

摘 要

会话含意理论是语用学中最重要理论之一。格赖斯在 1975 年发表的著作“逻辑与会话”一文中提出了著名的会话含意理论。这一理论指出,谈话是受一定的条件制约的,人们的交谈之所以不至于成为一连串互不连贯的话语,是因为交际双方都必须遵守一些基本原则,从而使交际活动能顺利进行。他把这种共同遵守的原则称为“合作原则”。但是说话者也可以故意地违背这一原则,这时听话人就要根据当时的语境,推断出说话人违反合作原则的目的,即了解他违反合作原则的隐含意义。格赖斯把这种在言语交际中使用的隐含意义称作“会话含意”。由于在特定的语境下,话语的含意是具有一定的文化特色并受其作者或者说话人的意图影响的,因此译者在翻译中要注意再现上下文的隐含意思及原信息的语言和文化特色。

小说中的人物语言往往违背常规,采用迂回曲折的表达方式,以产生言外之意。一方面,说话者的会话含意在特定的场合和情况下是确定的;另一方面,因为语境,交谈双方的理念,背景知识等因素,会话含意又不一定能被充分的理解。Grice 的会话含意理论正适合于解释这些具体例子的会话含意的产生、诠释和理解。

本文在合作原则和会话含义理论的指导下,关注的会话含意在翻译中的再现。本文首先阐述了 Grice 提出的合作原则及其会话含意理论,并分析了产生会话含意的原因及其方式,同时还提出了与会话含意相关的一些翻译理论。其次,本文分析了小说中人物对话的特点。小说中的人物对话往往含有言外之意,那么在翻译时候要特别注意抓住对话的言外之意,准确的传达人物对话的真正含意。最后,本文讨论了小说对话翻译的策略,分别从再现原文含意,明示原文含意及解释原文含意三个方面来探讨会话含义的翻译策略。同时,通过对

某些例子的两个翻译版本的比较，体现了译者在翻译小说作品中的特殊会话含意时，往往会采用不同的翻译策略。

但无论采取什么策略，都应基于对于原文会话含意的切实理解，注意在译文中尽量帮助译文读者准确把握原深层含意，尽量有利于读者更好地理解 and 欣赏外国小说。

关键字：合作原则；会话含意；准确翻译

Abstract

Conversational Implicature was first outlined by Grice in his lecture “Logic and Conversation”. In order to guarantee a successful, accurate and effective communication, the two sides of a conversation are required to arrive at a common aim and adopt a cooperative principle throughout communication. Grice called this “Cooperative Principle”(abbreviated as CP) to which the two sides should equally conform. It consists of four sub-principles, or “maxims”: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. Thus people concerned are required to obey some principles or maxims. It is obvious that an utterance, which violates a maxim, will often lead to an extra meaning-implicature. The hearer will have much difficulty in making a correct judgment of the extra meaning. Even the understanding of the extra meaning may vary with different individuals. Therefore, in translation, the translator should pay much attention to transferring the conversational implicature hidden in conversation, thus helping target readers appreciate the fiction successfully.

In fictions, characters always violate the regularities to generate more than what is said, that is, they employ indirect expressions to produce conversational implicatures by flouting the CP and the conversational maxims. Speakers’ Conversational Implicature is confirmed in particular situation; while, for some factors, Conversational Implicatures often can’t be understood well, such as lack of the common context, background knowledge, beliefs or interests, etc. Grice’s

Conversational Implicature Theory is right to interpret the generation and understanding of these specific examples' implicatures.

Under the guidance of Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature, this thesis focuses on how Conversational Implicature can be transferred in translating fictions. First, this thesis explores the Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature. Then it analyzes the features of conversations with implicatures or not in fictions, and how to grasp implicatures in fictions. Finally, the thesis discusses the translation strategies for Conversational Implicatures in terms of reproduction, manifestation and explanation of the original implicatures. Meanwhile, with many examples, especially these having two versions, the thesis discusses how the translator adopts different translation methods to reproduce the conversational implicatures in target text.

No matter what strategy we take, we should try our best to make target readers master the deep meaning of original text on the basis of understanding original Conversational Implicatures fully, thus helping target readers understand and appreciate foreign fictions better.

Key Words: Cooperative Principle; Conversational Implicature; Accurate Translation

湖南师范大学学位论文原创性声明

本人郑重声明：所呈交的学位论文，是本人在导师的指导下，独立进行研究工作所取得的成果。除文中已经注明引用的内容外，本论文不含任何其他个人或集体已经发表或撰写过的作品成果。对本文的研究做出重要贡献的个人和集体，均已在文中以明确方式标明。本人完全意识到本声明的法律结果由本人承担。

学位论文作者签名：李珍珍

2009年12月3日

湖南师范大学学位论文授权使用授权书

本学位论文作者完全了解学校有关保留、使用学位论文的规定，同意学校保留并向国家有关部门或机构送交论文的复印件和电子版，允许论文被查阅和借阅。本人授权湖南师范大学可以将本学位论文的全部或部分内容编入有关数据库进行检索，可以采用印影、缩印或扫描等复制手段保存和汇编学位论文。

本学位论文属于

- 1、保密口，在_____年解密后适用本授权书。
- 2、不保密口。

(请在以上相应方框内打“√”)

作者签名：李珍珍

日期：2009年12月3日

导师签名：李根

日期：2009年12月3日

Introduction

As a communicative activity, translation has ever since contributed to the processing and exchange of information both with and across cultural boundaries (Steiner, 2004:51). As a matter of fact, translation has also been studied throughout the centuries. It seems that there have been to date no universally accepted theories and principles for it. Thus, translation takes more than one aspect into consideration. The current translation studies are concentrating on describing and analyzing the procedure or processes, rather than commenting on the product itself and asking how well or badly any particular translation has been done.

As we all know, there exist complex and countless types of information hidden behind the texts in fictions, most of which are difficult for translators to identify and reproduce in the process of translation. Therefore, the problem is how to make these implicit or intended meanings reproduced correctly in the target texts. Now that translation is a communicative activity, it unavoidably has a close relationship with pragmatics which is the study of language in use and is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation (Peccei, 2000). Pragmatics is of great importance to both the process of translation and the critique of the products of translation.

The basic theory of this thesis is Grice's conversational implicature theory and the cooperative principle. The principle and its maxims require people to communicate in a cooperative way and the violation of the

principle can lead to the conversational implicatures. As for translation, it is also restrained by this Cooperative Principle because the process of translation is also a process in which translators, as the mediator, mediate the macro-conversation or the cross-cultural communication between the original author and the target language readers. Translation means communicating (Nida, 1993:116). Therefore, the Cooperative principle can work both as a general theory of translation and as an instruction for the translator to learn how to transfer conversational implicature across languages because under the guidelines of this principle, the translator may better understand the nature of his work and then act as a qualified mediator. However, since translation is a kind of interlingual communication, the function of this principle is far more complex. The translator must take the contexts in different cultures into consideration. Generally speaking, the process of translating conversational implicatures consists of two steps: the first one is that the translator understands the conversational implicatures with the help of the source context; the second one is that the translator reproduces these conversational implicatures in the target text. In both steps, the translator should observe and depend on the Cooperative Principle and its four maxims.

Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature Theory, as a branch of pragmatics, explain how the implicit meanings are generated and how participants understand the conversational implicatures in the process of communication with the help of certain context (Zhang Delu, 1993:51-55). According to Grice (1975), the guidelines of four basic maxims of conversation-the quality maxim, the quantity maxim, the relevance maxim and the manner maxim-jointly express a general

cooperative principle. The principle guarantees that our verbal exchanges are to be rational. However, the principle just provides points of orientation rather than strict rules which have to be followed by language users. People can and do refuse to adhere to these maxims in some situations (Baker, 2000:225).

Thus these maxims are frequently violated in the process of communication and conversational implicatures are generated (Grice, 1998:296). “Conversational Implicature”, a term invented by Grice (1975), refers to any meaning implied or “implicated” by the utterance of a sentence in addition to what is literally said. Grice divided the category of conversational implicature into two distinctions-the generalized and the particularized implicature. A generalized implicature is a conventional implicature that “arises without any particular context or special scenario being necessary”. A particularized implicature “does require such specific contexts” (Jiang Wangqi, 2000). In the later part of his works, Grice holds that the particularized conversational implicatures arising from violating the cooperative principle can be presented as speech act, indirect speech and some rhetorical figures such as irony, metaphor and hyperbole etc. (Grice, 1998)

Basil Hatim and Ian Mason hold that all texts can be seen as evidence of a communicative transaction taking place within a social framework, and translation should be regarded as “a communicative process which takes place within a social context” (Hatim and Mason, 2001:3). They also regard the translator as the mediator between the producer of original text and the receivers of target text. They claim that the translator stands at the center of a dynamic process of communication

and mediates this communication in a very direct way. This is to say, translation is actually a communicative process in which the translator acts as the intermediary. Therefore, in the process of this macro-communication between the original author and the target readers, translators, as mediators, should observe the cooperative principle to identify the speaker's conversational implicatures in the original text and reproduce them correctly in the target language to convey them to the hearers (the target readers). In fact, the first stage of translation is governed by the cooperative principle of original text, while the second stage by that of the target language.

This thesis is intended to explore the translation of conversational implicatures in fictions. Under the guidance of cooperative principle and conversational implicature, this thesis focuses on how conversational implicatures can be transferred in translating fictions. First, this thesis explores the cooperative principle and conversational implicature as well as their relationship. Then it analyzes the language features of characters and the conversation between many types of characters. Finally, with many examples, especially these having two versions, the thesis discusses how the translator adopts different translation methods to reproduce the conversational implicatures in target text.

By analysis of the translation of dialogues in fictions, we can offer a help for people to understand the deeper implicatures in original text. And it is good for people to understand and appreciate foreign fictions.

Chapter 1 Theoretical Basis

“In everyday talk, we often convey propositions that are not explicit in our utterances but are merely implied by them.” (Blimes, 1986:27) That sentence used in actual situations may have some extra meaning, something which is not inherent in the words used. Then what is the mechanism underlying the use of a sentence to convey extra meaning? Or to use the established wording in pragmatics, how can one mean more than one says? Actually, they are some questions to which the theory of conversational implicature attempts to provide tentative answers.

The theory of conversational implicature was proposed by Oxford philosopher Herbert Paul Grice. There is evidence that Grice began to formulate his ideas of this theory in the fifties, but it was through the William James lectures he delivered at Harvard in 1967 that this theory first became known to the public. Part of the lectures was published in 1975 under the title of “Logic and Conversation”, on which we base our present discussion.

Actually, there is always some regularity in our conversation. “Our talk exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did. They are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts; and each participant recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction.” (Grice, 1975:45) This purpose or direction may be fixed from the start, or it may evolve during the exchange; it may be so indefinite as to leave very considerable latitude to

the participants. People might then formulate a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe. This can be called Cooperative Principle. The following is the discussion on cooperative principle, conversational implicature and the standards we used when translating them.

1.1 Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature

As one of the core ideas in Pragmatics, cooperative principle is significant in guiding verbal communication in the living world. This theory is concerned by linguistics home and abroad, such as foreign linguists Horn, Levinson, Leech, Sperber, Wilson and domestic Xu Shenghuan, Qian Guanlian, Zhou Liquan, and so on. They search, evaluate, complement and improve the Cooperative Principle, which help develop the Gricean Conversational Implicature Theory. Stating the view of Cooperative Principle, Grice and others pay more attention to conversational implicature including its definition, characteristic and so on.

1.1.1 Grice's Cooperative Principle

“Pragmatics is the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation (Baker, 2000).” Cooperation is a very important notion in pragmatics, which is relevant to all kinds of texts including spoken conversation as well as written texts (Hickey, 2001). “In fact, cooperation, perhaps of a rather more basic type, is an inherent feature of all kinds of linguistic communication (Hickey,

2001:25).” The writers and readers should both constitute a type of cooperation with the text and with the norms and expectations of the culture within which the text exists and is accepted (Hickey, 2001). Among cooperation theories, the most popular is the account brought about by Grice in his CP and its four Maxims.

As a very important composing part of pragmatics, Grice CP and its four Maxims are paid much attention to by many scholars and language workers in the translation field, such as Li Hongmei(2006), Guo Yan(2006), Wang Yaxin(2004), etc. Leo Hickey(2001) holds that Grice (1975) account of some of the effects of communicative activities is the most famous account of what linguistic cooperation amounts to which has emerged from the philosophy of language and also “probably the most systematic account, in so far as it appears to strike a reasonable balance between a potentially unstoppable proliferation of principles and a denial of the need for or possibility of classification beyond one, overarching, principle (Hickey, 2001:25).”

Before moving on to Grice CP and its four Maxims, his notion “implicature” has to be mentioned first. Grice notices that in daily conversations people do not usually say things directly but tend to imply them.

Example 1:

A: How about going to the Imperial Palace on May Day holiday?

B: There will be many travelers from all over the world.

In this conversation, we can’t interpret B response successfully only depending on a good mastery of linguistic systems. It may mean “No, we’d better not go there because it’ll be very crowded” or “Yes, I’d like

to go there because we can meet people of different cultures.” An utterance can be open to two or more possible interpretations. How can we arrive at a particular inference or, in Grice terms, an implicature which is not explicitly expressed?

There is some regularity in conversation. “Our talk exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did. They are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts; and each participant recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction” (Grice, 1975:45). In other words, we seem to follow some principle like the following: “Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (ibid.). And this principle is known as the Cooperative Principle or CP for short, which is well known to us.

1.1.2 Grice Conversational Implicature

Grice develops the concept of implicature which is essentially a theory about how people use language. Implicature is the term which has the highest frequency of occurrences in Pragmatics. It is difficult to look up in an ordinary English dictionary. Grice coins this word in his article *Logic and Conversation*. Implicature means “What is implicated” or “what is implicitly conveyed” in contrast to “what is said”.

Conversational implicature separates from the notion of implicature. It must be attached to some restrictive conditions. Properly speaking, conversational implicature should be: speakers gives extra meaning to his

or her words according to different contexts, and expects listener can distinguish correctly by related inference. It means that conversational implicature includes three essential elements at least, namely users (speaker and listener), context and inference.

The second element context can change and affect the conversational implicature. The same sentence "It's cold." may imply that listener should turn on the air conditioner or turn off. In brief, there is no one-to-one correspondence between conversational implicature and its information carrier. It is inevitable to consider the context when listener makes sure the conversational implicature, especially paralinguistic context and non-linguistic context. Paralinguistic context contains speakers' facial expressions, actions, tone, and so on. And non-linguistic context refers to the situation of the moment of utterance and the word or encyclopedic knowledge.

In addition, decoding procedure of conversational implicature must depend on correct inference. The effect of inference is everywhere in speech using. Professor Cheng Yumin contributes its function to three aspects: 1) interpreting ambiguity; 2) establishing the discourse coherence; 3) producing conversational implicature.

Conversational Implicature Theory and Cooperative Principle play a key role in interpreting the true attention of communicators. And how the conversational implicatures generate interests Grice and other linguists a lot. They study the relationship between the two theories, and explain the conversational implicatures in different points of view.

Grice pays more attention to the conversational implicature generated by violating Cooperative Principle, but he also affirms in *Logic*

and Conversation (1967) that obeying the Cooperative Principle can generate the conversational implicature, too. However, he does not proof it like treating the former. About this question, Levinson does some further complement. He classifies the conversational implicature generated by violating or flouting the Cooperative Principle into one, and generated by obeying into another. He calls it the standard conversational implicature.

In Grice's opinion, the speeches which people use in daily life are not irrelevant. They are the result certain cooperation. Communicators would recognize at least one or a group of collective intention, or they have a same direction of communication. Of course, this intention or direction may be a fixed one at the beginning of conversation, or a comparatively free one. Communicators have freedom to converse randomly. However, the content of conversations still obeys a quite crude principle in fact.

1) By violating the maxim of quantity

Concerning the first maxim of Quantity, Grice uses as an example (2) an imagined reference letter by A for his past student X, who is applying for a lectureship in philosophy, and it reads: "Dear Sir, Mr. X command of English is excellent, and his attendance at tutorials has been regular. Yours, etc." Grice comments, "A cannot be opting out, since if he wished to be uncooperative, why write at all? He cannot be unable, through ignorance, to say more, since the man is his pupil; moreover, he knows that more information than this is wanted. He must, therefore, be wishing to impart information that he is reluctant to write down. This supposition is tenable only on the assumption that he thinks Mr. X is no good at

philosophy. This, then, is what he is implicating” (Grice, 1975; 52).

The following is another example (3) for the sub-maxim of quantity:

Aunt: How did Jim do his history examination?

Mother: Oh, not at all well. They asked him things that happened
before the poor boy was born.

Apparently, it is enough for mother to say “Oh, not at all well”. But she adds one redundant sentence. Listener can infer the conversational implicature from this sentence: mother thinks that obtaining the bad marks in history examination is not child’s fault. Because the questions on the examination paper are the events which happened before her child was born.

2) By violating the maxim of quality

By offering something that does not conform to the fact, the speaker purposely violates the first subordinate maxim of “quality”, so that the listener infers conversational implicature. The examples Grice provides for the violation of Quality maxim are all traditional figures of speech like the following example (4):

A) He is made of iron.

B) Every nice girl loves a sailor.

That is, at the level of what is said, they are false statements. No natural human being is made of iron, unless he is a robot. So ex.A will not be taken literally. Instead we will interpret it as a metaphor, meaning this man has a character like iron. In the case of ex.B, the implicature is that many girls love sailors.

3) By violating the maxim of relation

Some conversational implicatures are generated by violation of the

Relevance maxim. The speaker may not say something that is explicitly related to the topic of the conversation and invites the hearer to seek for an interpretation of the possible relevance. For example (5), at a genteel tea party, A says ‘Mrs. X is an old bag.’ There is a moment of appalled silence, and then B says ‘The weather has been quite delightful this summer, hasn’t it? B has apparently refused to make what He says relevant to A’s preceding remark. He thereby implicates that A’s remark should not be discussed and, perhaps more specifically, that A has committed a social gaffe (Grice, 1975; 54).

Another example (6):

A: I am out of petrol.

B: There is a garage round the corner.

B would be infringing the maxim ‘Be relevant’ unless he thinks, or thinks it possible, that the garage is open, and has petrol to sell; so he implicates that the garage is, or at least may be open, etc.

4) By violating the maxim of manner

The speaker purposely violates the first sub-maxim of “manner”: do not make your contribution obscure, and says something in an obscure manner to the listener, which is not understood by the other present persons, so that the conversational implicature which cannot be conveyed to the third person is inferred.

Example (7):

A: Let’s get the kids something.

B: Okay, but I veto I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M-S.

B’s answer uses the spelling of letters instead of the pronunciation of the words. He may not want the children to listen to this word and give

out immediate reaction. Here B violates the maxim of manner to show that ice cream is not good for children.

When illustrating violation of the maxim of manner, Grice uses an example (8)-William Blakes lines "*Never seek to tell they love, Love that never told can be.*" In this case, love may refer to an emotion or the person one loves. And "*Love that never told can be*" may mean either "Love that cannot be told" or "Love that if told cannot continue to exist".

And if a reviewer has chosen A in the example rather than B, the prolixity implicate that Miss X's performance is so poor that the words' meaning cannot be applied.

Another example (9):

A. Miss X sang "Home sweet home".

B. Miss X produced a series of sounds that corresponded closely with the score of "Home sweet home".

Grice did not give any example of disorder, which is understandable in that generally a disordered utterance will not convey anything but the fact that the speaker is mentally unsound. They had a baby and got married is not a disordered version of They got married and had a baby. They are both ordered, though, in their own different ways. But the Chinese example 屡战屡败 may be seen as an instance of the exploitation of this maxim.(胡壮麟, 2007; 195)

Actually, violating Cooperative Principle existed in our real conversation. Under this situation, people actually sometimes don't talk with each other under the guidance of CP and its maxims.

1.2 Translation Theories Concerned

Translation has a long a history as human being, and the translation criteria can be dated back to the beginning of translation practice. Nowadays, there are more and more translation theories appeared in the translation field. We meet many translation theories when we deal with translation. Therefore, it is very important to know these translation theories.

1.2.1 General Standards for Translation

Before 1970s, equivalence and faithfulness were regarded as dominant principles in translation studies in the West and China respectively under the tremendous influence of the source-text-oriented translation theories. Translation was likened to reflection, mirror image, or transparent pane of glass. Any treason, mutation or deviation from the original text was always criticized, and the translator was reduced to a secondary figure, who is supposed to remain invisible in the translated work. In respect of the criterion of faithfulness, there have been numerous expositions and debates on it.

Undoubtedly, the translation theory has played a historical part of great value both in guiding the past translating practice and in accelerating the development of Chinese translation. Lou Xinzhang once pointed out that traditional translation theories of China have developed a system of its own. He summarized the evolution of Chinese translation theories in the following paradigm: cling to the original, pursuing faithfulness, spiritual resemblance, sublimation.

The triple translation criteria of “Faithfulness, Expressiveness and

Elegance” proposed by Yan Fu has exerted much influence on translation theory history, and then the “faithfulness, smoothness” criteria, the “spiritual resemblance and sublimation” theory, are also influential in Chinese translation theories.

For almost a century, the criteria have been the subject of debate among the translators. The debate is always around “elegance”. Yan Fu held that only the language before the Han Dynasty could be considered elegant and old vocabulary, old structure of Chinese must be used in order to represent the original work fully and adequately. Therefore he can be said to oppose the use of the vernacular or popular language of the people, and he was against the application of the vernacular language in translation, that is the reason why many people criticized his “elegance” standard.

Yan Fu’s “faithfulness” means the full and complete conveyance or transmission of the original content or thought. His “expressiveness” demands that the version must be clear and flowing without any grammatical mistakes or confused logic and sense. His “elegance” refers to the use of classical Chinese before the Han Dynasty.

For almost a century, the criteria have been the subject of debate by the translators. The debate is always around “elegance”. Yan Fu held that only the language before the Han Dynasty could be considered elegant and old vocabulary, old structure of Chinese must be used in order to represent the original work fully and adequately. Therefore he can be said to oppose the use of the vernacular or popular language of the people, and he was against the application of the vernacular language in translation, that is the reason why many people criticized his “elegance” standard.

In the west, discussions concerning equivalence in translation theory can be traced to nearly 2000 years ago. Etienne Dolet emphasized that translations should work with the greatest fidelity to the intention of the authors; translation theories in the west of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries demanded that the translator's fidelity ought to get the author's confirmation and the intentions of the latter must be absorbed. Alexander Fraser Tytler put forth the three laws of translation in 1790 after Campbell summary of translation criteria. But it was Catford who made a most detailed specification of equivalence for the first time.

Since the 1950s, with a booming growth of translation studies from the linguistic angle, fierce debates occurred over which direction should be followed in translation studies, resulting in the formation of two distinct groups of translation theories: the literary school and the linguistic school. Among the latter group, there are numerous theorists who have expounded issues centered on the notion of equivalence.

Although the translation theorists had always been pursuing some kind of equivalence between the source and target, the concept of equivalence was not definitely put forward until Jakobson from a linguistic and semiotic angle approached the problem of equivalence: "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics". This definition has turned out to be vital for the further development of translation theory. From then on, many people put forward various terms concerned with equivalence, and the following one to be introduced is Catford textual equivalence.

Catford has been criticized for having relied excessively on an essentially referential theory of meaning, "an approach which translation

theorists...have found too narrow” (Baker 78). He was also censured for “using simplistic, invented sentences to exemplify his categories of translational equivalence, and for limiting his analysis to the level of the sentence” (ibid). Nevertheless, his approach to and insights in translation equivalence are more valuable than to be looked down upon.

1.2.2 Standards for Translation of Conversational Implicature

Translation is not only an activity of language but also an activity of human thoughts and the process of translation is exactly a process concerning the human thoughts activity. Bao Huinan holds that the similarity in human thoughts makes the translation possible. Thus, people from different cultures are likely to have a similar opinion on the same object. Human beings live in the same world, and their languages reflect their commonality. That is to say, in spite of using different languages, they can express themselves, refer to the objects and relate something with the same regularity of thoughts, such as concept, inference and generalization etc. As regards the translation process, the communication between the object of translation (SL text and its author) and the subject (the translator) depends mainly on the common regularity. This common regularity of thoughts is a similarity between human beings (Bao Huinan, 2001:23). Therefore, in most cases, translators can translate the conversational implicatures literally, which can not only retain the form of the SL text but also convey the implicated meanings. In the same way, the TL readers can reason out what is implied by the SL author. (Gutt, 2004:173-176)

However, in addition to the similarity, human thoughts also have

their own individualities. Different nations have different histories, religions and customs etc. Therefore, different nations will view the same object from different perspectives which reflect on the forms of their expressions in languages. For example, to express the concept “to achieve two aims with a single action”, Chinese people can say “一举两得” or “一箭双雕”; while in English, people use “to kill two birds with one stone”(一石二鸟) ; in French, it can be expressed like this “faire dune pierre deux coups” (一块石头打两处). Hence, the individualities of human thought can lead to differences in the forms of language expression (Bao Huinan, 2001:23-24). Because of the differences in human thoughts, translators can by no means convey the conversational implicatures exactly by word-for-word translation in the translation process. In this case, they have to use some methods to compensate for the conversational implicatures in the TL text at the expense of the language forms of the SL text. But the reproduction of conversational implicatures does not mean that the translator should interpret the implicit meaning of the SL text in detail in the TL text. For TL readers are as clever as the SL readers and they can infer the implied meanings according to the TL context (Wang Weihong and Chen Maoxin, 2001:1-6). The process of reasoning out the conversational implicatures is not to make all the implicit meaning explicit in the TL text, but to supervise the translator in reproducing the conversational implicatures effectively in the TL text in a more natural, real and accurate language (Wang Shenbao, 1996:15).

Therefore, to translate the conversational implicatures, translators must understand what is implied by the author in the SL text with the aid

of the SL context in that the author often conveys the meaning in an indirect way in order to make readers imagine by themselves. If translators do not understand the conversational implicatures correctly, they can not convey the correct information to the TL readers, and the TL readers will be puzzled or misled. In addition, according to the TL context, translators can use some methods to reproduce the implied information such as to change the form of the SL in the TL text, add notes to explain the implied information or to delete some extra information etc. so as to avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding.

Chapter 2 Conversations in Fictions

Fiction is an art of written language, diverse in style and rich in linguistic variety. Fictional language consists of characters' speech and narration. In fictional writing, writers manipulate frequently the style of conversation to achieve lively description of varied characters. Generally, characters' speech is considered as what characters say in literary works, which, in order to differentiate it from narration, is traditionally put in quotation marks. Some researchers hold that characters' speech represents itself in four forms, namely, dialogue, monologue, psychological language and author-character language. In their eyes, conversation is a fairly common form of characters' speech, and a conversation is generally performed between two participants, and occasionally more than three participants.

2.1 Conversations without Implicatures

According to Mick Short (1996), we need at least three levels of discourse to account for the language of fictional prose (i.e. a novel or short story), because there is a narrator-narratee level intervening between the character-character level and the author-reader level:

Addresser1---Message---Addressee 1

(Novelist) (Reader)

Addresser2---Message---Addressee 2

(Narrator) (Narratee)

Addresser3---Message---Addressee 3

(Character A) (Character B)

This diagram only accounts for the novel “in general” in the sense that all novel works as a form. But any particular novel may neutralize some of the distinctions, multiply others, or do both at the same time. The fact that there are six participants in the basic discourse structure for the novel automatically means that there are more viewpoints to be taken into accounts in the novel than in other genres (e.g. poetry). But the opportunities in particular novels for multiplying the number of viewpoints to be considered, and related to one another, are myriad. It is thus hardly surprising that the novel has become the genre where writers have explored viewpoints extensively.

I-narrators the person who tells the story may also be a character in the fictional world of the story, relating the story after the event. In this case the critics call the narrator a First-Person or I-Narrator because when the narrator refers to himself or herself in the story the first person pronoun ‘I’ is used. First-person narrators are often said to be “limited” because they don’t know all the facts or “unreliable” because they trick the reader by withholding information or telling untruths. This often happens in murder and mystery stories.

Third-person narrators If the narrator is not a character in the fictional world, he or she is usually called a Third-Person Narrator, because reference to all the characters in the fictional world of the story will involve the use of the third-person pronouns, he ,she, it or they. This second main type of narrator is arguably the dominant narrator type.

Schema-oriented language Viewpoint is schema-oriented. It is worth noting that different participants in the same situation will have different Schemas, related to their different viewpoints. Hence shopkeepers and

their customers will have shop schemas which in many respects will be mirror images of one another, and the success of shop-keepers will depend in part on their being able to take into account the schemas and points of view of their customers.

Besides indicating viewpoint by choosing what to describe, novelists can also indicate it by how it is described, particularly through expressions which are evaluative in nature:

Given vs. New information at the beginning of a story, we should thus be able to predict that narrative reference to everything in the fiction except items generally assumed by everyone in our culture (e.g. the sun) must be new, and hence should display indefinite reference. This is what happens, for example (10), at the beginning of Thomas Hardy *The Mayor of Casterbridge*:

One evening of late summer, before the nineteenth century had reached one third of its span, a young man and woman, the latter carrying a child, were approaching the large village of Weydon-priors, in Upper Wessex, on foot.

The first mention of the man (and by implication the woman) and that of the child have indefinite reference (a young man and woman, a child) because we have not met them before. As a consequence, we tend to get a distanced “bird eye view” of the characters. The nineteenth century has definite reference because Hardy can assume that his readers will already know what the phrase refers to. But note that even in this straightforward description, the village of Weydon-piors gets definite references for its first mention, encouraging us to pretend to ourselves that we are already familiar with it. Hardy is thus “positioning” his

readers as people who are familiar to some extent with the village (and hence the area) but not the characters.

Deixis because DEIXIS is speaker-related it can easily be used to indicate particular, and changing, viewpoint. In the following example from *The Secret Agent*, we see Mrs. Verloc actions from Mr. Verloc viewpoint:

Mr. Verloc heard the creaky plank in the floor and was content. He waited.

Mrs. Verloc was coming.

In addition to the perception and cognition verbs heard and waited and the indication of his inner mental state (was content) we can see that Mrs. Verloc movement towards her husband is viewed from Mr. Verloc position (coming). The fact that the events are only seen from Mr. Verloc viewpoint is strategically important at this point in the novel. He does not realize that his wife is about to kill him.

2.2 Conversations with Implicatures

Fictional dialogues are considerably important in portraying characters and helping the development of plots. They play an important role in the source text and should be give lots of consideration in the process of translation. However, fictional dialogues obviously differ from daily conversations in many ways. Carter acknowledges at the outset that natural conversation and fictional dialogues differ in many ways. Fictional conversations are not only ‘tidied up’, which means that there are relatively few unclear utterances, overlaps, false starts, hesitations and repetitions but also are governed by literary conventions, so that fictional

conversations are hardly faithful transcription of natural conversations (1995). However, certain principles such as CP and CI govern fictional dialogues as they do natural conversations, and in the former case as in the latter, a reader or hearer must recognize and attend to those principles in order to comprehend the dialogues.

CP and CI are applied to daily conversations as well as fictional dialogues. In fact, by violating some conversational maxims in fictional dialogues, the author presents to readers the characters' inner world, such as psychological state, mental state, feelings and emotions.

Let us examine a simple example from Emily Bronte *Wuthering Heights* in which Nelly Dean and Isabella are talking about Heathcliff:

Example (11):

Nelly Dean: 'Hush, hush! He a human being,' I said. 'Be more charitable; there are worse men than he is yet!'

Nelly Dean breaks the maxim of quantity by stating what is self-evidently true and therefore from redundant information: Heathcliff is a 'human being'. We know that human beings usually and should afford sympathy, care and consideration etc. to each other. To Heathcliff, the implicature, apparently by what follows, arises that he deserves to be treated with sympathy, care and consideration etc. When Nelly Dean said 'there are worse men than he is yet!' she breaks the maxim of quality 'do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.' There is no adequate evidence for her to say there might be even worse men than Heathcliff. What she said about him is merely her subjective understanding. The implicature arising from Nelly utterance is that Heathcliff is not the worst man in the world, he is one of us, Isabella should forgive him for what he

had done.

The breaking of the maxims of quantity and manner can be seen in the following extracts from Agatha Christie *Destination Unknown*:

Example (12):

Wharton: "What about the wife- you've tried her?"

Jessop: "Several times."

Wharton: "Can't she help?"

The other shrugged his shoulder.

Jessop: "He hasn't so far."

Wharton: "You think she knows something?"

Jessop answers Wharton first question straightforwardly. However, his response to the second breaks the maxims of quantity and manner. It is quite common for a contribution to a conversation to break more than one maxim at a time (Leech and Short, 1981). It breaks the maxim of manner because if he had the information asked for, yes or no would have been the shortest and most effective reply. The maxim of quantity is broken because Jessop does not give as full an answer as he might. "He can't help" would have entailed the actual reply, but "he hasn't helped" does not detail "he can't help". One good reason for breaking one of the maxims is to avoid violating one of the others. In this case Wharton notices that Jessop is apparently breaking the cooperative principle and interprets this violation as being necessitated by his not breaking the maxim of quality. Jessop is not sure of the answer and therefore cannot definitely reply yes or no. In real life the deduction of implicatures is often aided by the use of kinesic signals-eg gesture like eyebrow raising or head movement. In this case Agatha Christie gives us the kinesic

information in her narrative description: Jessop shrugged his shoulders', thus helping us to understand Jessop implicature: not only that the woman has not helped so far but also that she might be of some use in the future. The two characters are obeying the cooperative principle even though maxims are being violated.

Another example which appears to break both the maxims of manner and quantity comes later in *Destination Unknown*:

Example (13):

"He supposed to be a cousin by marriage of Tom Betterton."

"Supposed?"

"Let us say, more correctly, that if he is who says he is, he is a cousin of the late Mrs. Betterton."

Again, in order to avoid breaking the maxim of quality by saying "he is a cousin by marriage of Tom Betterton", what he suspects is false, Jessop uses a more complex and less definite locution. Hillary Craven echoed the added part of the sentence in order to indicate that she has understood the implicature, and to ask for further clarification. Although this particular strategy is not really covered by Grice maxims, it can be treated in an analogous fashion. Typically people employ echo questions to indicate that they are not sure whether they have heard or understood the relevant part of the precious remark properly. There is no obvious reason to suppose that Hilary has not heard the sentence correctly, or that it is difficult for her to understand. Hence we, like Jessop, treat the echo as a request for more explicit information.

Therefore, the conversational implicature takes place, for the speaker breaks one or more of the maxims of CP but the listener assumes that the

speaker observes CP at a deeper level. Paul Grice advances the CP and CI to be used to explain the implied meaning in daily conversations. Actually these two rules always applied in fictional dialogues as well.

2.3 How to Grasp Implicatures in Fictions

As we know, implicature exists in most conversation of fictions. To make the target readers understand as the original readers do the translator should try his best to translate the implicature implied in conversations. There are two ways in the following:

2.3.1 Understanding the Context

Context refers to any circumstances in which communication occurs through people's employment of natural language, and of which any alternation, whether internal or external to the text, would affect the nature of communication. In view of translation, context might be defined as the environment of an utterance that includes linguistic factors and nonlinguistic factors, namely, practical circumstances and setting. Since the beginning of the 1970s, linguists have become increasingly aware of the importance of the context in the interpretation of sentence. In literary it is obvious that context or background assumptions play a crucial role in the study of relation between language and its users, specifically to the contextual conditions governing the author choice of an utterance, and the reader interpretation of it. By "context" here, it means not simply the preceding linguistic text, the environment in which the utterance takes place or the set of assumptions brought to bear in arriving at the intended interpretation, but language users' pragmatic knowledge, namely

cognitive context. These may be drawn from the preceding text, or from observation of the author and what is going on in the immediate environment, but they may also be drawn from cultural or scientific knowledge, common-sense assumptions, and, more generally, any item of shared or idiosyncratic information that the reader has access to at the time.

The meaning of a word or an expression is built on context to some extent. Sperber and Wilson suggest that the context can not only help translators to filter out inappropriate interpretations but also provides premises without which the implicature cannot be inferred at all (Baker, 2000). Context involves many things, apart from the actual setting and the participants in an utterance and the broader social situation.

In most writings, while it is recognized that context makes a major contribution to understanding, the problem of how the intended context is identified is not seriously addressed. The assumption is that in normal circumstances only a single set of contextual assumptions could possibly have been intended.

Imagine the following scenario. B is an aunt of a little boy, and A knows that B has recently begun taking care of him. When they meet, A asks B:

Example (14):

A: What is your nephew like?

B: He has much in common with James Bond.

At least for audiences of the 007 movies, the intended interpretation of this utterance will be immediately obvious. You are intended to use the contextual assumption that James Bond life is full of fight and shooting,

and draw the conclusion that B nephew is extremely naughty.

Notice, though, that most people will have a lot more information than this stored under the heading “James Bond”, who is a character created by Ian Fleming, one of the popular Britain writers in the 20th century. Though Bond does not really exist in real life, he is such a vivid role created by Ian Fleming in the fictional world that most people love him and accept what he did and what he said in the fiction wholly created by the author.

In the example, you might know that James Bond is a very keen-witted secret agent, that he has a talent to be a good agent, that he could accomplish all missions which seem impossible to be done, that he is very handsome, that he often wears business suit when appearing, that he is very lucky that he always gets into girls good graces, especially very beautiful and charming ones, and so on. By adding these assumptions to the context, you could derive a whole range of further information: that B nephews, like James Bond, is a naughty but keen-witted boy that he is very handsome, cute and adored by girls who meet him, that he has a talent to be a warrior, and so on.

There is another question: what can stop you adding ever more contextual assumptions to the context, deriving ever more conclusions, and deciding which part is what B intended to imply? Notice, of course, that this is not what actual readers would do. This example suggests two important observations, which have to be taken account of in the theory of utterance interpretation.

Firstly, it is clear that in interpreting we do not assume that the addresser intended us to go on expanding the context indefinitely,

deriving even more interpretations. We do look for implicatures, of course; but what we appear to do is choose the minimal set of meanings that would make the utterance worth reading, and stop there.

Secondly, we do not-and could not-compare all possible interpretations of an utterance before deciding on the intended one. Intuitively, we do not do this; but, as this example show, theoretically, we could not do it either, since for any utterance there is a huge range of possible contexts and possible interpretations, not all of which could conceivably be considered in the very short time it takes to understand an utterance. What we need, and what readers seem to have, is some methods of recognizing the intended interpretation as soon as it presents itself, without necessarily considering any alternatives at all.

So interpretations will be different based on different contexts, language users cannot take unrestrained imagination optionally. The first reason is that possible interpretation is restricted by context and relevance. The second is that implicatures that have nothing to do with communicative intentions are only the shadow of language.

Just like when you go out in a sunny day, your shadow will with no doubt fall on the ground, but the shadow is not the purpose of outgoing. Implicatures having relevance to intentions are not the purpose of communication. (Xiong xueliang 1997) Only the first (relevant) implicature inferred, relevant to communicators' intentions and context, is the real implicature of discourse. (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 1995) It is not a very difficult task for people to get real implicatures. "Intention" is the "Occam Razor" to restrict redundant implicatures. Human behavior is also restricted by "principle of labor economy". So in specific situation,

some implicatures without intentions can be eliminated and become the shadow of language.

It should be clear by now that understanding an utterance involves considerably more than simply knowing the language. The class of possible interpretations is determined, on the one hand, by the meaning of the sentence uttered, and on the other hand by the set of available contextual assumptions. The addressee task is to choose, from among this vast array of possible interpretations, the actual, intended one.

Here we only pay much attention to the function of “context” and its role in interpreting conversation. While in literary analysis, inference of conversational implicatures does not always depend on concrete “context”; because language users have already transformed the relevant concrete linguistic context to contextualization and cognition through experience. Besides, analyzing conversational implicatures in literary works, we have to take two more steps: working memory and knowledge structure.

Working memory, which has stored innumerable cells of relevant “meaning” and “rules”, means the decoding process of the language use; knowledge structure includes literary knowledge and the degree of understanding the background of authors. (Xiong xueliang, 2001) So in order to analyze implicatures in novels better, we could borrow a model called “unilateral context inference model”:

Language decod (success)→conventional implicature

↓

(fail) →context 1(working memory factors)(success)→implicature 1

↓

(fail)→context 2(knowledge structure factors)(success) →

implicature 2

↓

(fail) →communication failed

Therefore, we can see that to the explanation of conversational implicatures, it can be seen as a process of addressee to choose and use cognitive context.

2.3.2 Understanding the Culture

History of every ethnic group has a great influence on the development of language. The historical process in China is different from that in America and England, so cultural connotations deposited in their languages are different, especially in proverbs and idioms which are usually used in conversations. When translating the idioms and proverbs, translators must know more about the history and culture reflected in the language. For example, Chinese men call their father-in-law “泰山”. If this word is literally rendered as “Taishan”, the Westerners will be confused. In fact the allusion of “泰山” can be traced back to Tang Dynasty.

Legend as well as customs will always be reflected in the idioms. Britain has nearly a thousand years of history, and English has substantial changes from the ancient to the modern times. The vocabulary has been greatly enriched through a mix of other languages in which many ancient idioms are from Aesop's fables, Greek mythology, Roman mythology or the Bible stories. And many other idioms are from the modern literary works of W. Shakespeare, A. Pope and C. Dickens, or from the historical

events in the middle of the 20th century. For example, “sour grapes(聊以自慰, 酸葡萄)” is from “Aesop's Fables”, “The touch of Midas(点金术)” is from Greek mythology; “To wear one's heart on one's sleeve(不掩饰自己的感情)” comes from Shakespeare's Hamlet, “Achilles heel” comes from Homer's Iliad, and “Dunkirk evacuation(敦刻尔克撤退)” is used after the Second World War.

In China, many idioms which are in historical documents are concerned with historical characters or historical events. For example, “价值连城”、“完璧归赵”、“负荆请罪”、“取而代之”、“四面楚歌”、“项庄舞剑” are about the ancient war, while the idioms, “毛遂自荐”、“四面楚歌”、“卧薪尝胆” are about the figures in the history. These idioms all have close relationship with specific historical period or characters. Without the historical background, they can not be understood. In the literary translated works, there are many such examples.

Example (15):刘姥姥道:“这倒也不然。‘谋事在人, 成事在天’, 咱们谋到了, 靠菩萨的保佑, 有些机会, 也未可知……”(曹雪芹, 高鹗, 《红楼梦》第六回)

“Don't be so sure,” said Granny Liu. “Man proposes. Heaven disposes. Work out a plan, trust to Buddaha, and something may come of it for all you know…” (杨宪益, 戴乃迭, 1980)

“I wouldn't say that,” said Grannie Liu. “Man proposes. God disposes. It's up to us to think of something. We must leave it to the good Lord to decide whether he'll help us or not. Who knows, he might give us the opportunity we are looking for…” (Hawkes, 1973)

In this example, the image in the original works “天” (Heaven) is preserved in Yang Xianyi's version. It conveys the conception of Taoism

as well as a Chinese person's belief in old China. Hawkes changes the image "Heaven" into "God" which is a reflection of Christianity in Western society, thinking that the Western readers may accept it easily.

Example (16):刘姥姥一面走，一面笑说道：“你老是‘贵人多忘事’了，那里还记得我们？”（曹雪芹，高鹗，《红楼梦》第六回）

Smiling as she walked in, Granny Liu remarked, "The higher the rank, the worse the memory. How could you remember us?"（杨宪益，戴乃迭，1980）

Grannie Liu followed her cackling. "You know what they say: 'important people have short memories.' I wouldn't expect you to remember the likes of us!"(Hawkes,1973)

When translating the Chinese idiom “贵人多忘事”，Yang used the sentence structure “The Xer, the Yer” skillfully. The translation is faithful to the content of the original works, and at the same time, it faithfully reflects its original form. The English readers who haven't read the original works can experience Granny Liu's humorous and flattering compliment. The highly faithfulness to the original works is better than Hawkes'. And the result is brought about by English idioms.

Translators' understanding and interpretation to the original works, as well as their choice of strategies when conveying the understanding and interpretation will lay a foundation for the survival of translated works. Translators' choice of the strategies is certainly not arbitrary. Each strategy is decided by considering a variety of subjective and objective factors as a whole. In these factors, some are definite, and translators cannot make any other choice, such as the literary trend at the time or the literary conventions of the culture. However, in the information chain, the

translators are in a special position. For them, the influence is imperceptible. In other words, the reason why the influence is reflected in the translation is that those factors influence the translators by osmosis, and they are reflected through the choice of strategies. And the translators' own cultural qualities, as well as their right and false understanding, the depth of recognition and the extent of expression to the original literary works will determine the translators' final choice on the strategies.

In one word, these idioms demonstrate the unique ancient culture of different groups. It is difficult, even impossible to find the equivalent expressions in another language, which shows the great difference between the two nations in culture.

Chapter 3 Translation Strategies for Conversational Implicatures

Language can reflect reality and fictional dialogues can be regarded as condensed and refined communication forms of real world dialogues. Whether it is right or not, as we know, any description of a state of affairs must draw assistance from language, which by its nature is a vehicle for abstraction and differentiation. It is certain that fictional dialogue simulates and describes ideas or feelings of characters, which are created by writers in their imaginal world. And the writer is closely connected with the society he lives. Therefore, there is saying, "Literature is a mirror of reflecting the society". In my opinion, the theory of conversational implicature is presented on the basis of daily colloquial conversations; it is the same to analyze the conversations in fictional text. As Yule(1996) points out, "Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker(or a writer) and interpreted by a listener (or a reader)".

In addition, Feng Zongxin confirms that, "In fact, it has been found that there are certain similarities and differences between the two types of dialogue(fictional discourse and actual conversation) and discourse stylist regard discourse models as valuable to the study of dialogue in drama and, more generally, in fictional texts."(Feng Zongxin, 2002). Since linguists suggest that fictional dialogue can be analyzed linguistically, it is reasonable to apply the conversational implicature to fictional dialogues.

Language is a vehicle of communication. In daily conversations, one person conveys messages to another for many different intentions, so is

fictional dialogue. What's more, it must oppresses the function of "informing" readers about certain particular fictional characters, but also it needs to achieve an identity of viewpoint whereby the contents and characters of the fiction can be interpreted and evaluated in a appropriate way. That is, with abundant implicature, fictional dialogue needs to be understood and interpreted well. As Page (1973) states, "It is always employed to portray and reflect character's thoughts, feelings and personalities and it also contributes to construct plots, explain the background, and enhance the emotional appeal and atmosphere. Therefore the study of character utterances is of key importance." Then, another similar opinion is proposed, "We must also recognize the importance of inference in the determination of characters: in novels, as in real life, a person characters are inferred from outward behavior, especially from speech" (Leech and Short, 2001). The conversational implicature rightly undertakes this significant task. Here is another example (17):

Reed: "Jane, you are under a mistake: what is the matter with you? Why do tremble so violently? Would you like to drink some water?"

Jane: "No, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: *"Is there anything else you wish for, Jane? I assure you, I desire to be your friend."*

(Jane Eye:41)

This fictional dialogue happens between Jane and her aunt-Mrs.Reed, after Jane violently protests her aunt false comments on her. Only from the sentence "Is there anything else you wish for, Jane? I assure you, I desire to be your friend", whoever will consider Mrs. Reed as a kind

hearted woman, who at least has the willingness to treat little Jane well. But in fact, she obviously violated the quality maxim---do not to say what you believe to be false. For Mrs. Reed's answer "I assure you, I desire to be your friend.", the implicature is :ok, I'll send you to the charity school, which will put you to death. From then on, it is nothing between you and me. On knowing about this, readers can easily recognize the true essence of Mrs. Reed.

To really translate a fiction faithfully, one has to pay much attention to the characters' utterances, especially the conversation between characters, which involve pragmatics, especially conversational implicature theory, which aims to arrange and describe the application and comprehension of the speech in the context. With meaning and communication as the major orientation in the reproduction of the original text, the translator is thus faced with the choice of the concrete translation. The following discussion will explore the translation strategies for conversational strategies from the following three aspects:

3.1 Reproduction of the Original Implicatures

In most fictions, most authors seldom stand out and explicitly tell readers what the characters thought. They just honestly write their utterances, leaving what was implicated in their words to readers and arousing endless imagination in the audience. Therefore, while translating fictions, the implicature should be kept in mind and the translator should try to convey the implicature of the source text.

According to Baker(1998:125), "Most literal translations are in fact compromises with the ideal: looser renditions that replace individual

source language words with individual target language words wherever possible, and clings as closely as possible to the source language word order in the target language". Thus translator will render the expression literally, if it is possible feel or recognize in the context the same intended meaning or the force of meaning in the source language.

In order to reproduce implicatures properly, the translator should go through a special process of inference to work out the implicatures and try his/her best to represent them in the natural corresponding forms in the target language. The following are some translating crafts often adopted when dealing with the implicature in conversation, which stands as concrete methods to carry out the pragmatic approach in the reproducing phase and may be applied both to the translation from Chinese into English and to that from English into Chinese.

Take the example (18) from *Pride and Prejudice*:

"It is wonderful,"—replied Wickham, — "for almost all his actions may be traced to pride;—and *pride has often been his best friend*. It has connected him nearer with virtue than any other feeling." (Austin: 72)

Version 1:“的确稀奇，”韦翰会答到：“归根结底来说，差不多他的一切行动都是出于傲慢，傲慢成了他最要好的朋友，照说他既然傲慢就应该最讲求道德。……”

Version 2:“的确让人奇怪，”威克姆答道，“因为他的一切行为差不多全是出于傲慢，傲慢成了他最好的朋友。傲慢使他比较注重道德。... ..”

In the above utterance, Wickham's words violates the quality maxim, for we all know "friends" can only be something animate, such as person, and even animals, "pride", however, is inanimate. In order to understand

the meaning of this utterance, we should believe Wickham is cooperative in saying so. According to the mutual knowledge, we know that best friends are always in company with us. And the situation in which the utterance is made is that the participants are talking about Mr. Darcy who is considered as a very arrogant man by many people. Therefore, we can find the connection between “best friends” and “pride”: pride is always in company with Mr. Darcy as best friends do.

Both translators all understand the implicit meaning of the utterance and render it literally. In Chinese, “好朋友” can always be someone accompanying with us. Thus the two versions conveyed the implicit meaning in a Chinese metaphor: “傲慢成了他最要好的朋友” and “傲慢成了他最好的朋友”. The TL readers can understand what is implied in the two sentences. So both versions not only conveyed the implicature but also keep its metaphorical function. Or we can render it into a simile “傲慢就像他最好的朋友一样如影随行”.

Example (19): “It was quite wicked of you, Mr. Sedley,” said she, “to torment the poor boy so.”

“My dear,” said the cotton-tassed in defense of conduct, “Jos. is a great deal than you ever were in your life, and that’s saying a good deal. Though, some thirty years ago, in the year hundred and eighty---What was it---perhaps you had a right to be vain. I don’t say no. But I’ve no patience with Jos and his dandified modesty. It is out---Joseph, Joseph, my dear, and all the while the boy is only thinking of himself, and what a fine fellow he is. I doubt, Ma’ma, we shall have some with yet. Here is Emmy’s little friend making love to him as hard as she can: that’s quite clear: and if she does not catch him some other will. That man is destined

to be a prey woman, as I am going on exchange everyday. It's a mercy he did not bring us over a black daughter-in-law, my dear. But mark my words, the first woman *who fishes for him, hooks him.*"

(Thackeray, 2006:42)

她说：“塞特笠先生，你何苦逗那可怜的孩子，太不应该了。”

流苏帽子替自己辩护道：“亲爱的，乔斯的虚荣心太重，比你当年最爱虚荣的时候还糟糕。你也算厉害的了。可是三十年前，一好像是一七八零年吧一倒也怪不得你爱俏。这一点，我不否认，可是我实在看不上乔斯那份儿拘拘谨谨的纵垮子习气。他实在做的太过火。亲爱的，那孩子一天到晚想着自己，只觉得自己了不起，太太，咱们还得有麻烦呢。谁都看得出来，爱米的小朋友正在拼命地追他。如果她抓不住他，反正有别人来接她的手。他那个人天生是给女人玩弄的。这话没有错，就等于我每天上交易所那样没错。总算运气好，他没给咱们从印度娶个黑漆漆的媳妇回家。瞧着吧，*不管什么女人钓他，他就会上钩。*

(杨必，1990:35)

她说：“塞特笠先生，你真不应该逗那孩子。”

丈夫替自己辩解道：“亲爱的，乔斯的虚荣心极强-----。谢天谢地，他总算还没给咱们从印度娶个黑漆漆的媳妇。瞧着吧，*不管什么女人勾引他，他准会上钩。*”

(宋建超译，30)

In the translation of this conversation taken from *Vanity Fair*, the original image *fish* in the hidden metaphor gets basically retained. The verbs *fish for* and *hook* are habitually restricted to refer to fish, such as the usage *fish a pound* and *fish trout*. When it is used to speak of a person, we may say that person, like a fish, is easy to rise to bait. In the specific

circumstances provided by the context, we may safely say that Joseph is the kind of person who is easily attracted by the woman making love to him. The fact that the translator keeps unaltered the original image *fish* is due to the reason that the verbs “*fish for*” and “*hook*” associate a reader with their implicated meaning “引诱” and “使上当” in Chinese, which are also quite familiar expression to Chinese readers. By retaining the original image, the true meaning and the spirit of the underlined sentence is well expressed, and at the same time the translation is comprehensible and fresh. So here Yang’s literal translation is more proper than Song’s adaptation translation.

Example (20):

“Oh, no, my love-only that I was a murderess; in which case, I had better go to the Old Bailey. Though I didn’t poison you when you were a child; but gave you the best of education, and the most expressive master money could produce. Yes; I’ve nursed five children, and buried three: and the one I loved the best of all, and tended through croup, and teething, and measles, and hoping-cough, and brought up with foreign masters, regardless of expense, and with accomplishments at Minerva House---which I never had when I was a girl---when I was too glade to honor my father and mother, that I might live long in the land, and to be useful, and not to mope all day in my room and act the fine lady---says I’m a murderess. Ah, Mrs. Osborne! *May you never nourish a viper in your bosom, that’s my prayer.*”

(Thaekera, 2006:594)

“亲爱的，你并不是说我要害你的孩子，不过说我是杀人的凶手罢了。既然这样，我该上贝莱去坐牢对呢，不知道怎么的你小的时候

我倒没有毒死你，还给你受最好的教育，大捧的钱拿出去，请了第一等的先生来教导你。唉，我养五胎，只带大两个，最宝贝的就是你这个女儿，闹什么气管炎啦，百日咳啦，疹子啦，都是我伺候。大来不惜工本的为她请了外国教师，又送到密纳佛大厦读书，我小的时候可没有这样的福气，我孝顺父母，希望多活几年，多帮忙别人，哪儿能够一天到晚愁眉苦脸的躲在屋子里充太太奶奶呢？我最疼孩子颠倒说我是杀人凶手，唉，奥斯本太太，*但愿你别像我一样，在胸口养了一条蛇，这是我的祷告。*

(杨必，1990:483)

“Nourish a viper in your bosom” reveals that we should not show mercy to our enemy and in the novel it implicates that Amelia should not be so kind to her son as Mrs. Sedley has treated her. The literary allusion *the Story of a Farmer and a Snake* from Aesop’s Fables is not only very familiar to the western readers, but also quite well-known to the Chinese readers. Thus the literal translation without additional information is an advisable alternate in this case.

3.2 Manifestation of the Original Implicatures

It is widely accepted that manifestation is actually a production employed to achieve an equivalence of situations wherever cultural mismatches are encountered. In the reproduction of conversations, the translator sometimes render the culture-specific expression into a synonymous one accepted by the reader of the target language to retain an equivalent effect of the message in both the source language and the target language. Here, manifestation should be used to convey the author real meaning.

Some references or concepts in the source culture may not have their counterparts in the target culture. These concepts may be abstract or concrete, such as a religious belief, a social custom, a type of food etc and they are often called “cultural-specific”. In the process of translation, it’s essential for a translator to identify these references or “cultural specific” and draw inference. Any mistranslation or awkward translation of these references will definitely disrupt the continuity of the text and obscure the meaning of the statement. The following are examples.

Example (21):

Finally, he insisted upon having a bowl of rack punch, everybody had rack bunch at Vauxhall, “Waiter, rack punch.”

(Thackeray, 2006:71)

最后,他又要了一碗五味酒,因为上游乐场的人没有一个不喝它。他说:“茶房,来碗五味酒。”

(杨必, 1990:65)

最后,他对茶房说:“茶房,来碗五味酒。”

(高玉其, 2003:46)

“Waiter”, here is rendered as “茶房” in Chinese. It’s a kind of cultural substitution. Though “茶房” is not in line with the present Chinese social custom and doesn’t have the same reference as “waiter” in English. It is too deep-rooted in Chinese specific culture to be used to substitute “waiter” in English.

But some cultural-specific words in the source language certainly can be successfully transferred into the target language in which these words can also trigger the same implicated meaning.

Take the conversation from *Vanity Fair* for example.

Example (22):

"Did you ever see a pair of buckskins like those at Miss Pinkerton?"
continued him, following up his advantage.

"Gracious heavens! Father," cried Joseph.

他看见自己的笑话说得很成功,便接着说下去道;"在平克顿女子学校里面有这种鹿皮裤子没有?"乔瑟夫叫道:"老天爷!爸爸,你这是怎么说?"

"你这是怎么说?" can't be found in the original text. It is an added part in translation. In conversation, the answer by Joseph doesn't offer enough information to his father question, which violates the quantity maxim of cooperative principle. Actually there is some information hidden in his answer: he feels embarrassed at his father unsuitable joke in the presence of Miss Sharp and hopes that his father doesn't make fun of buckskins. If the author just translated "Gracious heavens! Father" into "老天爷!爸爸", the effect on original readers must be stronger than that on target readers. Therefore, literal translation will reduce the effect on target readers. "你这是怎么说?" added here can help target readers to get enough information so that readers can obtain the conversational implicature hidden in their conversation. Look at the next example.

Example (23):

"Ought I to be angry with her for being faithful to him?" William thought. "Ought I *be jealous* of my friend in the grave, or hurt that such a heart as Amelia's can love only once and forever? O, George, how little you knew the prize you had, though."

(Thackeray, 2006:842)

威廉想道:"她对他忠诚到底,难道我反倒生气吗?像爱米丽亚这

样的心只能爱一次，她是永远不变的，难道我还能因此觉得不高兴，反而跟我死去的朋友吃醋不成？唉，乔治，你真不知道自己的福气。”

(杨必 1990:742)

威廉想：“她对他忠诚不二，难道我该为此而生气？像爱米丽亚这样的人只会爱一次，她是永远不变的，难道我还能因此而觉得扫兴，反而吃我死去的朋友的醋吗？唉，乔治，你真不了解自己有多大的福气。”

(高玉其，2003:482)

“Jealous of my friend” is translated as “吃醋” in both versions. The Implicated meaning of “吃醋” is the same as in the source text. “吃醋” has the implicit meaning-be jealous of a rival in love-while the word “jealous” itself does not. But the combination of the lexical unit “jealous” And the relevant background knowledge-William is in love with Amelia who is the wife of Dead George-implied as what “吃醋” means in Chinese. The above two translation versions both well convey the implicature in the source text.

Another example is taken from *A Dream of Red Mansions*.

Example (24):

凤姐笑道：“这孩子扮相活像一个人，你们再看不出来。”（第22回）

Version 1: “When that child made up she the living image of someone here,” remarked Xifeng. “Have none of you noticed?”

Version 2: “The way that child there is made-up makes him look so like someone we know,” she said. “Haven’t any of you noticed?”

Here Madam Phoenix knows that the actor looks like Daiyu, but she just says “活像一个人” instead of “活像颦姑娘”。 Actually, there are

some cultural connotations here. Madam Phoenix is an over-smart woman. She knows that some unsuitable words will bring some trouble to her, because some girls in rich families hate to be compared with actors, especially such an attentive and sensitive girl as Daiyu. Therefore, in above two versions, both of two translators chose someone to replace what Madam Phoenix really means, which actually offers no enough information and violates the quantity maxim, thus making the target readers to think the conversational implicature carefully. Here, the translator adopts literal translation to leave a room for readers to think about and reproduce the conversational implicature in target text successfully.

Hyperbole, as defined by Chen Shuhua (1990), is a rhetorical figure which produces a vivid impression by extravagant and obvious exaggeration for emphasis. In its extended or sustained form, hyperbole—deliberate exaggeration for effect—is used in many literary works. There are plentiful examples in comic fiction in everyday expression. It is often mingled together with other figure of speech. It may be used for the intensification of feeling or emotion; for the elevation of the heroic or mythical status and for humor or ridicule.

Example (25):

“I would no: be as fastidious as you are,” cried Bingley, “*for a kingdom!* Upon my honor, I never met with so many pleasant girls in my life...”

Version 1: “我可不愿意像你那样挑肥捡瘦。”彬格来嚷道, “随便怎么我也不愿意! 不瞒你说, 我生平没有见过今晚上这么多可爱的姑娘...”

Version2:“我可不像你那么挑剔，”宾利嚷道，“决不会！说实话，我生平从没像今天晚上这样，遇见这么多可爱的姑娘.....”

According to the discussion above, the word “a kingdom” here is a hyperbole. In translation, we can find both translators omit the word in their versions, which can convey the original meaning exactly but weaken the joyful exclamation of Mr. Bingley. However, translators add “随便怎么我也不愿意” and “决不会” respectively compensating for this exclamation from another aspect. In a word, the two versions can convey the implicit meaning in the target text.

3.3 Explanation of the Original Implicatures

In some circumstances, CP may not work or the implicature will not remain as clearly in the target text as in the source text if a translator doesn't make any explanation. So far as literature translation is concerned, the most important thing, for a translator, is to keep the implicature implicit in the target text by adopting some methods. Without the implicit meaning, the version will be flavorless as water for beauty of literature is tarnished and the room of imagination invaded. In fictional conversational, which always break the maxims of the cooperative principle. In translation we should choose the right emotional coloring words to convey the conversational implicature.

In common usage, as a term for loose rewording, one had better to say something in one own words, explanation is used very often in the translation process. Therefore, while translate a culture-specific expression into an expression of general adaptation in the target language, sometimes it is necessary to give up the specific description of the source

language, and retain only the pragmatic equivalent effect of the message with some explanation used in target language.

Take *A Dream of Red Mansion* for example (26):

原叫平儿哄他，平儿便笑着向还儿道：“你二哥哥的玉丢了，你瞧见了没有？”贾环便急得紫涨了脸，瞪着眼说道：“人家丢东西，你怎么又叫我来查问，疑我。我是犯过案的贼吗？”

Version 1: “Your Brother Bao has lost his jade,” she told him with a smile. “Have you seen it?” Chia Huan flushed scarlet and glared. “When he loses something, why suspect me?” he protested. “Am I a convicted thief?”

Version 2: “Master Bao jade has gone missing? I don’t suppose you’ve seen it anywhere, have you?” Jia Huan face instantly flushed to an ugly shade of purple. He glowered at her. “Just because somebody lost something, does that mean that I automatically become the suspect and get called in for interrogation? Have I got a criminal record or something?”

In this conversation, Jiahuan breaks the relevance maxim of cooperative principle by saying by himself without caring what Pinger says. In the first version, Jiahuang answers Pinger question in this way: “When he loses something, why upset me? Am I a convicted thief?”; In the second version, It is translated into “Just because somebody lost something, does that mean that I automatically become the upset and get called in for interrogation? Have I got a criminal record or something?” The two versions reproduce the original text faithfully. However, the second version gives a more precise translation. In the first version, “人家” is translated into “he” while it is translated into “somebody” in the

second version. Here, compared with “he”, “somebody” can express the language style of characters in specified environment. Its implicature is obvious: Jiahuan takes the chance to show his innocence and expresses his angry at the prejudice. The language is not only in line with the status of Jiahuan in Rongguo Mansion, but pays the foundation for the following plots, which achieved an ideal effect in translation of conversational implicature.

Another example taken from *Pride and prejudice*:

Example (27):

“How good it was in you, my dear Mr. Bennet! But I knew I should persuade you at last. I was sure you loved your girls too well to neglect such an acquaintance. Well, how pleased I am! And it is such a good joke, too, that you should have gone this morning, and never said a word about it till now.”

‘Now, Kitty, you may cough as much as you chose,’ said Mr. Bennet; and, as he spoke, he left the room, fatigued with the raptures of his wife.

Version 1: “你真是个好心肠的人，我的好老爷！我早就知道你终究会给我说服的。你既然疼爱自己的女儿，当然就不会把这样的—一个朋友不放在心上。我真太高兴了！你这个玩笑开得真太有意思，谁想到你竟会今天上午去拜访他，而且到现在—一个字不提。”

“古蒂，现在你可以放心大胆地咳嗽啦，”班纳特先生一面说，一面走出房间，原来太太那样得意忘形，把他闹得有些腻烦了。

Version 2: “亲爱的贝内特先生，你心肠太好啦！不过我早就知道，我终究会说服你的。你这个玩笑开得真有意思，早上就去过了，直到刚才还只字不提。”

“好啦，基蒂，你可以尽情的咳嗽啦，”贝内特先生说道。他一边说，一边走出房去，眼见着太太那样欣喜若狂，他真有些厌倦。

This is a dialogue between Mrs. Bennet and Mr. Bennet. Obviously, Mr. Bennet contribution is irrelevant to the current exchange, and thus he violates the relevance maxim. To infer his implied meaning, we must refer to the context: after Mr. Bingley who is single and has four or five thousand a year took the Netherfield Park, Mrs. Bennet manages to persuade her husband to visit Netherfield to make the acquaintance of Bingley so that she could marry off one of her daughters eventually. Mr. Bennet gets used to mocking his wife, thus he pays a visit to Netherfield in the morning without informing it to his wife and daughters. Mr. Bennet is naturally dissatisfied and angry with his husband and can not do anything but to scold one of her daughters, “Don’t keeping coughing so, Kitty, for heaven sake. Have a little compassion on my nerves. You tear them to pieces.” However, after being informed about the truth, she was so pleased with the news that she said to Mr. Bennet and her attitude towards her husband changes completely. Mr. Bennet says to satirize her wife, meanwhile, to revert to his previous utterance “Kitty has no discretion in her coughs...she times them ill.” His implicit meaning is that if Mrs. Bennet is glad, Kitty is permitted to cough as much as she could; but if the former is angry, her cough is forbidden.

Thus in translation, translators should convey the ironic intention of Mr. Bennet. The translation of the clause “cough as much as you chose” is the key way to reproduce the original ironic tone. Version 1 translates it into “可以放心大胆的咳嗽”，the Chinese expression “放心大胆” means that “something is permitted to do”; Version 2 interprets it into “可以尽

情地咳嗽”;“尽情” means “heartily, vigorously”. By comparing the two versions, version 1 conveys the original ironic intention in a more humorous way.

Another example:

Example (28): Tossing in his bed, he spoke to her. “God God, Amelia!” he said, “don’t you know that I only love you in the world-you, *who are a stone to me*-you whom I tendered through months and months of illness and grief, and who bade me farewell with a smile on your face, and forgot before the door shut between us!”.

(Thackeray, 2006:672)

都宾在床上翻来覆去，对她说道：“天啊，爱米丽亚！你难道不知道我爱的只有你？你对我就像石头一样冥顽不灵。你伤心害病的时候，我怎么样经年月地伺候你来着？到临别时候你笑咪咪地跟我说了声再会，门还没关上就把我扔在脑勺子后头了。”

(杨必，1990:546)

都宾在床上辗转反侧，对她说道“天啊，爱米丽亚！你难道不知道我爱的只有你？你对我就像石头一样冰冷。你伤心害病时，我是如何长期的伺候你？到临别时你笑咪咪的跟我说了声再会，门还没有关上就把我忘掉了。”

(宋建超译，522 — 523)

The original metaphor, “you, who are a stone to me”, is almost kept in the translation versions. Obviously, the deep meaning of this metaphor, “you, who are a stone to me”, is that Amelia doesn’t care about Dobbin’s feeling and is never moved by what Dobbin have done for her, but still only loves George. If we translate it literally as “你就像石头”，we can’t transfer this deep meaning into the translated text. As “顽” and “灵” are

also used to express one's feeling and thought, Yang paraphrases this metaphor and translated it into “你对我就像石头一样冥顽不灵”, which well conveys the original deep meaning. While, song's translation, “你对我就像石头一样冰冷”, does not retain the deep meaning of the metaphor, but just shows Amelia's attitude towards Dobbin. So Yang's translation is better.

Conclusion

This thesis has made a study of conveyance of conversational implicatures in fictions mainly from the pragmatic perspective. In fictions, conversational implicatures can be represented as some rhetorical figures such as metaphor, irony and hyperbole; also they can be implied in the use of idioms, allusions and some cultural concepts. By analyzing the reproduction of these particularized conversational implicatures in fictions, the author finds that only the target language text which can convey the conversational implicatures hidden in the original can be regarded as the best one. And the reproduction of conversational implicatures can be regarded as a criterion to judge whether the target language text is faithful to the original language text.

The basic theory of this thesis is Grice conversational implicature theory and the cooperative principle. The principle and its maxims require people to communicate in a cooperative way and the violation of the principle can lead to the conversational implicatures. As for translation, it is also restrained by this Cooperative Principle because the process of translation is also a process in which translators, as the mediator, mediate the macro-conversation or the cross-cultural communication between the original author and the target language readers. Translation means communicating (Nida, 1993:116). Therefore, the Cooperative principle can work both as a general theory of translation and as an instruction for the translator to learn how to transfer conversational implicatures across languages because under the guidelines of this principle, the translator may better understand the nature of his work and then act as a qualified

mediator. However, since translation is a kind of inter-lingual communication, the function of this principle is far more complex. The translator must take the contexts in different cultures into consideration. Generally speaking, the process of translating conversational implicatures consists of two steps: the first one is that the translator understands the conversational implicatures with the help of the source context; the second one is that the translator reproduces these conversational implicatures in the target text. In both steps, the translator should observe and depend on the Cooperative Principle and its four maxims.

In this thesis, a comparative analysis has also been made to compare two Chinese versions of some fictions, such as *Pride and Prejudice*, *A Dream of Red Mansion*. From the analysis we can see that different translators may hold different opinions toward their responsibilities as a communicative mediator. In practice, they may resort to different translation strategies to overcome problems occurring in the translation of these conversational implicatures. The main strategies are: (1) to reproduce the literal meaning by using a Chinese expression with the same or very similar contextual implicit meaning; (2) to reproduce the implicit meaning by using a Chinese expression with same or similar implicit meaning and different literal meaning; (3) to reproduce only the implicit meaning by using a Chinese expression with the explicit meaning; (4) to reproduce the literal meaning with footnotes added. Meanwhile, the merits and demerits of each version are explored with the hope to improve the quality of translation.

In a word, the application of Grice cooperative principle and conversational implicatures to translation studies both necessary and

effective. However, the discussion in this thesis is far from exhaustive. Further efforts need to be made to obtain a deeper understanding of the question of applying this pragmatic principle to translation theory and practice.

Bibliography

- Austin, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 1991.
- Basil Hatim. *Ian Mason Discourse and the translator* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
- Baker, Mona. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Bilmes, Jack. *Discourse and Behaviour*. New York and London: Plenum, 1986.
- Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Gile, Daniel. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.
- Grice, Paul. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2002.
- Gumperz, J. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Hatim, Basil. *Communication Across Cultures*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
- Hawkes, David (trans). *The Story of the Stone: Volume 1*. New York: Penguin, 1976.
- Hawkes, David(trans). *The story of the Stone: Volume 2*. New York:

- Penguin Books, 1977.
- Hickey, Leo. *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
- Holman, C. Hugh and Harmon, William. *A Handbook to Literature* [M]. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1972.
- Landers, Clifford E. *Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Larson, Mildred L. *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1984.
- Leech, G. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1983..
- MALMKJAR. *Cooperation and Literary Translation*. HICKEY L. Ed. *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1998: 25-40.
- Mey, Jacob L. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2001.
- Moulin, Georges. *Linguistique et Traduction*. Bruxelles: Dessart et Mardaga, 1976.
- Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
- Newmark, P. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd, 1988.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Translating Meaning*. California: English Language Institute, 1982.
- Nida, Eugene A. *On Translation*. Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation, 1984.

- Nida, Eugene A. *Language, Culture, and Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1993.
- Nida Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practices of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.
- Page, Norman. *Speech in the English Novel*. London: Macmillan Press, 1973.
- Peter Fawcett. *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained* (英)福西特.翻译与语言: 语言学理论解读.北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2007.1
- Thackeray, William. *Vanity Fair*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2006.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang(trans). *A Dream of Red Mansions Volume 1-5*[M]. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1999.
- 奥斯丁. 傲慢与偏见.孙致礼译, 南京: 译林出版社, 2006.
- 奥斯丁. 傲慢与偏见. 王科一译, 上海: 上海译文出版社, 2006.
- 包惠南. 文化语境与语言翻译. 北京: 中国对外翻译出版公司, 2001.
- 陈福康. 中国译学理论史稿. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.
- 陈淑华. 英语修辞与翻译. 北京: 北京邮电学院出版社, 1990.
- 陈望道. 修辞学发凡. 上海: 上海教育出版社, 1979.
- 陈喜荣. 会话含义与隐喻. 四川外语学院学报.第 19 卷, 第 4 期, 85-88 页, 2003.
- 樊葳葳, 张迎丰. 副语言符号英汉互译中的文化沟通, 《中国翻译》, 第 2 期, 36-38 页, 2000.
- 封宗信. 文学语篇的语用文体学研究. 北京:清华大学出版社, 2002.

- 高玉其, 左志群译. 名利场. 北京: 中国致公出版社, 2003.
- 黄玉兰. 会话合作原则和会话含义的产生, 江苏外语教学研究, 2002(3).
- 何兆熊. 新编语用学概要, 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.
- 何自然. 语用学与英语学习. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 1999.
- 姜治文. 文军. 翻译批评论. 重庆大学出版社, 1999.
- 林澜, 吉尔. 对忠实翻译的探索. 福州师专学报(社会科学版), 2002(3)
- 刘润清. 封宗信. 语言学理论与流派. 南京: 南京师范大学出版社, 2002(3)
- 钱冠连. 汉语文化语用学. 北京: 清华大学出版社, 1997.
- 宋建超译. 名利场. 北京: 华艺出版社, 1998.
- 苏儒. 论信达雅. 严复翻译理论研究. 北京: 商务印书馆, 1998.
- 王胜宝. 会话含义与小说对话的理解与翻译. 中国翻译, 1996(3)
- 杨必译. 名利场. 北京: 人民文学出版社, 1990.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank many people who have helped me in the preparation of this dissertation. First I would especially like to thank Prof. Huang Zhending, a respectable and considerate scholar. Without his enlightening instruction, insightful guidance and invaluable support, I might not have finished this dissertation. And I will never forget that he has always encouraged me to seek for originality and become independent-minded, keeping me on the right track throughout my thesis writing.

My sincere thanks should also go to my classmates and my family who have made contributions to my graduate program.