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Abstract
This research aims at finding out how we can benefit from comparing Chinese and Western poetics when translating texts of traditional Chinese literary theories into English. We will try to find out, from the perspectives of comparative poetics, the difficulties and solutions in translating traditional Chinese literary theories into English. We will also see how comparative poetics would affect the translating strategies and the readers’ understanding of the translated texts.

The paper starts with a comparison and analysis of the four English translations of the “Shen Si” “《神思》” chapter in WXML. The comparisons and analyses expose problems in translating traditional Chinese literary theories into English, but it also gives us some insights. We find that some characteristics of the text, such as the critical terms, the figurative use of language, and the numerous quotes and illusions, impose lots of challenges to the translating. We also find that a comparative study of Chinese and Western poetics in many ways is helpful to the translation of the texts of traditional Chinese literary theories.

Keywords: Traditional Chinese Literary Theory, Translation, Comparative Poetics, Western Poetics

1. Introduction

My motivation of writing on the present topic has to do with my concern about the developing of Chinese literary theory, which is confronted with puzzledom at the moment. Since the 1980s, western literary theories have flooded into China. Although the phenomenon itself has advanced the construction of Chinese literary theory, it has also produced a lot of confusion. This is termed by some scholars as “aphasia” of the Chinese literary criticism, which really should not be so considering China’s long literary tradition. One of the effective ways of presenting Chinese literary theories is to translate them into English, because “the obvious inequality in the conversation between China and the West” tells us that “it is quite unrealistic to expect the West to understand Chinese literary works in their original language in a short period of time” (王晓路: 1998, 108).

The major research question of this paper is, when translating texts of traditional Chinese literary theories into English, what is the role of comparing Chinese and Western poetics? We will try to find out, from the perspectives of comparative poetics, the difficulties and solutions in translating traditional Chinese literary theories into English. The task of translation necessarily extends beyond the normally defined translating process itself to also include in-depth research into both the literary norms and cultural conventions in both source and receptor cultures. It is even more so in the translating of traditional Chinese literary theories into English. Translators should have adequate understanding of both poetic traditions. Readers of the translated texts should also bear in mind the differences between the two traditions. By investigating the English translations of the traditional Chinese literary theories, we hope to provide the translators with some insights into the two traditions, and the readers with a better understanding of the translated texts.

The method adopted in this research will be an inductive one. The paper will start with specific translation examples and then go to theoretic discussions. Firstly it will review the translations of some classical texts of traditional Chinese literary criticism as well as the related discussions on them, then it will goes on to compare and analyze the translations of “Shen Si” chapter in Wen Xin Diao Long (here after WXML). After that we will discuss our findings in the frame of comparative poetics.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Translations and Studies of Some Classical Texts

“It is along with the introduction of Chinese culture into the western world that the introduction of Chinese literary theory into the western world developed” says Wang Xiaolu (王晓路: 1998, 10). At first the overseas missionary played an important role. Also the field owes a lot to “some great masters who has broad general knowledge of both Chinese and English” (王晓路: 1998, 3). For example, Wang Guowei (王国维), Wen Yiduo (闻一多), ChenYingke (陈寅恪), Wu Mi (吴宓), Zhu Guangqian (朱光潜), Zong Baihua (宗白华), Yang Zhouhan (杨周翰) and Qian Zhongshu (钱钟书). It is their “foresights and extensive learning that opened up the space of this field and thus starting a brand new phase of comparing different disciplines and literary theories of China and the west” (ibid). According to Wang, the 1960s witnessed a momentous progress in the translations and studies of Chinese literary theory in the English world. It was at this time that the branch of academic study steadily gained its maturity and it was at this time
the groups of specialists are formed. By citing the translations of these important works, we are aiming at providing a general background.

In order of time, some of the important texts include: The Great Preface (《毛诗序》); A Discourse on Literature (《典论·论文》); The Poetic Exposition on Literature (《文赋》); Wen-hsin tiao-hung (《文心雕龙》); Shih-p’in (《诗品》); The Twenty-Four Categories of Poetry (《二十四诗品》); The Great Preface: James Legge in the 19th century; Sui-kit Wong (黄兆杰, Early Chinese Literature Criticism); James Liu (刘若愚, Art of Chinese Poetry); Stephen Owen (Reading in Chinese Literary Thought, 1992); Steven Van Zoeren (Poetry and Personality); J. T. Wixted (The Kokinshu Prefaces: Another Perspective).


2.2 Translations of WSDL

WSDL has a very important status in the history of Chinese literary theory. The following facts may justify WSDL’s status. First, the book was written in the era of Wei, Jin, Southern and Northern Courts, an epoch in which literary theories flourished, and which was commented by Lu Xin as an era when “literature was made consciously”. And among all the works of literary theories, WSDL “obviously surpassed the precious works in such aspects as literary creation, history and criticism and proposed some very systematic and original ideas, which made it an unprecedented summarization” (章培恒, 马玉明 2005, 474). Secondly, WSDL has been handed down from more one thousand years ago, but people never stop making exegesis on it, commenting it and quoting from it. Since the second half of the 20th century, the researches on it have been increasing, and this is so not only in the mainland China but also in Hong Kong and Tai Wan. The WSDL Association (《文心雕龙学刊》) is specially dedicated to the studies in this field. There are even scholars who think that the research on this field has become “a study that has international significance” (张文勋: 2001, 1). As for the West, we have seen several English versions since the fifties in the last century. Next we will introduce the English translations of WSDL in order of time.

The general situation of the English translations of WXDL is that since in 1951 E.R.Hughes translated Chapter 1 Yuan Dao (“The Basic Tao”, 《原道》) (王晓籁: 1998, 16), there have been quite a few translations, either complete or selective. Vincent Yu-chung Shih’s complete translation was published in 1957(thereafter would be referred to as Shih’s translation), and was reprinted later in 1970 and 1983, respectively in Taipei and Hong Kong. In 1970 Yang Xianyi and Gladys translated the first five chapters of the book (ibid). “The two translated versions generated in the English world much interest in ancient Chinese literary thought” (ibid). Then Ference Tokei translated two chapters of it; Stephen Owen in 1992 translated all except the genre chapters(thereafter would be referred to as Owen’s translation); Wong Zuoliang translated two chapters (Qin Hua, “Analyzing the Translations of Two passages in WXDL”, 桑华, “精理为文秀气成采—《文心雕龙》译文二段评析”, 西安外国语学院报, 2002.3). And we have two more complete translations, one being translated by Sui-kit Wong, Allan Chung-hang Lo, and Kwong-tai Lam (thereafter would be referred to as Wong’s translation) and the other by Yang Guoabin(thereafter would be referred to as Yang’s translation). Now we will just have a general review of the four complete translations (including Owen’s).

The earliest complete version is Shih’s translation. There is a detailed introduction to Chinese ancient literature history and traditions. The Chapter 50 “Xu Zhi” (《序志》) is placed at the beginning of the translation as a preface, which is a different arrangement as compared to other three versions. A lot of notes are given, probably taking half space of the whole book. The appendix is a glossary and an index and there is not any bibliography or reference books listed. The transliterations are based on the Wade-Giles system.

Stephen Owen provides the second comparatively complete English version of WXDL in Reading in Chinese Literary Thought (1992). Stephen Owen’s translation is not complete because he skips all the genre chapters from chapter 6 to chapter 25. Even so, the translator’s position as a prestigious sinologist and the methodology he adopts in his translation makes the version an important one which cannot be excluded.

Wong’s translation was published in 1999. The preface gives a brief account of the background of Liu Xie’s writing WXDL. Very few notes are provided, for which the translator makes an explanation on the first footnote of Chapter 1: Notes are provided in this translation only if they are essential; they are intended more as an aid to the comprehension and appreciation of the original for a popular audience than as bibliographic or expository apparatus for specialist.
has been taken not to make the notes unduly cumbersome and distracting (The Book of Literary Design, trans. Sui-kit Wong, 1). A prominent feature of the book is the translation of “zan” (summary, 贊): they are translated into free verses and are consisted of four sentences and eight lines. Detailed bibliography is given. The transliterations are based on the modern pinyin system.

Yang’s translation was published in 2003 by Foreign Languages Teaching and Research Press. According to the translator, it took more than ten years for the translation to be finished, during which time different annotated versions and modern translations were studied and compared. Mainly, the translation is based on Zhou Zhenu’s annotated version and the translator claims that he benefits a lot from Shih’s translation. Lastly, the appendix (A Brief Chronology of Chinese History and the Glossary of Personal Names) offers great convenience for the readers.

2.3 The Translations of WSDL under Criticism

For the translations of such an important book, not many researches and comments have been made yet. Outside mainland China, some papers or reviews were published in Tamkang Review (Tai Wan) and Journal of Asian Studies, mainly about Vincent Shih’s Translation. Chiang T’ai-fen and Chi’u Chin-jung’s “Vincent Y.C. Shih’s Translation of the Wen-hsien tiao-lung: A Note on Literary Translation” (Tamkang Review, Vol. xv, 233-253) comparing the Chinese text and the translated version in terms of semantics and formal, analyzes Shih’s translation from a very comprehensive perspective.

In the mainland, there are also some discussions on the English translations of WSDL and we will list these articles first and then give a brief account of their major points. The articles appeared in magazines are: Wang Lina, Du Weimo, “The Translation and Researches of WSDL in Foreign Countries” (“国外《文心雕龙》的翻译和研究”, 《文心雕龙学刊》, 1984, 2); Yang Guobin, “Comparison of Three English Translations of ‘Shen Si’ in WSDL” (“《文心雕龙·神思》——英译三种之比较”, 《中国翻译》1991), Zhou Qiaona, “Analyzing Two English Translations of ‘Cai Lüe’ in WSDL in the Light of Domestication and Foreignization” (“‘归化’和‘异化’关照下《文心雕龙·才略》两英译本评析”, 湖南经贸干部学院报, 2006, 11); Qin Hua, “Analyzing the Translations of Two passages in WSDL” (“精理为文, 秀气成采——文心雕龙译文 二段评析”, 西安外国语学院报, 2002.3). QinHua’s comments on Wang Zuoliang ’s translation of “Ming Shi” (“明诗”and “Cai Lüe” (“才略”) is that “(The translation) conveys skillfully the subtle meaning of ancient characters, but the shortcoming is that sometimes it is too straight”. Qin Hua thinks that when translating WSDL, both of the form and the content should be taken into consideration. Zhou Qiaona compares Yang Guobin and Wang Zuoliang’s translation of Cai Lüe (“才略”) and concludes that Yang’s translation is mainly foreignization while Wang’s is a combination of foreignization and domestication. And in Han Ji Wai Yi Shi (《汉字外译史》, 2003), there is a review of Yang Guobin’s article: “Yang puts forward three criteria for evaluating the translation which include legibility, concision and liveliness. As for legibility, Yang thinks that the translations of Sui-kit Wong and Yang Xianyi are clear enough while in Shih’s translation there are many ambiguities. Talking about concision, Yang uses chapter 26 “Shen Si” as an example to illustrate that Yang’s translation is the most concise while the translation of both Shih and Wong have a good many pleonasms. He thinks some of the additional meanings are even thrust into the text by the translators” (马祖毅,任荣珍: 2003, 368-372). Lastly, according the criteria of liveliness, the conclusion also favors Yang’s translation. Also, Wang Xiaolu (王晓路:1998, 117-119) makes some detailed discussion on the translations of the two terms shen si (神思) and feng gu (风骨). His method is to make the best choices by comparing the explanations of the original words and English renderings. He provides his own translations at the same time.

The previous efforts made by these scholars are illuminating while the review above also indicates that so far there have not been any studies that place the three complete translated versions together to make a comprehensive analysis and comparison. The present study does not intend to do that either, since that will be a huge project and will need much effort of many. We also notice that many of these essays focus on the formal elements of the translation and that is where the author of this paper wants to take a different track. Rather than just focusing on the formal elements, we will explore the content rendering by looking into these translations in the light of comparative poetics, hoping that from comparing and analyzing the specific examples in WSDL, we can gain some insights into the translating of traditional Chinese literary theories into English.

3. A Comparison of the English Translations of “Shen Si” Chapter in WSDL

3.1 The Content of “Shen Si” Chapter and Its Important Role in the Book

“Shen Si” is seen as a very important chapter in WSDL. It is agreed that of the book WSDL, the first twenty-five chapters are the first section, which discusses the genres of ancient Chinese literature, and the other twenty-five chapters are the second section, which deals with literary criticism in a comprehensive manner. Wen Xin Dao Long Zhu (《文心雕龙注》, 1958), subdivide the book as followed: i Pandect (chapter 1-4); ii Genre Theory (chapter 5-25); iii Composition Theory (chapter 26-43); iv Theory of Appreciation (chapter 44-49); v “Xu Zhi” as the Conclusion. So “Shen Si” falls into the section of Composition Theory.

“Shen Si” is the first chapter of the Composition Theory and is commented by Huang Kan (黄侃) as the essential creed of composition (孔祥丽, “《文心雕龙·神思》辨伪”, 《文学学刊》, 2007,9). The era of Wei, Jin, Southern and Northern Courts is an epoch in which when “literature was made consciously”. Wang Xianpei (王先霈: 2007, 40-41) thinks one of the evidences is that at this time theorists began to pay attention to the creativity in literary thinking, thus making shen si an important category. Also, Chinese traditional poetics values individual experience very much and the close relationship between it and the term shen si (神思) again guarantees its crucial place in Sino-west comparative poetics.
“Shen Si” (《神思》) succeeds to Lu Ji’s Wen Fu but has its own fresh merits” (章培恒, 马玉明: 2005, 472). Taking into consideration of the reasons above, we believe that the analyzing of the English translations of this chapter in WXDL will help us tackle our research question, or at least provide some clues for us.

We will now look at the structure and the content of “Shen Si” chapter. Concerning the topic in question, Jiang Fan and Yu Yuan’s A Course of Ancient Chinese Literary Theory and especially, Zhou Zhenfu’s “Liu Xie on Shen Si” is probably the most related sources.

Zhou Zhenfu divides the “Shen Si” chapter into five sections: 1) The observation and preparation of writing; 2) the relationship of shen si (神思), yi xiang (意象) and yan ci (言辞); 3) the problems of swiftness and slowness in writing; 4) the improvements of the writing and the implications of the words; 5) summarization. Jiang Fan and Yu Yuan think six aspects are included in “Shen Si” chapter. When compared with Zhou’s division, except that the fourth one is replaced by “the function of imagination” (both equate “shen si” to “imagination”), they are more or less overlapped.

3.2 Translations of “Shen Si” Chapter in WXDL

Our comparison and analysis will be based on the four complete translations (including Owen’s translation) of WXDL. Relevant translations of other translators would be used where needed. And, related examples from other chapters of WXDL could be included at times. The content of the original text will be used as an outline of our analysis. As has been said, according to Zhou Zhenfu, the “Shen Si” chapter can be divided into five sections and in our actual analysis we will follow the order of this division, omitting the summary. Understandably, we will not analyze sentence by sentence of the whole chapter but only look at those key pieces that we think are important and are representative in the original and the translated texts.

3.2.1 Section one: the observation and preparation of writing

The observation and preparation means the mental state of the writer, in which shen si (神思) plays a very significant part. At the beginning, Liu Xie quotes from Zhuang Zi so as to define the concept of shen si (神思).

古人云：“形在江海之上，心存魏阙之下。” 神思之谓也。文之思也，其神远矣。

Shih: An Ancient said, “One may be on the rivers and sea in body, but his mind remains at the palace gate.” This is what I mean by shen-ssu, or spiritual thought or imagination. One who is engaged in literary thought travels far in spirit.

Owen: Long ago someone spoke of “the physical form’s being by the rivers and lakes, but the mind’s remaining at the foot of the palace towers of Wei.” This is what is meant by spirit thought (shen ‘- ssu ’). And spirit goes far indeed in the thought that occurs in writing (wen’).

Wong: Your earthly frame may indeed be sailing upon the main, but your longings linger yet over the mightiest portal,” someone said, speaking out of the distant past. But that is precisely what one means by inspiration, the mental process that defies analysis. Literary thinking emphatically is magical, beyond analysis.

Yang: An ancient said, “My physical form is on the sea; my heart lingers in the court.” This is shenisi, or imagination, at work. A writer’s imagination travels far.

The four translations of this first statement in the chapter give us a general idea of the characteristics of the four translated versions. Shih and Owen’s translation look quite similar in that they both seem to stick to the original text in forms and meanings (although language forms are not the focus of our discussion here). But if we look more closely we would find that Owen’s translation is not so much in a word-to-word manner as Shih’s. He uses “someone” instead of “ancient” to translate “古人” and “江海” is translated as “the rivers and lakes” while Shih follows the text closely and translated it as “the rivers and sea”. In other words, although Owen, like Shih, has tried hard to stick to the original text, he adds his own understanding too. Owen is also more sensitive to some critical terms. We can see from the text that he has not translated shen si (神思) into “imagination” or “inspiration” but sees it as an important critical term and supplements it with pinyin and gives a detailed annotation to it.

The same is to the term “wen” (文) in this sentence. Compared to Shih and Owen’s translation, Wong’s translation is of a much more free style. He reconstructs the sentence pattern, changes the person of the first sentence and the last sentence “Literary thinking emphatically is magical, beyond analysis” even does not really conform to the original sentence. He tries to avoid endnotes as he has declared and if there are elements that need explanation—either semantic or cultural—he usually inserts it into the translation like the way he explains inspiration in this case. So sometimes his translation tends to be lengthy. If Shih and Owen’s translations are on one pole, Wong’s is on the other, and Yang’s version is something in between. Yang’s translation is somehow quite free but he also pays sufficient attention to the cultural factors of the text. He tends to use simple sentences and general vocabulary, which sometimes results in a vague expression. This is the general impression we get from the translations of the first sentence.

The difficulties of translating this sentence lie in the term shen si (神思) and the quote from Zhuang Zi. Also the elements in the compound word shen (神) si (思) sometimes appear separately, which poses more difficulties to the translation. Vincent Shih uses pinyin to translate shen si (神思) and supplements it with literary translation and then with free translation. The other translators would adopt one or two but not all. Owen translates it literally, with its pinyin in a parenthese. He even includes shen ‘and ssu ’ in the Glossary of Basic Terms respectively, showing a strong
caution in dealing with the literary terms. Wong translates the term into “inspiration” and he renders shen (神) as “magical”. Yang uses pinyin and free translation.

As for the quote from Zhuang Zi, Shih and Owen provide similar notes explaining its origin and Liu Xie’s intention of quoting it, while Wong and Yang have not bothered giving any notes. We know that there are many quotes in WXDL. Some of them are very important while others are less so. As the only definition to shen si (神思), I think the note is worth giving here while the interpretation can be left to readers themselves. For example, Owen reckons that this quotation shows that Liu Xie is keen at “giving the idea of ‘spirit thought’ a pedigree in an age long before that of Lu Chi” (1992, 202). Owen suspects it’s Liu Xie’s personal pressure because he considers “that Liu Hsieh, living in the lower Yangtse region, was another person whose ‘physical form is by the rivers and lakes’” while Lu Chi “was another native of that region, who went north to the capital of the Tsin in Lo-yang, directly west of the capital of the old state of Wei” (ibid).

Then a metaphor is used to describe shen si (神思):

吟咏之间，吐纳珠玉之声；眉睫之前，卷舒风云之色；其思理之致乎！

Shen si (神思) is such an abstract concept that from the definition we are not really sure what it is. This metaphor further tells us that it can create in the writer’s mind the sweet sound and spectacular scene. The use of highly figurative language to express critical concepts is a characteristic of traditional Chinese literary criticism. In translating this kind of expression, the translator may find a similar figure in the target language or he may just translate the metaphor literally. In this example, all the translators render the sentence directly. Anyway, the translations show a strong subjectivity on the translator’s part. Again, the translators’ own styles are manifest in their translations. We will look at another example.

In the following sentence, the meaning of the figurative speech is not as obvious as the one we just discussed.

箴全御过，故文资确切；铭兼褒赞，故体贵弘润。 (铭箴第十一)

In this sentence, run (润) is to describe the feature of the genre ming (inscription,铭). Respectively Shih, Wong and Yang translate the word as brilliant, rich, and gracious. And in his translation of “ming bo yue er wen run” (Inscription is broad and concise, warm and gentle, “铭博约而温润”；《文赋》), Owen translates the word run (润) as “gentle” (Stephen Owen: 1992, 130). For this same word we have other translations like “warm (in tone)” (E.R.Hughes: 1951, 100), and “pregnant with meaning” (Sam Hamill: 1991, 37). With all these translations, we might ask: which is the right one? We may just as well ask another question: why run (润) is used to described the style of a work? Owen’s explanation may provide us with some clues. Owen translates run (润), which describes the characteristic of ming (铭) as “gentle” because he thinks wen-run (温润) describes the quality of personality appropriate to “gentleman”, chün-tzu, and that it involves a softness and compliance, and is often associated with the Confucian value of jen (仁), “kindness” or “fellow feeling” (Stephen Owen: 199, 132). So run (润) is more a word to describe a person than a word to describe a work. If the translator is familiar with the system of traditional Chinese literary criticism, he will know it is not uncommon to apply such words to describe literary works.

The period of Wei and Jin was a time when the practice of pin ping ren wu (appreciating people’s character) is in its prime. It was a time when a literary work was naturally and usually associated to its author. Some scholars have pointed out the close relationship between literary criticism and pin ping ren wu. For example, Zhan Ying thinks that the development of Chinese literary theories is based on the “cai lun xing” (Theory of Talent and Character, 才性论) that categorizes people. There is a whole chapter in WXDL that is devoted to the very topic — “Ti Xing” (体性). Owen must also have noticed it. He says, “Generic typology and the typology of personality arose together in traditional China, and they are unified by a largely shared vocabulary of manner and quality” (Stephen Owen: 1992, 65). And the relationship between the two is that “a given personality type will manifest a corresponding manner and will appear at his best in those forms in which his manner is naturally appropriate” (ibid). If the translators could bear this in mind, it would be easier for him to understand the word properly. Run (润)’s original meaning, according to Shuo Wen Jie Zi (《说文解字》), or Xu Shen’s Etymological Dictionary, is “rain falls to moisten everything on earth”. The image of the flowing of water conveys the meaning of “gentle”, “gracious”, “not drastic or violent”, which also indicates a certain type of personality as Owen has said. It is not of so much significance as for which one is the most accurate since “there is some prior unity ‘at the root’, but that unity devolves into a multiplicity of particulars” (Stephen Owen: 1992, 64).

From the analysis of this section we can see that the use of figurative language is a typical characteristic in traditional Chinese literary theories. It may be not easy to translate these figurative speeches into some other languages, but the comparison of the two poetic traditions does give the translators some clues in the actual translations.

3.2.2 Section Two: the Relationship of shen si (神思), yi xiang (意象) and yan ci (言辞)

After a metaphorical description of how shen si (神思) can affect what one sees, contrasting to the fact that what is in the writer’s mind usually can only be half expressed, Liu Xie begins to explain the relationship of shen si (神思), yi xiang (意象) and yan ci (言辞). To indicate the relationship, among the most important sentences are:
Shih: Therefore, although the idea takes shape from spiritual thinking, and the language receives its form from the idea, thought, and language may be so closely related that they are experienced as one, or they may differ as strikingly as if they were a thousand li from each other.

Owen: Thus concept (yi ’) is received from thought (ssu ’), and language in turn is received from concept. These [language and concept] may be so close that there is no boundary between them, or so remote that they seem a thousand leagues from one another.

Wong: Artistic intentions are given by thought and the final verbal construct is determined by those intentions. Thought, artistic intention and verbal construct can be so closely related that they seem indistinguishable; but then they can also be a thousand miles apart.

Yang: Ideas come from the mind; the choice of words is guided by ideas. Ideas and words can be so closely knit as to be in perfect harmony; they can fit so badly as to fall totally apart.

The relationship of shen si (神思), yi xiang (意象) and yan ci (言辞) may seem simple enough. But the translations prove to be very problematic in that translators use very different words for the same term yi (意), which is a very important term in Chinese literary criticism. In literary creation, the mind-world relationship is basic. So the relationship of these elements is actually a foundation of all poetics. In China, this problem was not firstly brought about by poets but by philosophers. According to Lao Zi, Tao (道) is the utmost reality which cannot be accessed by sense organs. Men must realize Tao by means of image. This theory influences Chinese poetics to a great deal. The theories of yan yi zhi biam (the dispute between yan and yi, 言意之辨), yi zai yan wai (the meaning between the line, 意在言外), yi jing theory (the theory of artistic conception, 意境说) etc. are all directly related to it. From the perspective of comparative poetics, many scholars agree that the concepts of yi (意), xiang (象), and yan (言) are of central significance in Chinese criticism, and that reviewing the relation of them will be most rewarding in the comparison of Chinese and Western poetic traditions (赵新林: 2005, 205). Scholars from home and abroad including Wang Guowei, Pauline Yu, Zong-qi Cai and Stephen Owen have published their studies on the topic.

When it comes to translating the terms, Owen says that yi (意) is perhaps the most difficult technical term of poetics to translate, because it crosses a wide variety of quite distinct English concepts in unexpected ways. Obviously, the translators here in this case have chosen one of the meanings but neglecting others. Again, one thing to be noted is that for some translators, the choice of words usually depends on the context. Take Owen for example, like most British and American Sinologists, he usually uses “language”, “image” and “concept” to translate the terms yan (言), xiang (象), and yi (意) but he also frequently uses other words like “meaning”, “intend”, “words” and “speech” under different contexts. For translating the term “xiang” (象), Zong-qi Cai would use words like hexagram, xiang, image, idea-image etc. in accord with the places where it appears. So in translating such complex term like yi (意) or xiang (象), there is no easy and unique way. The accomplishment of a proper translation relies on the translator’s interpretation of the terms and his resourcefulness in translating methodology.

Again we see that the comparison of the two poetic traditions can affect the translation to a great deal. There are some critical terms that are of significant importance to Chinese poetics, and the translations indicates a great deal about the translator’s understanding of the tradition.

3.2.3 Section Three: The Problems of Swiftness and Slowness in Writing

Some can write promptly and others cannot. But in both cases, the writers have to perfect themselves on a broad scope. This is the general idea of this section in “Shen Si” chapter. To prove this, Liu Xie cites many names and works as examples for the two types of writers. We have known that one special feature about Owen’s translation is his purposefully omitting 20 chapters of the book that are generally considered as the “genre chapters”. When explaining the reason why Owen writes: “Although there are moments of great interest in these generic chapters, I have left them untranslated since they make continual reference to works and authors with which the Western reader will not be familiar and, in many cases, in which he would have no interest even if he were” (Stephen Owen, 1992: 185). Here it might be interesting to compare the translations of this part to see how the translators, including Owen, will deal with the proper names. As the paragraphs are long, we will just transcribe one or two sentences as examples.

Shih: Prince Huai-nan [or Liu An] completed his (jiu on Encountering Sorrow before the morning was spent, Mei Kao had his piece ready as soon as he received the royal commission, Tzu-chien [or Ts’ai Chih] wrote poetry as easily as if he were reciting, Chung-hsun [or Wang Ts’an] let his brush fly as if copying from a ready-made draft, Juan Yu penned a letter on the saddle, and Ni Heng produced memorials while at meals.

Owen: The Prince of Huai-nan [179-122 B.C.] composed his (sao in the space of a morning; Mei Kao [Western Han] completed a poetic exposition as soon as he received the royal command; Ts’ai Chih [192-232] would take a writing tablet and recite extemore; Wang Ts’an [177-217] lifted his writing brush as if he had already done several drafts beforehand; Juan Yu [ca. 165-212] wrote letters in the saddle; Mi Heng [173-198] could draft a memorial at dinner.

Wong: Prince Huainan wrote a descriptive piece on the Li Sao well within a morning, Mei Gao completed a (jiu as soon as it was commissioned, Cao Zhi composed, not with the mind, but with the mouth, Wang Can took up the brush and put down what seemed to have been put together the night before, Ruan Yu drafted a letter on horseback, Mi Heng dashed down a memorial over a meal.
Yang: The Prince of Huainan wrote a work of rhyme-prose in one morning; Mei Gao penned one right in front of the emperor. Cao Zhi wrote as easily as if reciting a piece from memory, Wang Can as quickly as if he had been prepared in advance. Ruan Yu dispatched a letter on horseback; Mi Heng drafted a report to the throne over a meal.

First let’s look at the names of people. According to Yang Guo Bin (2005, 39), there are over 500 people all together have their names mentioned in WXDL and the forms of addressing are various. Sometimes an official title is used, sometimes the family name is used, and other times the first name or zi (子) In the example we cited above, six authors are mentioned. For the first one, the official title is used; for the third and the fourth one, zi (子) is used; for the others, names (first and family) are used. In all the four translations, the official titles are reserved. In Shih’s translation, the translator translates directly from the original text but provides the name in a bracket in cases the naming is irrelevant to the discussion of poetics, yet sometimes they do bear important information about the author and his writing. The choices of names often suggest the author’s characteristic. And traditionally, a person’s social status is related to his literary achievement.

We also notice in these four translations of the sentence that different words are used to referred to the name of the genre fu (赋). Shih and Wong use pinyin only while Owen and Yang use “poetic exposition” and “rhyme-prose” respectively. From chapter 6 to chapter 25, WXDL uses all together 20 chapters to discuss genres in which thirty-three genres are discussed in great details. Most of these genres cannot find their counterparts in English and many of them are even not in use any more in modern Chinese. Nevertheless, the comparison of the genres between Chinese and Western literature can be informative. In this case, we might ask: Is fu a poem, prose or an exposition? “The fu, also known in English as ‘rhyemeprose’ or ‘poetic essay,’ is a mixed genre of prose and verse, generally dealing with premeditated subjects” (James Liu: 1975, 20-21), says James Liu. E.R. Hughes also thinks it is “a prose poem” and says “Chinese fu does strictly stand midway between prose and poetry in the Western sense and combine the essential of both” (E.R. Hughes: 1951, 15). Owen emphasizes the descriptive features of fu and understands it as a kind of exposition. “In its early stages, the poetic exposition (fu) was an epi-deictic form (i.e.; the rhetoric of verbal display) that made extensive use of catalogues and lists. Its aim was always to ‘give the full measure of,’ to say all that could be said about its topic” (Stephen Owen: 1992, 75). As for Sam Hamill, although he also says fu “might best be described as ‘prose poetry’”, it “bears little or no resemblance to what passes as prose poetry in our own language” (Sam Hamill: 1991, 11). For Tokei, it is doubtful that fu is “a descriptive poem which enters into competition with the descriptive arts of ‘carving and painting’” (Ferenc Tokei: 1971, 115).

For this section, the inference is that when translating proper names in traditional Chinese literary theories, a study of some cultural phenomenon might be necessary. The comparison of the less abstract terms like the genre terms can also be informative in the understanding of the two poetic systems.

3.2.4 Section Four: The Improvements of the Writing and the Implied Meanings of Words

There is a very important allusion in this section of the text:

伊志不能言鼎，轮扁不能语斤，其微矣乎！

Shih: The [master chef] I Chih was unable to tell people how he cooked, and wheelwright Pien could not inform people how he wielded his axe, [Great art] is infinitely subtle.

Owen: Yi Yin could not tell of the art of the cauldron; Wheel-wright Pien could not speak of the ax. These are the real fine points.

Wong: Yi Yin could not tell you about the cooking in the cauldron, no more could wheelwright Bian communicate to you the wielding of the axe, such being the mystery of these mechanism.

Yang: If Yi Yin cannot explain his art of cooking, if Wheelwright Bian cannot talk about his art of using the axe, there is some mystery indeed!

The allusions here are indeed appropriate, both to the form and to the content of this chapter. The chapter starts with an allusion from Zhuang Zi then it ends with one from the same work. In addition, it is resounding with the discussion of the relationship between yan (言) and yi (意). These two allusions have been repeated in the history of Chinese literary criticism and in WXDL it also has been repeated. The anecdotes as well as their implications are well known enough to Chinese readers, but not so to Western readers. They tell us that yan (言) can fail to communicate yi (意). And they convey an old value in Chinese theoretical tradition. That is artistic skills become spontaneous action through intuitive insight. So when translating it into English, it is advisable to give some notes, which Shih, Owen and Yang all do. As usual, Wong has not given annotations to this allusion, conforming to his principles and probably assuming the familiarity on the readers’ part. Interestingly, for those translators who give notes, the annotations differ in their length, some being much more detailed than others. What’s more, the translators do not only annotate, but also provide their fine points.

4. Findings and Discussions: Shen Si and Shen Si Theory under Comparison

4.1 Shen Si and Shen Si Theory

What is shen si (神思) anyway? According to Wang Xianpei (王先霈: 2007, 41-48), in talking about “thinking”, ancient Chinese sometimes use si (思), lu (虑), nian (念), sometimes use xiang (想). The Shuo Wen Jie Zi
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and imagination are similar in some ways, but their differences exceed the similarities”. He says, “what Liu Xie
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4.2 Shi Si Theory under Comparison
How is shen si (神思) seen as compared to its counterpart in the West? Or does it have a counterpart at all?
Shen Si Theory is often compared with romanticist’s Imagination Theory in the west. Some scholars would equate shen si (神思) to imagination. Others mostly think the two concepts have both similarities and differences. They can be divided into two distinctive groups: those who emphasize the similarities and those who emphasize the differences.
Cai Zongqi, Chi Chu-lang and Yang Guobin should belong to the first group. Cai Zongqi (“华兹华斯和刘勰的文学创造诗学”,《文心雕龙研究》第三辑, 205) thinks ‘by taking writers’ inner thinking as one respect of literary, Wordsworth became one of the western critics who approached Chinese criticism earliest. His theories obviously have much in common with Liu Xie’s theories”. In this article Cai observes that what Liu’s theory and Wordsworth’s theory have in common is their identification of the four aspects in the process of the creation of literary work. That is the writer usually begins by “observation” in order to grasp what he is going to write. At this moment, he is in the state of Xujing (虚静, what Wordsworth terms as tranquility). Then the writer’s emotion reaches a new height, that is what Liu Xie describes as “if one climbs a mountain, one’s affections are filled by the mountain” (“登山而情满于山”). The last phase is the writing. Chi Chu-lang in his article “Liu Hsieh’s Shen-Ssu: Its Positive and Negative Capability” (Tamkang Review, 1985, Vol. XVI, No.2), “for a mutual illumination”, carries out a parallel comparison between the Romantic poet-critic Wordsworth, Coleridge and Liu Xie. He finds a lot of “similar views” in their theories. Yang Guobin thinks “shen si (神思) and imagination share some important similarities” (2003, 57) and those that he identifies are as followed: first, both shen si (神思) and imagination refer to a kind of spontaneous and creative power; secondly, they both presuppose experience and learning; finally, both Liu Xie and Coleridge believe that imagination needs a time of patient preparation.
James Liu, Stephen Owen and Liu Jiemin should belong to the other group. James Liu (1975:123-125) insists that “various modern scholars have identified Liu Hsieh’s ‘intuitive thinking’(神思) with ‘imagination’ or its modern Chinese equivalent , 虚静, but in fact it is only the active mode of Shen-Ssu that corresponds to ‘imagination’, as the word has been used by Coleridge and most critic writing in English since”. According to Liu, in “Shen Si”, or the chapter of “Intuitive Thinking”, Liu Xie advises the writers to empty his mind and keep it still, but at the same time, he advises them to “accumulate learning to store up” and so on. The seemingly contradicting views, James Liu points out, actually is a modification of Taoist concept by Liu Xie, “thus making it possible to admit expressive and technical views into his metaphysical theory”. So shen si (神思) has both a “passive” mode and an “active” mode. And one more thing is different. “Coleridge asserts that the imagination is ‘essentially, just as all objects (as objects) are essentially dead’”. Then James goes on to assert that Liu Xie, “in common with practically all other Chinese critics, does not regard things as ‘dead’ but as possessing their own ‘spirit’ (神思). It is therefore somewhat misleading to translate Shen-Ssu as ‘imagination’. As for Owen, although he does not make any comparison between “Shen Si theory” and imagination, his translation of shen si (神思) into English as “Spirit thought” (神思) indicates that he does not equate the two terms, but rather he emphasizes the differences. Liu Jiemin (刘介民, 2003:172-173) also thinks “Shen Si (神思) and imagination are similar in some ways, but their differences exceed the similarities”. He says, “what Liu Xie emphasizes is the breaking of the time-space restriction, “when spirit thought is set in motion, ten thousand paths sprout
before it” (神思方运, 万涂竟萌 trans. Stephen Owen).” In comparison, “the Western imagination theory does not emphasize the transcending of time and space.” Also, Liu thinks “Almost all Chinese artistic imagination theories do not pay attention to the difference between imagination and fantasy”. So “there is no tense in Chinese poetry and it strives for the one integrated mass”. He quotes James Liu by saying that “it makes Chinese poetry usually contains a quality of eternality”.

I also believe that the differences between the two are more important. It comparative poetics, it is the difference of poetic traditions that makes the discipline so appealing. Even those scholars who emphasize the similarities are always fully aware of the fact that the two concepts or the two theories have radical difference. Cai Zongqi (“华兹华斯和刘勰的文学创造诗学”, 《文心雕龙研究》第三辑, 208), for example, after comparing Wordsworth’s and Liu Xie’s theory, concludes that “Wordsworth’s and Liu Xie base on different philosophy when studying the relationship between experiential and transcendent, namely, Plato and Zhuang Zi”. According to Plato, divinity is the foundation of human and nature, and divinity enters nature through human’s eyes. But according to Zhuang Zi, Tao is the foundation of the combination of nature and human, and that Tao is an eternal and natural process which creates everything in the world. Ideas and language are more obstacles than necessary conditions. So Liu Xie emphasizes the absolute fusion of the poets and the experiences but does not look at them or think of them as outsiders.

As we have discussed earlier, the words imagination, or inspiration, or magic only conveys part of the meaning of the term shen si (神思), but since no equivalent can be found in English they might as well be used to translate the terms, as long as the translators bear in mind that the differences are always there. And in this case, providing a pinyin version is a good complementarity because it can be a good reminder to the readers that the translation does not efficiently convey all the meaning in the term.

5. Summary of the Comparison and Analysis

By comparing and analyzing the translations, we at least have the following findings. Firstly, the abundant quotes and illusions and the use of figurative language in the text of WXDL expose much difficulty to the translators. Most translators seem to be aware enough of to those cultural signals but treat them differently as their understanding of the materials differ and have different purposes of translating the book. In Shih’s translation, the detailed introduction to Chinese ancient literature history and traditions indicates that he places much importance in the presenting of a whole picture of traditional Chinese literary theories to the West. So his translation seems to be very much in a word-for-word manner. A lot of notes are given, probably taking half space of the whole book. And for Wong, as he himself has pointed out, notes are provided only if they are essential; and they are intended more as an aid to the comprehension and appreciation of the original for a popular audience than as bibliographic or expository apparatus for specialist. His translation seems quite free and, as we can see from the examples, the translator is good at embedding additional information in the translation, either by parenthesis or explaining. Yang agrees with Wong in that WXDL is not an ordinary composition because it itself has been a master piece of literature, and the readers are recommended to try his best to appreciate the ancient text without referring to the notes. Anyway, his translation seems quite a compromise between Shih and Wong. Together with the translation, there are just a few notes, made only when they are unavoidable and are intended to serve as brief explanations of the historical and literary quotations in the text. By contrast, we see very cautious treatments to these elements in Owen’s translations. The remarks after the translation and the detailed annotation reveal a conscious comparatist of Chinese and Western literature.

Secondly, we can safely conclude that there is no easy way to solve the problem of translating critical terms from traditional Chinese criticism. A simple rendering of words can’t always entail all the meanings of a concept and transfer it from one tradition to another. Shen si may overlap with imagination in some ways, but that is only a very small part of it. A careful comparison of the similarities and differences between the two concepts shows that they are rooted in different cultures and what “imagination” arouses in a reader can be very different from that of “shen si”. As we can see from the analysis, a good understanding of each of the tradition can be a hinge in the translation and the comparison of the two traditions helps us understand each of the tradition. The treatments mainly fall into several types: Literary translation, in which the translator tries to represent the original texts as they are by sticking to the language forms and exact meanings, sometimes even in a word-to-word manner; Free translation, in which the translator at times reconstruct the sentences and often use terms in target language to replace the source language; Explaining translation, which tends to make much longer texts than the original one thus altering the style very much and at times may even hinder the readability; Romanization, which can be considered as zero translation but sometimes just necessary. Of course, in actual translation, no translators use only one method but they usually combine two or more methods in accord with the context, although one dominant method is often employed. And for most translators, annotation is a common supplementary for their translations.

To sum up, the analysis and comparison above indicates that in translating WXDL, the four translators show different features. Yet in general, we are convinced that all the translators are aware of the value of WXDL as a literary criticism and are quite sensitive the cultural signals in the text. Indeed many problems in translating traditional Chinese literary theories into English are exposed in this study of “Shen Si” chapter in WXDL, but it also gives us some hint: a comparative study of Chinese and Western poetics proved to be quite helpful in the translation of the texts of traditional Chinese literary theories. And more systematic studies of this role played by comparative study in the translation of similar texts should be of interest.
Notes:

1. This inequality refers to the different status of the two languages: Chinese and English (author’s note).

2. The introduction made is based on Wang Xiaolu’s book (王晓路, 1998), mainly from p. 24 to p. 28, unless specific notes are made.


4. Wang Xiaolu does not specify this translator. It should refer to Zhou Ruchang (周汝昌). “An Introduction to Lu Chi’s Wen Fu” was Zhou’s dissertation when he graduated from Yan Jing University.

5. The original words are: “《文心雕龙》是中古时期文学理论史上独一无二的体大思深，涉及到文学理论巨著”
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The present thesis will adopt the modern pinyin system, but all the quotations from the English translations will take after the pinyin system as are used by the translators.

See Wen Xun Dao Long Zhu (《文心雕龙注》, 范文澜), 1958, page 1. The original words:

1. 总论 (一至四篇); 二、文体论五至二十五篇; 三、创作论二十六至四十三篇; 四、鉴赏论四十四至四十九篇; 而以自序性的序志一篇为第五十篇, 总结全书.

8 See Fifteen Lectures on Ancient Chinese Poetics (《中国古代诗学十五讲》, 王先霈, 2007), page 40: "到了六朝时期, 文学艺术取得了长足的发展, 它们的独立性凸显出来. 人们对于文艺创作思维的特殊性也有了切近的认识, 在此基础上, 诗学家们开始认真细致地研究文学创作思维".

9 蒋凡, 郁源, <<中国古代文论教程>>, 83.
10 周振甫, "刘勰论神思", <<周振甫讲文心雕龙>>, 92-106.
11 Refer to 3.1.
12 Shih refers to Vincent Shih; Wong refers to Sui-kit Wong; Yang refers to Yang Guobin and Owen refers to Stephen Owen. The examples are cited in order of time when the translations appeared.
13 All the words in bold face are marked by the author of this thesis.
14 A typing mistake may have occurred here. “Your” should be “you” (author’s note).
15 The original words of Zhan Ying are: "中国的文论就是在品人的‘才性论’基础上发展起来的。
16 Stephen Owen’s comment is made on the passage in “A Discourse on Literature” by Cao Pi: 夫文本同而末异, 盖奏议宜雅, 书论宜理, 铭诔尚实, 诗赋欲丽. 此四科不同, 故能之者偏也; 唯通才能备其体.
17 See Shuo Wen Jie Zi: 润, 水曰润下.
18 Refer to Zhao Xinlin (赵新林,《“象”与“象”—中西诗学象论渊源》), page 187-207.
19 For details please see Stephen Owen, Reading in Chinese Literary Thought, page 594.