Kefei comments that *Evolution and Ethics* was translated with a particular purpose and strategy in a special historical period. Here, the particular strategy just refers to employing the popular and prevalent literary style to create a smooth and domesticated version for the intelligentsia and high-rank official of that society, who only read such elegant works. It is believed that the translation of *Evolution and Ethics* is the product of his times under the manipulation of the social background. His peers, Lin Shu, Liang Qichao, Su Manshu, all adopted the traditional Chinese fiction style with the antithetical couplets as the head of each chapter, to translate western novels, ignoring western novel's textual features, so as to cater for the readers' taste.

In addition, the public's attitude to translated literature and its status in target culture, as well as the specific translational view at that time also exert a subtle influence on the translator, which makes the translator realize the discrepancy between

the source culture and the target culture, providing the translator with a special cultural attitude, which inevitably will affect his translation choices and strategies.

4.1.3 Creativity of the Translator

From the above discussion, we find that translation is a very complex activity, involving many subjective and objective factors. During the translation process, the translator is unavoidably restricted by many conditions and factors. Just because of "obstacles" caused by the linguistic and cultural discrepancies, the translator possesses some creative room to achieve various translation purposes. And the translator should display his great creativity in the limited space. As the famous scholar Liu Miqing pointed out, "Objective restrictions just reflect one negative aspect of the translation feature, while the whole translation activity is a process in which translator gives full play of his subjective creativity to overcome those objective restrictions." (Liu Miqing, 1999:53)

In a sense, the translator is a creator. And translation is often considered to be a creative activity; it is fundamentally creative for a number of reasons. First of all, translation is not merely the transformation of an original text into its literary equivalent, and it must successfully convey the overall meaning of the original, including that text's surrounding cultural significance. Second, the translator has to weave ideas in the ST into the structure of TL. In addition, the process of searching out a TL counterpart to various ST words or phrases is often creative.

The translators' creativity is most evidently manifested in literary translation, and as someone argues "there is no fundamental difference between the work of translators and that of painters or writers."

Wilss (1996) maintains that "the most competent translators possess a malleable and creative mind", which is part of the translator's "translation intelligence".

Nida (1969) suggests that "translation is neither a science nor an independent discipline, but a creative technology with insights from several disciplines".

Snell Hornby (2001) points out that language norms give the translator an "initiative creative potential". The translator can make "creative extensions" of the norms; and Snell Hornby concludes: "the language norm is in fact supremely flexible and it offers potential for creativity within the possibilities of the language system. This is of crucial importance for the translator, especially the literary translator".

The translator's creativity goes through the whole translation process from text reading, interpretation to presentation, and can be seen from a lot of aspects in

translation, such as skillful conveyance of meaning, crafty creation of language form and structure, as well as reproduction of the original flavor and style and so on.

Translation starts with the translator's reading and understanding of the source text. The indeterminacies and blanks of the ST make it possible for translators to make creative additions. The translator's reading and understanding is a process of concretization rather than a kind of passive acceptance. On the contrary, understanding itself is a positive and constructive behavior, with the translator's subjective and creative involvement.

According to the conception of "fusion of horizons" advanced by Gadamer. "Fusion of horizons" is a key to the activity of understanding. The horizon refers to every person's and every text's pre-determinacy and openness brought about by "pre-understanding" and "prejudice". Gadamer argues that different historical situations lead to different horizons, and different individuals own different horizons, which are not closed but open. An interpreter keeps interacting with a text in order to broaden his horizons and form new horizons. The fusion of horizons occurs between the past experience that is embodied in the text and the preference of its present readers. Gadamer argues that all interpretation of past literature arises from a dialogue between past and present. Our attempts to understand a work will depend on the questions that our own cultural environment allows us to raise. Our present perspective always involves a relationship to the past. Understanding is a process of fusing one's present horizons with a text's past horizons, subsequently new horizons are produced and they surpass the previous two horizons. That is to say, the authentic understanding involves receptors' creativity of a text.

According to the translator, Peng Qiurong, "interpretation is the essence of translation". She claims that this essence of translation depends on the features of language and culture, including the features of characters, syntax, distribution of meanings and semantic non-correspondence, etc. And the whole translation process consists of two procedures of information reception and information release.

The translator, while undertaking interpretation in the process of information reception, is required to try to fuse his own horizon of expectation with the text's horizon, to bring his imagination to full play and to undertake the interpretation of the source text to the greatest degree it allows. Just as Guo Moro ever said, while translating the poem by P.B.Shelley　1792-1822　'I want to let myself be Shelley', and 'let Shelly be myself'; I want 'to lend all ears to his aspirations', 'to sympathize with him', and 'to

fuse with him into one'; (Luo Xinzhang, 1984:334) or in the words of Li Jiaxi, 'to get into the text.' But after 'getting into the text' and 'sympathizing' with the author, the translator while planning to release the information to the target language reader, has to 'jump out' of it, restrain his own rich imagination and make a sober and scientific analysis and judgment of the form, the content and the style of the source text, and then press the received information in the target text, which is required to be as close as possible to the source text so that the target text can also own a vast space resembling that of the source text, where the target language reader can also bring his imagination into full play.

"Translation is creative treason."(Xie Tianzheng,2001) This saying sings high praise of the translator's creative efforts. Literary translation conveying the original artistic charm and aesthetic value is a tough project. In the words of Mao Dun, "Literary translation is to produce the original artistic images in another language so that target readers can be inspired, touched and aesthetically entertained in the same way as one reads the source text." In order to realize this demanding goal, translators must grasp the original aesthetic value through reading and researching. Apart from bi-lingual proficiency and bi-cultural competence, they should apply literary insight and aesthetic sensitivity. They should also take the target reader's expectation of horizons into account. In this sense, their recreation is by no means a simple copy of the source text but a different kind of writing task. Operating the target language, translators must make full use of every level of language, namely semantic, lexical, syntactic properties, or rhetorical devices, paragraphs, sentences. Translators enjoy a high degree of freedom in recreation so long as they fulfill the task of transferring the original message.

Let's take the famous sentence "to be or not to be: that's the question" as example:

—

Cheng Guohua,1996:25-33

Because the original sentence is very concise, with the open structure—"to be or not to be", it provides translators a high degree of freedom for imagination and creation. Therefore, the differences among the translations are obvious, due to the translators' various imagination and understanding. The different choices of words such as "

"and "   " "   "and "   " "   " and "   " as well as "   "and "

" reflect the individual and creative understanding and appreciation of the translators.
Apart from this, Liang Shiqiu adds"   "to"   "   and Zhu Shenghao
puts"   "before "   "   which just manifests that translators' creativity
plays an important role in their understanding and reproducing of the source text.

After the translator gives full play to his rich imagination in information reception,
he will turn to the procedure of information release, i.e. representation. On this stage,
his creativity must be displayed to the highest degree, which is embodied in his creative
use of target language and translation techniques.

In translation we often find it difficult to search out the exact meaning of some
words in dictionary, which needs the translator to comprehend the additive and
rhetorical meaning according to the context. Thus, translation is by no means the simple
transformation of linguistic symbols. A successful translation lies mainly in the
translator's creative selection of appropriate words, phrases and his creative
presentation of the exact meaning of the original one. When there are gaps between the
language's surface meaning and its real connotation, and literary translation can not
convey the connotation successfully, the translator should make full use of his abstract
thinking ability and imagination to make creative translation in accordance with the
context. For example:

Original: *Those who feel it is okay to tell white lies soon go colorblind.*

Translation:

Obviously, it will be unintelligible if the word "colorblind" is translated into"   ".
So we can see that the quality of translation is sometimes determined by the translator's
creativity. According the word "white lie" in the sentence, the translator deduces that
"colorblind" used here to mean "cannot separate 'white lies' from 'black lies'", i.e."

"in Chinese. So translators sometimes cannot mechanically remove words'
meaning defined in dictionary to the translated version, usually they need to translate in
a flexible manner. The reproduction of the original meaning in the target language is on
the premise of the translators' creativity at vocabulary level. Whether this
"reproduction" can be successfully realized, it is sometimes decided on whether the
translator can slip the leash of language framework to convey the original meaning with
appropriate target language structure. Let's compare the two translated version of the
example sentence:

Original: *He was a good father, within his limitations.*

Translated version 1:

Translated version 2:

In Translation version 1 "   "is the "transplant" directly from the original structure, which leads the obscure translation. However, the kernel meaning is "   "In this translation, deconstruction of the original kernel structure plays a key role, and the successful translation is usually the recreation of language form and structure.

Translators not only have to convey the original meaning correctly, but also reproduce the original flavor and style successfully. That is to say, during the process of appreciating, accepting and expressing of source text's artistic beauty, the translator ought to reproduce the most equivalent aesthetic meaning of the source text in the target text through his aesthetic recreation. Especially, when translating some weak translatable source text, the translator's presentation of the original aesthetic meaning not only is decided on his bilingual capability but also depends on his exertion of his imagination and creativity, which can be seen from the following example:

Original: It was a splendid population—for all the slow, sleepy, sluggish-brained sloths stayed at home. (Mark Twin)

Translated version 1:   —

Translated version 2:   —

Translated version 3: (   )   —

In the sentence, five alliterative words are used correlated with "splendid", which achieves a strong humorous effect and increases the difficulty of translation at the same time. Comparatively, translated version 3 uses five expressions with the same word "   " contained. It basically creates Mark Twin's style and reflects the rhetorical features of the original one both in sound and language form. As the result of the translator's creation, translated version 3 is more successful than the other two. The translator's creativity can also be seen from the following example:

Original:

Translation   Most Chinese daughters have desire so strong,

                To face the powder and not to powder the face.   Xu Yuanchong

The translator uses two "face" and "powder" in the poem, which are in the same

form but belong to different parts of speech respectively. The two phrases "face the powder" "powder the face" are skillfully used and bring about a particular effect, which successfully reproduces the meaning and style of the original one "   " through the translator's creation.

It goes without saying that translation is by no means "small trick"; it is actually a kind of creation. And translator is a creator. As we enjoy the artistic beauty of translated text —the translator's creation—we may understand the significance and necessity of the translator' subjective consciousness and aesthetic recreation in translation.

Moreover, translators' creativity is also manifested in their creative identity of cultures in the society. Translation plays an irreplaceable role in cultural exchange and evolution. The translated text even transcends the original text when the former becomes the source to shape and control target culture. In this process, the translator's attitudes, decisions can greatly influence the TC and the readers in it. St.Jerome (340-420) believed that translation could be used to expropriate ideas from another culture to enrich one's own. For example, translation has played fundamental role in forming today's English language and literature. Britain shaped a national literary identity through borrowing from other languages. It also influenced other languages and literatures in the course of cultural migrations that occurred in Europe since at least the medieval period. Therefore, English has become a "mixed, impure, and constantly shifting medium" and even an international language as many people think. The English literary canon has translated material at its heart. There is the *Authorized Version of Hebrew Scriptures,* and classical works in Greek, which are read and discussed in translation by many who study them. Beowulf, the oldest surviving epic, is a translation that has been canonized as one of the "original" texts of English literature, and Shakespeare was inspired by the work of the translators from different countries.

Besides, translators' activities in China have served as a motivating force, pushing the country's process and enriching its culture. The earliest translators were Chinese monks who are conversant in both the doctrines and Sanskrit, and translated numerous Buddhist scriptures by Indian and Central Asian Buddhist monks in the late Han Dynasty. Their translation continued for more than 1,000 years, leaving a permanent influence on China's religion, philosophy and society. In the late Ming Dynasty of the 16th century, Jesuit missionaries from the west came to China using translation to spread Catholicism and teach science and technology. In the early Qing Dynasty, humiliated by Chinese underdevelopment in science and military, Chinese scholars and patriots

translated many works in social sciences and military strategy. During the late Qing, China's academic and some farsighted Mandarin officials realized that weapons alone couldn't save the nation and hoped to inspire and educate their countrymen. As a result, literary translation prevailed. The influx of western novels hastened the birth of a new Chinese literature. During this period, translations ranged from political, educational, science and technological works to novels, essays, poetry, and drama. The most recent translation climax began in the 1980s. More and more excellent translators join in the work of translating. The founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 enabled translation to enter onto a new era. Translation has become a very important part of the national cultural and educational cause. As cultural creators, innumerable translators are actively involved in not only introducing foreign culture into China but also introducing Chinese culture to the outside world.

We have expounded the three characteristics of translator's subjectivity. However, it must be noted that these three characteristics don't exist independently; they are dialectical unity in which they act on each other and coexist in the whole translation activity. Because the translator has to be restricted by various factors, and in order to achieve his translation purpose, he must give full play to his creativity.

4.2 Manifestation of the Subjectivity of the Translator

The subjectivity of translator runs through the whole translation activity. That is to say, the subjectivity of the translator is not only manifested in his understanding, interpretation of the source text, and his artistic recreation at language level, but also manifested in his selection of translation text, translation strategies, and his concrete cultural purpose as well as his manipulation on the expected cultural effect of target text. In the next part, the subjectivity of the translator will be further explored through analyzing its embodiment in the translation process, in the translator' s cultural consciousness and orientation, in the awareness of readers, in the intertextual relationship between the target text and the source text, the target text and target literature, and in the inter-subjectivity of translation.

4.2.1 In the Translation Process

The translation process is the key link in the whole translation chain, in which the manifestation of the translator' subjectivity is the most striking. Let's take literary translation as example. During the translation process, the translator ought to display his capability as triple identities— as reader, interpreter, and writer (creator of the TT)

The translator has to conduct a careful study of the original as a reader before translating in written form, but he, as a reader with the special mission or purpose, is different from general readers. He reads in order to produce, decodes in order to re-encode. The translator's understanding of the source text is inescapably universal, historical and creative as Gadamer points out. As for a given text, although it reflects the objectivity of both outside and inside world and therefore has the function of orientation— reflects certain aspects of the world, there may still be some blankness, or cultural default, discontinuity   some translational ideas may be left out intentionally or unintentionally by the source text writer , and indeterminacies. These uncertainties and blankness result in discontinuity. All these put together leaves the reader and the translator opportunities and enough space to use their imagination, to fill in the blankness and to resolve the uncertainties. According to Hermeneutics, translation is indeed interpretation. Interpreting is to tap the latent meanings; this includes the cultural condensations such as values, world outlook, and national character, in addition to the surface meaning of the work. Translation is not a process of precise reproduction of meaning from one language to another but a process of the translator's interpretation, presenting one's own understanding of the meaning by such means as active reading, extrapolation, paraphrasing and explaining. So interpretation of the source text requires creativity. In the reading and interpreting process, the translator needs to maneuver his literary abilities such as emotions, volition, aesthetics, and imagination, thus concretize the indeterminacies or blankness in the evocative structure of the source text. In the dialogue between the source text and him, the translator adjusts an individual pre-structure to the structure of the source text and hence achieves the fusion between the two fields of horizons so as to make text meaning more completely constructed. Different interpretation and translation of   written by Li Shangyin   will shed a light on this point.

3   4

5   6

Translated version 1 :   The Sad Zither

Why should the zither sad have fifty strings?

Each string, each strain evokes but vanished springs;

Dim morning dream to be a butterfly;

Amorous heart poured out in cuckoo's cry.

In moonlit pearls see tears in mermaid's eyes;

From sunburnt emerald let vapor rise!

Such feeling cannot be recalled again;

It seemed long-lost e'en when it was felt then.   (translated by Xu Yuanchong) (Xu Yuanchong, 1997:340)

Translated version 2 :   Jeweled Zither

Vain are the jeweled zither's fifty strings;

Each string, each stop, bears thought of vanished things.

The sage of his loved butterflies daydreaming;

The king that sighed his soul into a bird;

Tears that are pearls, in ocean moonlight streaming;

Jade mists the sun distils form Sapphire Sward;

Why need their memory to recall today? —

A day was theirs, which is now passed away.   (translated by John A. Turner) (Xu Yuanchong, 1997:338)

The poet Li Shangyin inserted a lot of literary quotations into his poem. Even though clear indications are provided for the allusions used, it is still difficult to determine the poem's concrete meaning. Therefore, the uncertainty of the word in the poem evokes various possibilities for imagination and interpretation, hence results in the completely different translation: In terms of Xu Yuanchong's interpretation and translation, this poem is created to express the poet's lament for his wife. So all the images of "sad zither", "dim morning", "amorous heart", "cuckoo's cry", "tears in mermaid's eyes" and "such feeling" indicate the poet's deep grief for losing his lover. However, John A.Turner understands and translates the poem from another perspective. The using of such words as "vain", "bear thought of", "vanished thing", "day-dreaming", "sigh his soul into a bird", "jade mists", "recall", "a day of theirs" and "passed away" just expresses the poet's disconsolate and sentimental feeling for the elapsed youth.

Undoubtedly, the two entirely different interpretation and translation of the poem are both reasonable. Different scholars should have made all kinds of speculation on the

historical environment the poet lived and the purpose of the poet's creation, so as to obtain a persuasive understanding and interpretation. But due to their different personal experience, pre-understanding, and cognitive mode, the interpretations are bound to be different. And different meanings will come into being from the blankness in text, leading to the plurality of interpretation. And different translations just reflect translators' initiative and subjective creativity.

After the translator makes a thorough understanding and appropriate interpretation of the ST and gets the text meaning completely constructed, he will turn to the language transformation procedure, which is more creative than mechanical. The translator should endeavor to convey from the ST to the TT not only the basic information but also the aesthetic characteristic and language style. He has to maneuver what he has obtained from the ST as a reader and interpreter, and makes it fuse into the language transformation, i.e. presentation. Translation is a kind of creation that is different from the original author's creation. Although literary translator is restricted from the ST, it contains the creativity of the translator at the same time. It is crucial to slip the linguistic leash and convey both the original content and cultural connotation. Only if the translator tries to hold the same attitude as the author, and take the target cultural surrounding into account, can he create excellent translation that not only conforms to the author's purpose but also is acceptable to target readers. Enlightenment can be drawn from Wang Zuoliang's translation of *A Dirge* written by Shelley.

<center>A Dirge</center>

Rough wing, that moanest loud

Grief too sad for song;

Wild wind, when sullen cloud

Knells all the night long;

Sad storm, whose tears are vain,

Bares woods, whose branches strain,

Deep caves and dreary main,—

Wail, for the world's wrong!

—

We can find from the translation of the poem that the translator conducts creativity on the premise of conveying the original content information. His creativity is mainly manifested in the following aspects: firstly, the translated poem possesses rich connotation with concise words, which is similar to the original; secondly, the artistic feature and rhythm of the original are completely reflected in the translated work, and the translated poem is the reproduction of the original in style rather than merely similar to the original in form; in addition, the translated poem properly expresses the author's strong aspiration of promoting justice, and conceives a kind of crafty and abundant artistic conception, which provides the readers with the same artistic enjoyment as they obtained from reading in its original language.

The translator is the most dynamic element of the translation process. The translator has to make a full play to the subjectivity, or consciousness, in achieving a comprehensive understanding of the original and an appropriate representation in the target language. Since the manifestation of the translator's subjectivity is the most striking in the process, so far, the majority of studies concerned are focused on this aspect. However, we can attempt to expound the manifestation of the translator's subjectivity from other aspects.

4.2.2 Translator's cultural awareness and orientations

4.2.2.1 Translator's cultural awareness

Since translation is a kind of cultural communication, three cultures are generally interacting in the process: (1) the source language culture, (2) the translator's culture and (3) the receptor culture. This cultural mixture sets up the translation or communication context in which each component needs to be clearly understood by the translator who desires to engage in communicating the meaning and spirit of the source text with a minimum amount of cultural skewing. So it is crucial for the translator to have a keen sense of cultural awareness so as to make successful communication. As the translator knows and understands his own window on reality, he can consciously make adjustments and predict trouble spots that will demand special care.

Cultural awareness is a particular way of thinking, a criterion for judgment or an acute sensitivity to cultural element consciously or subconsciously cultivated by the translator. The translator's cultural awareness involves at least three aspects:

First, the translator must have a thorough understanding of the source language culture. Without an adequate understanding of the source language culture, the translator cannot hope to convey the author's message effectively across the temporal and cultural chasm separating it from the receptor. If the source culture is not the one which the translator belongs to, it is necessary for the translator to take a learner's attitude when entering the new context—approach the situation with a desire to learn and not judge; accept their view of reality and discover what it means to live by those standards he must pay attention to, those cultural elements that are not to be found or different from the target culture and decide how they can be properly transferred not only into the target language but also the target cultural environment too. Only then can the translator successfully realize his role as interlingual or intercultural mediators. Otherwise, there will be some mistranslation due to the translator's misunderstanding or lack of cultural knowledge. For instance:

2

Though plenty was left after death, he forgot to hold his hand back; only at the end of the road does one think of turning on the right back.

(Translated by the Yangs)

If there is sufficiency behind you, you may concentrate on going forward. When there is no road in front of you, you should think about turning back.

(Translated by Hawkes)

The Chinese antithetic couplet seems very simple, but it has rich implication, indicating that one should be content with his lot and know how to stop before going too far. This is actually a Chinese rule of conduct bearing the Taoist philosophical thought. Comparing the two versions, a careful reader will find that the Yangs' version is based on their deep understanding of Chinese culture while Hawkes' version seems unfaithful and it is a misunderstanding due to his different outlook on life. From this example we can see the importance of grasping cultural distinctions both implicit and explicit in the source text.

Second, the translator must become thoroughly involved with the receptor language and culture in order to effectively translate the message of the source so as to avoid distortion caused by differences in language or culture. It is essential that the translator understand the target language culture to the greatest extent: its features,

concerns, needs, interests, beliefs and values, i.e. its system. In case the translator is working in his own or related sociolingustic contexts, it goes without saying that his world outlook will easily match the receptor culture. But, if the translator is transferring from his native culture to a completely new culture, it is rational that the translator be considerate to the other's behavior, social customs and feelings. Or else the translation might be obscure or awkward so that it will cause difficulty for understanding.

Third, the translator also has his own culture. In general, the culture prevailing in a country will determine in many important respects the way in which individual people will perceive their surroundings, how they will interpret what they see, and how they will react to it. Hence, the translator's habits and options will be inevitably influenced by his society's dominant norms. More often than not, he may view the original text through their own culture glasses and relate to the receptor by means of cross-cultural interaction. In translation practice, the essential problem for him with culture-bound or culture-generated texts is that there is no correspondence between the perception of the cultural reality of the sender and that of the receiver. Accordingly, he is often in the middle of two demands that seem almost impossible to reconcile. On one side, the author calls out to him: respect my property, don't take anything from me and don't attribute anything false to me. On the other side, the reader demands: respect our taste, give us only what we like and how we like it. To solve these problems, the translator has to strike a balance between the culture as acceptable to the author of the original, and the other culture, which is acceptable and familiar to the translator, himself and his readers.

4.2.2.2 Translator's cultural orientations

Since the translator plays a dynamic role in the process of translation as a mediator with keen sense of cultural awareness, his attitude towards different cultures is of vital importance to the understanding and reproducing of the source text. Due to the differences between two cultures, he always between the devil and deep sea to decide which culture his translation should be based on. This cultural orientation of the translator usually takes on three typical models. They are: (1) the target culture oriented model in which the translator places the target culture in the dominant place. He values the target culture norms so much that source culture elements are blocked and consequently disappear in the target text; (2) the source culture oriented model in which the translator gives priority to the source culture. He considers the source culture incompatible with the target culture but so strong as to be transplanted into the target

culture; (3) the integrating model in which the translator shows respect to both the target culture and source culture without upsetting the target culture norms. As a translation operator, the translator naturally has enough flexibility to choose among the three models. Apart from restrictions from social circumstances and patrons, there are various factors including the translator's purpose of translation, his cultural background knowledge and his attitude towards target text reader and foreign culture that influence his cultural orientation.

In general, the following factors will possibly make the translator follow model 1: (1) the translator intends his translation to be appreciated and enjoyed by the general readers not to inform them of an alien culture; (2) the translator is a member of the target culture. Accordingly, his cultural knowledge is deeply rooted in the target culture that greatly influences his world outlook, value, custom and way of thinking;(3) he regards translation as communication and his responsibility as removing cultural difference, so he tries to narrow the gap between the source culture and the target culture by strictly following the target cultural norms; (4) he places his readers in the first place, aiming to produce the same response of the target text readers as that of the source text readers; (5) he believes the target culture is central or authoritative, which imposes censorship restrictions so that the source cultural elements will find no way into the target culture.

By contrast, factors, which make the translator, opt for model 2 include: (1) the translator means to introduce the source cultural elements into the target culture; (2) he is a member of the source culture that greatly influences his world outlook, value, custom and way of thinking, and he shares a lot in common with the original author; (3) he considers translation as a way of cultural interchange and believes it necessary to help the target text readers know different features of another culture; (4) he shows great respect to the author of the original and tries to be faithful to the author and the source text as much as possible.

However, there are occasions on which neither model 1 nor model 2 is workable to convey the cultural connotations as well as the linguistic meaning of the text, the translator has no choice but resort to model 3 in order to make a compromise between the source culture and target culture. Furthermore, with increasing interconnections between people of different nations in terms of politics, economy and culture, cultural difference tend to be interactive on each other and mutually promotive. Language and culture are always in a process of change, and they tend to be enlarged. As a result,

model 3 is adopted when translators are developing an egalitarian attitude toward the source and target culture without causing cultural shock, or when the target culture is ready to tolerate foreign cultures and yet retain its own norms.

4.2.3 Translator's awareness of the readers

Traditional translation theories always neglect the active participation and creative force of the readers and regard the source text and target text as a static object with the aim to reproduce the original and produce an equivalent effect. Reader's response has been highlighted in this theory, for a translation is normally intended for a target language reader. From the perspective of reader-response theory, translation means communication between the text and the reader. One important criterion for translation is to judge whether it meets the requirement of the reader's reception capacity, which is in a historical and dynamic context. Erwin Wolff proposed the concept of "intended reader", referring to the imagined readers in author's mind when writing. Similarly, Terry Eagleton advanced the concept of "implied reader". In order to make the TT accepted and play a particular role in target cultural context, the translator has to consider the "horizon of expectation" of the "implied" or "intended" readers, which will decide the corresponding translation strategies the translator adopts.

Here, the translator's consideration of the "horizon of expectation" of readers can be expounded under three situations.

In the first case, translators choose source text in accordance with the ideology of the majority of readers and adopt corresponding translation techniques according to their ideology and reading interest. This is shown in the translations of foreign fictions running through the end of Qing Dynasty to early years of the Republic of China.

In the second case, translators attempt to subvert the dominant ideology through translation, then, the translation works selected by them must be far away from the reader's expectation of horizon. The translators need to adopt some flexible strategies to seduce readers to accept the translation so that they can deliver the information and meaning of source text successfully. Yan Fu is a representative of this type.

As Yan Fu himself once declared, "my translation is not intended to benefit school children, but for those who have read much of ancient Chinese writings.[7]"

These people, proud of ancient Chinese culture, tended to be very conservative; they generally had a special preference for writings of classic elegance and looked down upon the unorthodox writings. Yan Fu noticed the advanced thoughts in western culture, which, he thought were of great use to the then China in frustration and peril. In order to

seduce the feudal literati and officials into reading his translations and accepting the advanced thoughts of western culture, Yan Fu took great trouble to have the source expressions domesticated. Take Yan's translation of the *Evolution and Ethics* for example, which was written in the first person, Yan changed the first person pronoun to "   ", the name of the original writer "Huxley". Here is the first paragraph of *Evolution and Ethics* by Huxley:

It may be safely assumed that, two thousand years ago, before Caesar set foot in Southern Britain, the whole country-side visible from the windows of the room in which I write, as in what is called "the state of nature". Except, it may be, by raising a few sepulchral mounds, such as those which still, here and there, break the flowing contours of the downs, man's hands had made no mark upon it; and the thin veil of vegetation which overspread the broad-backed heights and the shelving sides of the combed was unaffected by his industry. The native grasses and weeds, the scattered patches of gorse, contended with one another for the possession of the scanty surface soil; they fought against the droughts of summer, the frosts of winter, and the furious gales which swept with unbroken force, now form the Atlantic, and now from the North Sea, at all times of the year; they filled up, as they best might, the gaps made in their ranks by all sorts of underground and overground animal ravagers. One year with another, an average population, the floating balance of the unceasing struggle for the existence among the indigenous plants, maintained itself. It is as little to be doubted, that an essentially similar state of nature prevailed, in this regard, for many thousand years before the coming of Caesar; and there is no assignable reason for denying that it might continue to exist through an equally prolonged futurity, except from the intervention of man.

The change of the first person pronoun here, most probably, aimed to make the translation read like a Chinese historical essay or book, which usually begins with the

name of the writer. Since in Chinese literary culture at that time, there was no tradition of using the first person narrator in the same article as that in the original. In this case, if the translator followed the original strategy of representation, he would run the risk of presenting what his intended readers might regarded as aesthetically strange. Except for the change to the first person pronoun, the use of many orderly expressions of four characters was also characteristic of ancient Chinese writings. In Yan Fu's translations, he also arranged chapters and paragraphs so they would be consistent with the style of presentation and organization of ideas found in Chinese classics. This was because the implied readership for his work was mainly scholar-bureaucrats and even governcrats, who were erudite and familiar with classical Chinese writing. As Wang Zuoliang pointed out, this was like to coat the bitter medicine with sugar. This sugar coat was nothing but the highly domesticated and elegant form that Yan Fu's intended readers preferred. Owing to his flexible strategies, Yan Fu was thus able to appeal to government officials, who at the time played an important political role, and won their support. His translation of *Evolution and Ethics* set off a heated debate throughout the country, involving scholars, conservative bureaucrats and the Manchu aristocracy. The debate overflowed into the schools, where the text was frequently used for instructional purposes and the "survival of the fittest" became a favorite essay topic.

In the third situation, when certain cultural or literary reforming awareness is sprouting but still very weak, translators may observantly catch this sign, choose related works to translate in order to support those readers with reforming consciousness, which can attract more readers and strength for reforms at the same time. Typical examples under this situation are Chinese scholar's translations of western cultural works and modernist literatures in 1980s.

Lefevere mentioned three key factors that manipulate translation— poetics, ideology and patronage. (Lefevere, 1995) Various restrictions in TL culture polysystem are usually placed on translators, who need to hold certain cultural and aesthetic judgment and orientation. The result of the translator's judgment and orientation will then be manifested in his choices of the ST, translation strategies, and his interpretation of the text (individual opinion in the preface and postscript of the translated text) and so on. Therefore, if translation studies are conducted through comparing the ST and the TT at language level without taking the cultural context and the subjectivity of the translator into account, the conclusion drawn is inevitably one-sided and superficial, which leaves behind the more important factor— culture. Provided that the translator's

consciousness of the TL culture and readers is taken into consideration when analyzing the translated text, the translator's deliberate "mistranslation" and abridgement will not be denounced as "poor translation". On the contrary, "those logical translation errors in translated text just mirror the translator's responsible and strict attitude". (Kong Huiyi,1996) Especially during the shift in culture and literature, translators often adopt some flexible strategies to approach the readers' expectation of horizon in ethic, cultural and literary aspects so as to obtain their acceptance.

4.2.4 In the Intertextual Relationship between the TT and the ST, the TT and the Target Literature

The intertextuality theory was first advanced by the French Post-structuralist critic, Julia Kristeva, in 1969. She believes "every text is constructed as a mosaic of citations, every text is an absorption and transformation of other texts."(Hatim & Mason, 2001:125) That is to say, there exists a complex relationship between different texts, which is the so-called intertextuality. Lemke identifies two kinds of intertextual relationship. The first type is the relationships which exist between elements of a given text; The second type of intertextual relationship consists of those which exist between distinct texts. (Hatim & Mason,2001:125)

The intertexuality theory also reveals the successive and development relation between different texts. In detail, the connotation of intertexuality includes: 1) rewriting of the text; 2completing of the text; 3) interpreting of the text. According to the intertexuality theory, the ST and the TT are intertexts. The ST can be considered to be a pretext, and then the TT is its derivative text. The translator serves as the media between these two texts, and plays an important role for his multiple identities as mentioned above —as reader (to complete the text), interpreter (to interpret the text), and writer (to rewrite the text). The translator at first is a reader. When reading, the translator is always influenced by a background environment including the society, age, and culture in which he lives and his own experience as well. The completion of the same text often varies from translator to translator, resulting from their different background as well as different knowledge and understanding of ST and the author. As interpreter, the translator needs to grasp the most reasonable meaning in the text, i.e. the original meaning of the author. So the translator has to explore the implied meaning to the greatest degree to determine the author's intention. During this process, the translator needs to re-shape the world of the author in his mind. The translator may take advantage of the literary and historical factors in the ST, research various texts related to the ST,

and refer to other non-literary materials for help in the appropriate interpretation of the ST. The translator's reading activity can be regarded as literary criticism and intended to understand and interpret the text in macro sense so as to determine the method of the presentation. The translator is the media between the pretext (the source text) and the derivative text (the target text). He consciously rewrites the pretext and presents it in another language, which just reflects the direct intertextual relationship between the ST and the TT. The ST, when entering the TL culture, is branded with the TL cultures due to the translator's cultural consciousness and value orientation mentioned above, and loaded with the cultural and epochal connotations of the TL. The translated text is no longer a copy of the original, but a recreated one, a rewritten product by the translator, which is closely related to the ST, and is a derivative life of the original in an "unexpected frame of the reference". It is an "afterlife" (Benjiamin, 2000: 197-224) with an independent life and value, and is a new work in the TL, which will conduct a brand-new literary communication with new readers. (Zhan Mingjian, 2003).

The life of the translated text is given by the translator, who not only can endow it with life, but also can decide what kind of life to give, how to make it enter the TL literature. (Lefevere, 1995) It is the subjectivity of the translator that endows the translated text with independent aesthetic quality and target cultural characteristic. In view of the independent life of the TT, we can say the TT is not subordinate to the ST but an intertext of the ST. Moreover, the TT also exerts certain influence on the target culture and forms an intertexual relation with composing literatures in the target culture.

These two intertextual relations just manifest the creativity of the translator, and reveal his consciousness of target culture as well. If we clarify that the TT has its own independent life, then it may be not difficult to understand that the translation doesn't mean a lower literary status than the original and its literary and cultural significance is not less than that of the original. (Xu Jun, 2002)

4.2.5 In the Inter-Subjectivity of Translation

The translator's subjectivity is also manifested in the relationship with the author. This relationship has been explored through analyzing the literary styles or personalities before. There are two distinctive views, one is "the translator should imitate the author's style", the other is "the translator should keep his own style". Every person has a unique style, and writer's style is closely related to personality and aesthetic capabilities and so on. In view of this, the former view emphasizes the author's subjectivity should be respected, while the later one attaches great importance to the manifestation of the

translator's subjectivity. Chapter Two mentions that the author and the translator are both subjects in links of the translation chain; here, I'd like to explore their relationship in accordance with the Inter-subjectivity theory. Inter-subjectivity is a feature of the interaction of different subjects, which is a necessary part of the subjectivity of human. Subject exists in relation with other subjects, and remains its individuality at the same time. And the inter-subjectivity refers to the co-existence of different individuals (Yang Chunshi,2002)

According to Inter- subjectivity theory, the translator and the author co-exist in the act of translation, and the translation is the interaction of them. The ST provides a platform for communication between the translator and the author, also is the topic of their dialogue, then translation is the process of their dialogue, and the translated work is the result of their dialogue. Since translation is a kind of communication, as one participant of the communication, the translator cannot and should not be a passive servant of the author. The translator and the author are equal participants in the dialogue. A dialogue should not be a soliloquy with one party monopolizing the power of discourse, or the translator's mechanical echo of the author. Every translation has a dual nature —the voice of the author, and the voice of the translator. The translator may sympathize with the author, or sometimes disagree with the author. The creative treason in translation just reflects the translator's "argument" against the author in accordance with his specific epochal cultural context. Owing to the two voices existing in translation, the translated works are endowed with two important values.

The relationship between the translator and readers is also very important content in studies on inter-subjectivity. The relation of the author versus the translator differs from the relation of the translator versus the target readers, because the translator is not the intended reader of the author, but the target reader may be the intended reader of the translator. In view of the "intended reader", the dialogue between the translator and readers does not begin with the readers' reading of the translated work, but with the translator's choices and his consideration of translation strategies, which is manifested in the translator's consciousness of readers discussed above. The readers' reading of the translated text is the last link in the translation chain, which determines whether the translation purpose has been achieved in the end. If we believe the translator's cultural creativity is materialized in the translated text, then the readers' cultural creativity may be shown in their reading and understanding of the translated text, even their actual cultural actions. The translator's cultural intentions implied in the translated text and the

translator's interpretation of the translated text in its preface and postscript demands readers' reading, understanding and sympathizing, so as to be converted into actual cultural actions. Therefore, the actual cultural significance and effect of the translated works are decided on the inter-subjective relationship and the result of the dialogues between the author, the translator and the readers.

Chapter Five   Reflection on Translation Research

5.1 Uniting the Translator's Consciousness of Creativity and Self-restraint

The analysis of the connotation and characteristics of the translator's subjectivity in the foregoing chapters makes it very clear that the translator possesses the subject status and has individuality in the act of translation. The translator has to give a full play to creativity during the translation process in order to accomplish the translation task, while he suffers a lot of restrictions at the same time, due to the special nature of translation.

It is true that translation, especially literary translation, requires the translator's artistic creation. Since it is "recreation", the translator activity differs from original composition in the creative space and degree of freedom. All the translator's creativity should be conducted on the basis of certain text and serve certain purpose, and any arbitrary creativity deviated far from the original text doesn't make sense. In view of this, the translator should take the limitation of the original text into account while exploiting his creativity. That is, "the translator should have a sense of both creativity and self-restraint. The two restraining and complementing each other, no one should neglect either of them. Too much stress on 'self-restraint' to the neglect of 'creativity' would result in 'formalism', while too much stress on 'creativity' to the neglect of 'self-restraint' would lead to 'liberalism'. It is advisable to strive for a balance between the two." (Sun Zhili,2000) Therefore, the translator must be aware of his task to correctly understand and grasp the content expressed in the original and represent it appropriately in another language.

The subjectivity of the translator runs through the whole translation process. However, the confirmation and acceptance of the translator's subjectivity does not mean that the translator can discard the respect for the author and the original text to present his personal view and comment or express his individual aesthetic recognition and aspiration arbitrarily. In excellent translations, the faithfulness and subjectivity of translation lie in a dialectical and harmonious unity rather than in contradiction. We attach great importance to the translator's subject status, which rules out any error translation resulting from the translator's "liberalism". As for error translation, in which the subject status of the author is denied, they should not be taken into consideration to expound the translator's subjectivity, for the exploration of the translator's subjectivity is conducted on the premise of the translator's creativity within a limited space.

5.2 Further Understanding of Translation Criteria and Principles

Although rich contents have been developed in our traditional translation theory, there still exists a unitary and simplified mode of thinking in discussions of translation criteria and principles. As Luo Xinzhang pointed out, the system of Chinese traditional translation theory went from "semantic equivalence (   ) — faithfulness (   ) — spiritual resemblance (   ) — transmigration (   )" Luo Xinzhang, 1984:5 . This development chain of translation criteria reflects the demanding requirements on the translator that the translated text should resemble the source text both in form and spirit, while the influence of the translator and readers on the translation process is neglected. The researchers who insist on the above translation criteria or principles believe that the translator's interpretation is just the original meaning of the source text, thus, they fall in the illusion of pursuing the "equivalence" between the translated text and the original, which results in translator's paradox that it is impossible to meet the requirements of translation theory in practice. Zhi Qian felt "there are difference between things (in different languages), and it is difficult to express accurately." And Yan Fu sighed and said," it is very difficult to pursue faithfulness", and Fu Lei realized " even the most beautiful translation may either exceed or be inferior to the source text in the flavor", and Qian Zhongshu admitted," The complete 'transmigration' is an illusion that can not be realized". It is evident that the traditional translation research was confronted with the awkward situations that resulted from the neglect of the subjectivity of the translator.

True, much of our routine discourse about translation still projects equivalence as something translators ought to be able to achieve. The norm of faithfulness insists that translators should produce originals completely and accurately, without addition, deletion or distortion. It calls on translators to be so discreet as to spirit themselves away for the sake of the original's integrity, to bite their own tongues in the interests of consonance. The conventional discourse about translation abounds in images and metaphors urging translators to make themselves unseen and unheard. But let us be clear about the implications of such requirements. Only a translation purged of the translator's presence allows us to indulge fully the illusion of equivalence. The illusion of equivalence demands the elision of the translator as a subject in the text. Equivalence spells the death of the translator and the end of translation. When a translation sublimates into authentic equivalence text, it itself destructs as translation.

From the above exploration, we know the translation subject cannot be elided or

eliminated for two reasons. First, translation presupposes a reading of the source text, and therefore interpretation. Interpretation needs a viewpoint, and therefore a subject-position. Secondly, as text-production, translation requires a choice of linguistic means. That choice is deliberate and it involves dimensions other than that of the original. If, as critical linguists have it, there is no such thing as a neutral utterance, then the translator's utterances are necessarily slanted, revealing a discursively positioned subject.(Theo Hermans,2002)

Through the discussion of the translator's subjectivity in translation activity, it is advisable that translation criteria or principles should be established on the premise of taking the translator's subject status into account, and acknowledging the rationality of the translator's creative treason for certain translation purpose. In recent years, some new modern translation theories such as Cultural- translation Criticism School represented by Poly-system theory and Functionalism Translation School represented by Skopostheorie, which were developed in western countries from 1970s, have been introduced to our country, and provided new dimensions and new perspectives for establishing reasonable criteria for translation criticism. In these theories great importance is attached to the translator's dynamic participation in translation. Researchers shift their attention from the "meaning" to the "context" in which the "meaning" is produced, and consider translation as "cultural digestion". Therefore, translation criteria and principles become a multi-dimensional and dynamic system, and translation criticism then breaks away from its fetters and provides a more proper and reasonable explanation and assessment of a translated text. Only if researchers adopt these rational criteria and principles, can they fully understand the unavoidable discrepancy between the translated text and the original and reveal the subjective and objective restrictive factors in translation activity so as to establish a more reasonable system for translation criticism.

Chapter Six   Conclusion

Translation is essentially a human process, but it has not been described systematically from this point of view. Too often the process has been seen as a highly technical one and translation is always examined in terms of the languages involved in it. The translator, the key figure and absolute subject in translation process, is excluded from sharing a correspondingly prominent social and economic status, and shamefully put into a shadowy condition. Since the late 1980s, the translation studies turned to be cultural- oriented. The cultural orientation averts the perspective of translation studies from its invariable labyrinth to the approach stressing target- oriented, dynamic description in the context of history, society and culture. The culture turn not only provides new dimension and approaches for translation studies, but also develops new space for research. As a result, the exploration of the subject of translation- the translator has been put on the agenda of translation studies. Based on the philosophic connotation of subjectivity, we can get the three characteristics in terms of the subjectivity of the translator: 1) As the subject of translation, the translator must give full play to his/her subjective creativity to act on the object (the original text) in order to accomplish the translation tasks. During the process, creativity is undoubtedly paramount. 2) "Translation is a purposeful activity"(Christiane Nord,2001:1). Any translation activity has its own specific purpose. Every translator must possess a certain "skopos" when translating, and each of his translated works may serve a given purpose．3) The translator is inevitably influenced by all kinds of subjective or objective factors and the translator' creativity is not arbitrary or beyond any limitation. On the basis of the above analysis, we can attempt to define the subjectivity of the translator as: the subjective creativity that the translator (as the subject of translation) displays in the translation activity to achieve his translation purpose, on the premise of respecting the translation object (the original text), which mirrors the translator's cultural awareness and personality, as well as his cultural and aesthetic creativity.

The subjectivity of the translator is further explored through analyzing its embodiment in the translation process, in the translator's consciousness of the target culture and reader, in the intertextual relationship between the target text and the source text, the target text and target literature, and in the inter-subjectivity of translation.

The translation process is the key link in the whole translation chain, in which the manifestation of the translator' subjectivity is the most striking. During the translation

process, the translator ought to display his capability as triple identities- as reader, interpreter, and writer (creator of the TT). The translator has to make a full play to the subjectivity in achieving a comprehensive understanding of the original and an appropriate representation in the target language.

Cultural awareness is a particular way of thinking, a criterion for judgment or an acute sensitivity to cultural element consciously or subconsciously cultivated by the translator. Since translation is a kind of cultural communication, three cultures are generally interacting in the process: (1) the source language culture, (2) the translator's culture and (3) the receptor culture. This cultural mixture sets up the translation or communication context in which each component needs to be clearly understood by the translator who desires to engage in communicating the meaning and spirit of the source text with a minimum amount of cultural skewing. As a translation operator, the translator naturally has enough flexibility to decide which culture his translation should be based on. He can be target culture oriented, source culture oriented or make a compromise between the two.

The TT is not subordinate to the ST and but an intertext of the ST with an independent life. It is the subjectivity of the translator that endows the translated text with independent aesthetic quality and target cultural characteristic. Subject exists in relation with other subjects, and remains its individuality at the same time. The actual cultural significance and effect of the translated works are decided on the inter-subjective relationships and the results of dialogues between the author, the translator and the readers.

The subjectivity of the translator runs through the whole translation process. However, the confirmation and acceptance of the translator's subjectivity does not mean that the translator can discard the respect for the author and the original text to present his personal view and comment or express his individual aesthetic recognition and aspiration arbitrarily. The translator should have a sense of both creativity and self-restraint. Through the discussion of the translator's subjectivity in translation activity, it is advisable that translation criteria or principles should be established on the premise of taking the translator's subject status into account, and acknowledging the rationality of the translator's creative treason for certain translation purpose.

The translator's subjectivity is a very complex subject on which systematic researches have just begun in China. The present paper is only a tentative attempt at exploring in this complicated field. Both advice and criticism are heartily welcome.

Acknowledgement

I am sincerely indebted to Professor Jiang Zhiwen, my supervisor, for his insightful instructions and detailed comments and suggestions on this dissertation. He has assisted considerably in sharpening and strengthening the focus and in pointing out errors and inaccuracies. His insightful criticism of my earlier drafts has a major impact on the formation of the thesis.

My hearty thanks without exception are given to all the teachers who have taught me in the English Department of W.U.T. Professor Yu Weishen, Professor Xu Tiecheng, Professor Li Hong, Professor Xiang Chaohong, Professor Huang Yuling, Professor Zhao Hong, Professor Hu Wencheng, Professor Peng Xiaohua. Without their enlightening lectures in linguistics, literature and translation, I could never be able to conduct my own studies in this thesis.

My thanks also go to all my classmates for their great help in my study and life. I'd like to say, I am fortunate enough to have the opportunity to share their intelligence, their wisdom and their personalities in life.

Finally, warm thanks to my family and other friends who have been constantly offering me love and support in my study and life.

Notes

1   "   "

         "   ,

            "   1998

2 *Erwin Wolff* put forward the conception of "intended reader" —the target reader the writer imagines for his text, when talked about the relationship between the relationship between the writer and the text. He believes the writer should pay attention to the "horizon of expectation" of his "intended reader" during his writing. This theory can also apply to the analysis of the relationship between the translator and the target reader, which will be discussed in the next section.

3   "   "

4

                                            Zhu Chaowei, Zhang Boran,2002 (5) 55-61

5   "

            "

                                         ……

              Zhu Chaowei, Zhang Boran,2002 (5) 55-61

6   ·

                                       Zhu Chaowei, Zhang Boran,2002 (5) 55-61

7 ……   ……

References

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere A. (Eds.). 2001. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. London: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Basil, H.& Ian Mason. 2001. *Discourse and The Translator*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Delisle, J. & Judish Woodsworth. 1995 *Translators through History*. Philadelphia: the Benjamins Publishing Company.

Even-Zohar, I. 1990, 1997 (Revised). *Polysystem Studies*.

http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers.

Even-Zohar, I. 2002. Polysystem Theory. (T. Chang Nam Fung). *Chinese Translators Journal*. Vol. 23, No. 4.

Gentzler, E. 1993. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Holub, R. C. 1984. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London: Methuen.

Jauss, H. R. 1982. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Iser, W. 1987. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP.

Lefevere, A. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, A. 1990. *Translation, History and culture*. London: Cassell.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. A. 1993. *Language, Culture, and Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Tompkins, J. (Eds.). 1980. *Reader-Response Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Tytler, A. F. 1978. *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. 1995. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London & New York: Routledge.

2000

1998

1999

1989

1999

2000

2002   2002   5

1984

2002   2002   2

2000   2002   6

2000   2000   5

2000   2000   1

1991

2000   2000   6

1998   1998   5

1995   1995   6

1998 "   "   1998   2

1999

2002   2002

1

2002

1998

2003   2003   1

2003   2003   4

2002   21

1997

2002   2002   1

2002

2003   2003   1

2002   2002   5