

## Chapter Three

### The Practice of Chinese-English Translation

#### 3.1 Moving Closer to Writer-Responsibility in to Become

##### More Communicative

*Sinorama*, firstly published in 1976, devoted a large portion of pages to Chinese writing and at that time English was only the version translated from part of the Chinese original. The amount of words in Chinese and English was not in an equal status although it emerged as the form of a Chinese-English bilingual monthly. The layout of Chinese writing and English writing did not achieve balance but gradually with the greater demand to expand the readership to the foreigners, English writing in translation became more and more important and readable. But now, the layout keeps balance and the writing either in Chinese or in English is equal in its quality and quantity. So far, it has been prevalent in the form of a bilingual magazine for more twenty years and has undertaken some changes in Chinese discourse and English version. Through careful readings of some articles written respectively in 1979-1980 and 1999, we try to make a rhetorical comparison of Chinese discourse and English version in these two different ages and investigate into the differences in the rhetorical expression after the flowing away of twenty years.

It is generally recognized that oriental way of thinking is different from the western way of thinking. According to the doodles drawn by R. B. Kaplan (1966) to

describe the expository paragraphs, the logical way of thinking in English is linear while the oriental way of thinking is circular. In other words, the Chinese writing tends to express ideas by means of indirection and to develop the subject of the paragraph by beating about the bush. Things are developed in terms of what they are not, rather than in terms of what they are. This often violates the expectations of the English speakers. This situation can be illustrated by resorting to the cultural factors. That is, in terms of Liao (1988, p.4), Confucianism, emphasizing the harmony of society, has long been exerting a great influence on the Chinese mind so that Chinese value modesty in social interaction in the community and use "Chinese discourse patterns, which seem indirect, imprecise, and very hard to process." Rhetorical style, referring to the way in which the contents or arguments in a discourse are evaluated and arranged by the writer or the speaker, is culturally conditioned.

In contrast with the writer-responsible writing of English, Chinese writing, reader-responsible, expects the readers to understand the referential meanings from the proverbs and allusions in the texts. Chinese philosophers love to use proverbs and sayings to express their thinking, which will be verified as truth in their practice of life. Thus, Chinese intuitively sense some truth and then they like to use concrete examples from the historical allusions in a circular way of analogy to serve as the proofs of this truth. This kind of expression is quite different from the Western logical thinking with guidance to the readers through step-by-step analysis in a deductive or an inductive way. In the words of Lin (1939), Chinese mind belongs to the female type of thinking, namely, Chinese thinking, as the woman talk, is synthetic, concrete and accustomed to

use sayings. One can suggest "truth" but cannot prove it. As Lao-tse said, "The Tao that can be spoken of is not the Tao itself. The name that can be given is not the name itself" (Chang, 1975, p.3). In this sense, language as the representation of reality is suspicious for Chinese thinking. One should be free from conceptualization in preparation to enter the gate of Tao. Therefore, logic is never developed in a systematic way in China. Chinese writers have the tendency to "suggest" or be indirect, using "rhetorical questions, analogies, and anecdotes to reveal intentions" (Conner, 1996, p.40).

As for paragraph development, Conner (1996) points out that the organizing principle of the eight-legged essay still overpowers Chinese writings and the application of the more recent four-part model of *qi-cheng-jun-he* in organizing paragraphs also dominate over students in writing. As is explained by Conner (1996, p.39), "*qi* [起] prepares the reader for the topic, *cheng* [承] introduces and develops the topic, *jun* [轉] turns to a seemingly unrelated subject, and *he* [合] sums up the essay." Although some scholars raise questions about these phenomena, but basically they do not neglect this tendency in Chinese discourse and remind researchers to notice other factors when examining this tendency in Chinese discourse. For example, Mohan and Lo (1985), after examining the classical texts and modern works on Chinese expository writing, argue that organizational pattern of Chinese writing does not differ markedly from that of English. They explain that the experience of Chinese students with English composition is confined to the sentence-level problems, in which accuracy is emphasized while the development of appropriate discourse organization is paid less

attention to. They suggest that if there is any difference in the ability of Chinese and Western students to organize essays in English, the source of these differences does not lie in a preference for "indirectness" in the language and culture of Chinese. Rather, it lies in the emphasis of the English language instruction programs to which students are exposed. In fact, according to Mohan and Lo, language instruction may be the primary factor to make students conscious of their control of the organization of the writing but behind that they do not neglect the transfer factors from Chinese to English, allowing us to identify writing difficulties and attribute them to well-established cross-cultural differences in rhetoric.

For the topic of language instruction, in 1970s, the appearance of "national language movement" in the Republic of China encouraged people using language in Mandarin Chinese and Japanese was prohibited for speaking since then. No wonder that the earlier issues of *Sinorama* in 1970s age have lessons in the column called "How to learn Chinese" (see Appendix I). In this column, each word is accompanied by the phonetic symbol of Mandarin for recognition and pronunciation and Chinese phrases are arranged here for oral, reading or writing practice. Besides, the English version of Chinese in the issues before July, 1979 shows no form of indentation in each paragraph. Undoubtedly, National Language Movement is the movement of language instruction, inspiring people to seek their language identification with Chinese and to bring the Chinese illiterate to the level of literacy. Therefore, in this period the focus of language instruction is on Chinese; English is only "enslaved" by the Chinese text. In other words, Mandarin underlies the structures of English and English version of

Chinese is limited in the literal sense. Let's look at the first paragraph of lesson ten (Appendix I):

The fifth day of the fifth moon of the lunar calendar of the Chinese is observed as Dragon Boat Festival. On this day the people eat rice dumplings, and go to the rivers to see dragon boat races.

中國舊曆的五月初五日，俗稱端午節。在這一天裏，中國人家吃粽子，到河邊去看龍船比賽。

It is interesting to notice that except for the underlined Chinese is translated into English in a reverse word order, the paragraph is translated word by word and organized according to the patterns of Chinese. It sounds strange to translate "中國舊曆的五月初五日" into "The fifth day of the fifth moon of the lunar calendar of the Chinese." Also, the length of these two paragraphs does not acquire balance (see Appendix I). English rhetoric tends to be mechanical, not so fluent and elegant in speaking. Let's look at the following sentences in lesson 10 and lesson 24:

He loved his country very much, and wanted to build it strong enough so that it could cope with the powerful and aggressive state of Chin. But King Huai of Chu, who easily believed the words of his treacherous subjects, brushed aside Chu Yuan's plans for making the country rich and strong.

他很愛自己的國家，想出力把國家弄好，以抵抗強暴的秦國。可惜楚懷王聽信奸臣的話，不肯接受他的富國強兵的計劃。(lesson 10)

Yu Kung: No, you are wrong. I am old, yes, but my children will still be

here when I die. There will be grandchildren and great grandchildren. There will be no end; they will keep on coming. But the mountain will not grow higher. So one day the mountain will be gone if we keep on working.

愚公：啊！你老哥的話錯了。我的年紀雖然老，要知道我死了以後，還有兒子，兒子以後，還有孫子，子子孫孫沒有窮盡，而山卻不加高，不是總有一天會把山掘平的嗎？(lesson 24)

More interesting, the topics in these columns intend to engrave a strong image of Chinese by exposing the readers to the content of Chinese traditional virtues and patriotism. They expect Chinese to possess the spirit of great heroes (e. g. Chu Yuan 屈原, Wu Hsun 武訓, Yu Kung 愚公) and even proclaim the spirit of patriotism of overseas Chinese in the song called "patriotism of overseas Chinese" in lesson 26. In lesson 25, the image of Chinese shows that "the indomitable will and hard-working spirit of the Chinese people are known throughout the world." Particularly, in December 16, 1978, U. S. government being aligned with P.R.C. had met with united opposition both inside and outside the Republic of China. This event uplifted the spirit of patriotism in R.O.C. to build a strong image of self-concept. Most articles in the 1970s circle around the topics about great happenings, great athletes, great teachers, great local cultures, and great scientific advances in R.O.C. There fills with a strong sense of nostalgia for R.O.C. to break from the motherhood of Mainland China and the support of U. S. government.

The layout of Chinese and English writings are unequal in the earlier issues of

*Sinorama*. Take the article "Teaching with Love" (see the first page in Appendix II) for example, there are at least 14 Chinese paragraphs on this page, but the English version does not equal these paragraphs and is placed in the right column of this page. We had better say that there is no notion about English paragraph at all, for the English version is not "faithful" to the organization of Chinese paragraphs. Below, let's examine the English writing on the first page and see its parallel to Chinese (In Appendix II, only the underlined Chinese is translated into English):

After teaching art at the Tainan School for the Deaf for 23 years, Pan Yuan-shih has earned a reputation among his friends for being reticent.

This sentence is literally translated from the first paragraph in Chinese as follows: 潘元石老師在省立臺南啓聰學校小學部教了二十三年美術，他的朋友說他越來越像啞巴了。 Then the next two sentences are only translated from part of Chinese in the second paragraph:

He himself recalls how once after eating at a road-side noodle stall, he noticed the Proprietor gestures toward him with five raised fingers.

Pan was puzzled for a moment until he realized he must pay five New Taiwan Dollars for his meal. (Chinese: 有一天，他在攤子上吃麵。吃完了，麵攤老闆對著他伸出了五個指頭。起先，他不懂什麼意思，他恍然大悟，原來老闆打手勢告訴他是五塊錢。)

In Chinese, the article is well structured by dividing into eleven sections with subtitles (e.g.也變的『失音』了，上課的第一天，做學生的家長...). These subtitles,

serving as the main concepts of the article, are supported by incidents in Pan’s teaching career. In the description of the incidents happening to Pan, “time” is the important beginning to narrate Pan’s story. Thus, “One day有一天” (in paragraph 2 and 11), “When he first started teaching當他剛開始教書時” (in paragraph 4), “Now現在” (in paragraph 5), “That year 那年” (in paragraph 7), “Later 後來” (in paragraph 10), “After that 事後” (in paragraph 12) are used to link the Chinese discourse. It is worth noticing that time sequence sets the model of “*qi-cheng-jun-he*” in this article. Below, from Table I we can see the model applied to the three sections on page 1. As for the whole article “Teaching with Love,” Table II may support the application of this model:

Table 1: The Structure of the Sections in *Sinorama*

<i>Section</i>	<i>Qi</i> (起)	<i>Cheng</i> (承)	<i>Jun</i> (轉)	<i>He</i> (合)
* Section one-- 也變得失音 ( I become voiceless)	教了二十年 (has taught for 20 years)	有一天 (One day)	當他開始教書 時 (When he first started teaching)	現在 (Now)
* Section two-- 上課的第一 天(The first day I have class)	民國四十四年 (In 1955)	那年 (That year)	有一天 (One day)	事後...如 今... (After that,...Now .....)
* Section three-- -做學生的家 長 ( To be a parent of students)	他說：「...」 (He said, “ ...”)	潘元石認為在 教聾生之前 (Pan thought that before you taught the deaf.)	後來 (Later on)	潘元石 說：「...」 (Pan concludes, “.....”)



Table 2: The Structure of the Article, "Teaching with Love"

<i>Qi</i> (起)	<i>Cheng</i> (承)	<i>Jun</i> (轉)	<i>He</i> (合)
* Section one—也變得失音( I become voiceless)	* Section two—上課的第一天(The first day I have class) to * Section eight—加強口語教學 (To enhance the ability of oral teaching)	* Section nine—難忘的學生( Unforgettable students) to * Section ten—也教智能不足的學生(Teaching students of Mongolism)	* Section eleven—讓他們有個快樂的童年 (Give them a happy childhood)

In the third section with the title of “To be a parent of students 做學生的家長,” two quotations spoken by Pan are introduced from the beginning and gradually they lead to the key concept in paragraph 16, that is, the teacher should not only impart knowledge to students but also encourage students like being a parent in support of his or her child in spirit. After this paragraph, one example is given to illustrate this point. And in the last paragraph, it again quotes the words of Pan to come to a conclusion and demands the readers to sense the meanings in the quotations. This is the indirect way of Chinese writing to express the idea. English translation also follows this model. Besides, in each section of the article the author seldom directly uses the topic sentence in each paragraph to explain the subtitle and tends to use “time” for transition and to present events for readers’ association with the meanings in it.

As for the article, in the part of *chi* (section 1), it briefly describes the reason why Pan became reticent in his teaching career of 23 years but he felt so happy. In the

part of *cheng* (section 2 to section 8), it developed the topic of *chi* and began to describe Pan's teaching career from the beginning class to the teaching process and his contribution to deaf education. Then in the part of *jun*, Pan, after 23 years, recalls the memory of two unforgettable students, who overcome their psychological problems by drawing under the patient guidance of Pan. In addition, this part mentions that nowadays Pan also works at a rehabilitation center for the mentally retarded and helps those who suffer from Mongolism. This part seems unrelated to Pan's teaching career of deaf education, but it emphasizes the greatness of his "teaching with love." Finally, in the part of *he* (section 11), it summarizes that Pan loves children by instinct and tries to grant them a happy life in their childhood. And the concluding part refers to Pan's happy memory of his childhood in Tainian by his own utterance as follows:

「我的童年正好遇到戰爭，我們家整個搬到鄉下，也就是臺南縣潭頂鄉。在那裡，我們住了五、六年。父親買了三隻羊，每天我和弟弟就到山坡上放羊，羊吃草，我們就玩耍談天，烤蕃薯、撈魚，非常愉快。」

("I happened to encounter war in my childhood. Our family moved to the country village, that is, T'an-ting Hsiang in Tainan County. We lived for five to six years. My father bought three sheep. My younger brother and I fended them on the slope of the hill every day. When the sheep were eating grass, we talked, played, roasted potatoes and caught fish. We felt so happy.") (tran. by me)

「我母親一大早就到田裏去替人做工，晚上才回來。下雨天，她不去上工，就在家裏講故事給我們聽，我就特別高興。如今，每當下雨天，

我就會想起童年的那段日子。」

(“My mother went to the field and worked as an employee in the early morning and she did not come back until night. If she got no work on the rainy day, she would stay home and read stories to me. I felt so happy. Now, each time when it rains, I will recall those days in my childhood.)

(tran. by me)

The utterances above, with a strong sense of nostalgia so sentimental to readers, are arranged to parallel Pan’s childhood to that of his students, which may suggest “the importance of the family in traditional Chinese society with the consequent deep attachment to the ancestral home” (Liu, 1962, p.55). It requires the readers to be sensitive enough to Chinese mind with a keen awareness of the personal existence in time. Indeed, the structure of time underlies the structure of the article in describing Pan’s teaching career, which could be processed by the following transition: an outline of 23 years’ history in his educational career (*qi*)→ the first class (*cheng*)→the unforgetful memory (*jun*)→ a happy childhood (*he*).

English version of Chinese in this article shows no division of paragraphs. The English readers themselves must be responsible to have a clear cut of the paragraphs or smooth transition of the jumping thoughts one by one. English is scrambled into a large paragraph, which urges the reader to go through the labyrinth, reading it in a circular way and finally it leads to the concluding remark of Pan: “It is very important for a person to have a happy childhood. I intend to work hard to ensure that my students are not deprived, so they will have the courage to face the challenges of adult

life”. In this situation, by selecting the sentences from Chinese passages for translation, English for survival has to struggle to constitute its body text by the transitional sentence like “The transformation did not occur easily, however.”

In fact, the earliest *Sinorama* (before 1980) gave free copies to overseas Chinese with a slim 36 pages. In 1980 and 1981, *Sinorama* took an important step, namely, it expanded to over 100 pages and it included three different editions: Chinese-English, Chinese-Spanish, and Chinese-Japanese editions. Although the content of the original Chinese is not translated into English at all, English version of Chinese in 1980 began to appear in paragraph form with indentation and to seek the balance of words among the paragraphs. This shows that the level of literacy in English composition was elevated and English started to survive as a form and caught attention. Besides, English tries to summarize the main points of Chinese and English version is not limited by the order of Chinese sentences. In other words, translation tends to be writer-responsible or communicative rather than literal or reader-responsible.

At present, *Sinorama* is marching toward the 21st century, hoping that through special in-depth reportage readers will gain a better knowledge and understanding of Taiwan other than the economic and political development. The ultimate goal of *Sinorama* has been to build a bridge of friendship between Chinese at home and abroad, to present a true picture of Taiwan on the international scene and to persuade foreigners to support what Taiwan stands for because of the greater understanding of the Republic of China. *Sinorama* is written not only for domestic and overseas Chinese, but also for the foreigners to support Taiwan in the world. Therefore, modern edition of

*Sinorama* looks much more attractive than that of 20 years before. If we compare the table of contents of volume 24, number 3 in 1999 to that of volume 4, number 1 in 1979, we must appreciate the creative layout of titles and colorful pictures in volume 24. Most titles possess a subtitle to make the topic more specific and even uses a picture below the title to motivate the readers, for “visual images have often been used in deliberate attempts to foster cross-cultural understanding ”(Messaris, 1997, p.90). While in volume 4, Chinese titles are too general to motivate the readers and some of English titles do not match Chinese (e.g. “Heaven helps those who help themselves” does not match the Chinese title “斷交·奮怒·抗議—自信·團結·奮勵”). The layout is not obvious enough to express the specific title and so is the arrangement of pictures.

On the other hand, Chinese as well as English rhetoric should be as forceful as visual persuasion. Let’s discuss Chinese and English rhetoric in the article “The New Woman: Daring to Be Less than Perfect.” Basically, the model of *chi-cheng-jun-he* still dominates over the structure of Chinese writings; the framework of this article is without exception. But inside the framework, each section begins to escape the bondage of the model and it allows polyphonic remarks by different levels of people for an interactive dialogue to argue different ideas. Below is Table III to illustrate the framework of this article:

Table III: The structure of the article, "The New Woman"

<i>Qi</i> (起)	<i>Cheng</i> (承)	<i>Jun</i> (轉)	<i>He</i> (合)
* Section one—喜帖 (The wedding invitation)	* Section two—所謂「好女人」(The so-called good woman)	* Section five—女兒當自覺(Wake up, sister)	* Section eight—女性生活未來趨勢(Future trends in the lives of women)
	* Section three—女超人(Super women)	* Section six—爲誰結婚? 因何生子?(Why marriage? Why children?)	
	* Section four—公共領域的好女人(New Women in the public sphere)	* Section seven—「造反」有理(To rebel is justified)	

Under the title there is a prologue used to show the main concern of this article. In the earlier issues of *Sinorama*, the passage in the prologue is constituted with affirmative sentences, while in volume 23, it starts to use rhetorical questions in the column of the cover story. Particularly in volume 24 we see that this passage is composed by rhetorical questions so that we may wonder what is happening in Taiwan. It seems that the society is full of questions for argument and we had to ponder over them prudently. However, these questions strongly motivate readers to be concerned about the issues in this article and to feel responsible for society. The writer becomes more responsible than before, forcing the readers to focus on the key issue, which is expressed as follows, "Is there a type of new woman who is autonomous, happy, and confident about herself, her family, and her job? Is there a secret to being a 'new woman'?" Also, this article, corresponding to Bakhtin's notion of "polyphony",

collected “a diversity of social speech types... and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized” (qtd. in Kowal 1998, p.66). People from different walks of life possess the opportunities to express diverse opinions about the issues. The way to understand the issue is to examine the “simultaneity” of perspectives and see “how they interact dialogically and synchronically” (Kowal, 1998, p.221). In this sense, a responsible writer should try to make use of arguments for the readers to comprehend the key points more logically.

In section one (the part of *chi*), the placement of the invitation card in a poetic form is unusual and it evokes the readers’ interest in the arrival of the “new era of legal cohabitation.” Therefore, in section one, in the wedding banquet, there is a controversy about this new era of legal cohabitation. A teacher named Wu, Dr. Chang, and a business owner named Lin express their opinions from different angles, which challenge the traditional perspective of marriage. Wu says that a woman may change after marriage because of “taking care of all the routine daily tasks, and pre-marriage atmosphere is worn away.” Wu has a great concern about the loss of beauty when a woman becomes “wife.” Dr. Chang has the worry to deal with her mother-in-law and she says, “You don’t know what kind of person the mother-in-law’s going to be.” Mr. Lin is not confident with himself, saying that men only really show their true character after they get married. Therefore, they feel insecure with the traditional marriage system. Their different worries lead to Liu’s idea of cohabitation ; his wife, an advocate of equality between the sexes, does not have to bear any of the traditional responsibilities of a marriage. This argument is clear to give the reasons for the idea of

cohabitation, that is, it can be summarized as the proposition—Because we worry about A, B, and C, so we believe in D.

In the part of *cheng* (from section 2 to section 4), there are some arguments about "a good woman," "super woman," and "new woman in the public sphere." In section two, firstly, Liu argues that a good woman should be intelligent and independent. But for those who still stick to tradition protest this notion. A man who runs an auto shop says, "I am responsible for outside the house [earning money], she is responsible for inside [taking care of parents and children]." Then to clinch this argument, a psychiatrist raises another viewpoint. He thinks that economic pressures demand that women enter the workforce for earning money and the adjustment between the sexes should be reached. The arguments go on and in fact different males, who seem to be self-contradictory and often possess double standards toward woman, frame different definitions of "a good woman." Being "a super woman" or "a new woman in the public sphere" might disrupt marriage; as a result, traditional women dare not have a try.

Owing to the suspicions of female status in the society, in the part of "*jun*," it seeks to have a revolt against man's manipulation over woman. This part is a counter-argument to that of "*he*". A woman should determine the definition of her self, reject the stereotype rather than live under the shadow of man. So this part tries to persuade woman to unlock her own life and open her own door of hope. Under the titles "Wake up, sister!" and "Why marriage? Why children?", this part quotes some feminist opinions and leads to the beliefs that to rebel is justified; women should set their own



standards. So in the concluding part—the part of *he*, it holds that movement toward equality between the sexes is inevitable; the new woman should put herself first and receive a less-than-perfect grade. This article follows the sequence of *chi-cheng-jun-he*, and different perspectives are expressed for argument and for leading to the concluding remark, which gives answers to the rhetorical questions in the prologue of the article.

As for the English version from Chinese, it is not limited only at the literal level. For the purpose of expanding readers to the foreigners, *Sinorama* tries to fulfill two aims of translation, namely, accuracy and economy, which could be achieved through semantic and communicative translation. Generally speaking, a semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level, a communicative at the readership (Newmark, 1988, p.47). In other words, in translating the Chinese text into English the translator has considered the elements of being accurate and readable for successful communication with the readers. The translator is more conscious of the readership than before and more responsible to convey the messages. In the earliest issues of *Sinorama*, one can not distinguish one paragraph from another, but in the latest issues, English version cut the article into paragraphs more clearly than the original Chinese. Take this article for example, the section two in Chinese is divided into two sections in English under the extra title “The new double standard” for expressing ideas clearly. In this sense, English version not only lays emphasis on being faithful to Chinese but also creates its own title of section for a clearer cut of ideas.

In conclusion, in the past 20 years, *Sinorama* has a tendency for a transition of reader-responsible to writer-responsible writing if we compare the issues in 1979-1980

to the recent issues in 1999. For a macro-structure of the article, both the earliest issues and the latest issues follow the traditional Chinese discourse pattern of *qui-cheng-jun-he*. For the micro-structure of the article, the sections of the earliest issues still follow the traditional model of *qui-cheng-jun-he*, while the section of the latest issues present different opinions for interaction and argument. The earlier issues, limited by the utterance of mono-phony voice, tend to be narrative and sentimental while the latest issues, full of polyphony voices, tend to be expository and argumentative. On the other hand, in the later issues of *Sinornama* the translators pay more attention to the “accuracy” and “readability” of English version for widespread prevalence. The transition of literal translation to both semantic and communication translation signifies the writer’s consciousness of his responsibility to integrate the readers with text. So, the readers can send the letters to the editors to express their opinions in the column “Letters to the Editor.” Undoubtedly, without the readers, without the existence of *Sinornama*; it is the editor’s consciousness that leads to the tendency of writer-responsible writing with increasing ages. This tendency contributes to a more communicative Chinese-English translation.

### **3.2 Translation as a Communicative Activity**

Speech is the utterance of mind. Ordinarily, everyone was born with language acquisition device by which one was able to learn language. Lin (1998) sets a model for the process of translating, namely, analysis, transfer, restructuring and testing. Analysis is the first step to understand the original meaning of text. We can analyze the text from two levels: one is the analysis of semantics involving lexical meaning and