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The subtitle of this book sounds axiomatic, so much so that many readers may ask, “If one does not understand translation through translation, how else can one understand it?”

To answer this question, one has to browse through a large number of monographs, collections of essays, and journal articles in translation studies published over the past decades. On completion of this arduous task, one will see that the majority of these publications are not aimed at helping readers understand translation through translation, but through something else. This “something else” includes, among other things, assertions, convictions, and speculations: assertions and convictions which are little more than personal opinions; speculations which are not based on practice.

Starting approximately from the 1970s, monographs and collections of essays in translation studies containing such assertions, convictions, and speculations began to be churned out at breathtaking speed, rarely dealing with actual translation. By “actual translation,” I mean the actual process of translating a text from one language into another. No matter how hard novelty-seeking scholars may try to subvert the meaning of translation, the following observation made by J. C. Catford in 1965 will remain incontrovertible: “Translation is an operation performed on languages.”

---

1 J. C. Catford, A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics, Language and Language Learning 8, General Editors, Ronald Mackin and Peter Strevens (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), 1. The quotation is from the opening of the book: “Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language—a general linguistic theory” (1). In just two sentences, Catford has already given us a succinct definition of translation, and highlighted the importance of linguistics to translation theories. Scholars who try to formulate translation theories without reference to linguistics are unlikely to be able to come up with anything that is scientific, verifiable, exhaustive, and universally applicable. In other words, their “theories” are unlikely to qualify as theories in the strict sense of the word. For a
For translation to take place, there must be at least two languages on which an operation can be performed. Failing this, we would have neither translation nor translation studies. Whether we like it or not, the translator’s “operation on languages” is central to translation. Yet, the trend over the past decades has been to talk and write about things that are hardly related to this central act. Thus, scholar A may produce a thoroughly researched history of translation from St. Jerome to the present day; scholar B may try to prove with evidence culled from various sources that a certain ideology has affected a certain translator’s selection of source-language texts; scholar C may argue forcefully that sexism has given rise to a certain age’s rendering of a certain classic, so on and so forth. To be sure, publications of this sort can be interesting and worth reading, but they cannot help readers understand the translator’s “operation on languages.”

Speculations about translation which are not based on practice are not much better. Spawned in a vacuum, they often contradict common sense and reality. Unlike physics, in which speculation could produce the theory of relativity, translation is a practice-oriented subject; translation theories or principles that are not substantiated by actual practice are only unverified hypotheses.

Translation is like surgery: to be able to theorize about surgery meaningfully, one must be able to perform operations on the human body; to be able to theorize about translation meaningfully, one must be fully conversant with the translator’s “operation on languages.” In saying this, I do not, of course, mean that knowledge of translation in practice alone is a guarantee of a sound theory of translation, but theorizing about translation without reference to actual translation is as untenable as theorizing about surgery without reference to surgery.

Motivated by this belief, I have, over the past twenty years, written nineteen papers in translation studies, which are now collected in this book. In these papers, whether in formulating theories about translation (as in Part One), in discussing general issues (as in Part Two), in looking at genre-oriented translation in practice (as in Part Three), in talking about my experience as a translator alone or vis-à-vis other translators (as in Part

 brief evaluation of many of the “translation theories” put forward in the past decades, see “The Shifting Nexus: Translation Revisited.”

2 In editing the nineteen papers for publication in this volume, I have revised some of their titles and added abstracts and subheadings to those which did not have abstracts and subheadings when they were first published.
Four), or in closely examining the work of well-known translators (as in Part Five), I always focus on actual translation. Even when I am engaged in abstract reasoning, which is an important step in theory formulation, I always make a point of substantiating with examples what I put forward. To make sure that my inferences are true not only of isolated source- and target-language texts, I have included a large number of language pairs in my discussions, liberally drawing on texts in Chinese, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Latin, and Classical Greek. In so doing, I hope that whatever I say about the translator’s “operation on languages” has validity.

In going through the book, readers will also notice that, in discussing, analysing, and comparing translations, I frequently draw on linguistics. This is because linguistics, being the most scientific subject in the humanities, can provide me with a scientific tool. Unlike many translation theories which are nothing but opinions, convictions, claims, and assertions, none of which can be proved right or wrong, any statement made with reference to linguistics can be verified, as is the case with J. C. Catford’s *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics* or Eugene A. Nida’s *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.*

---

3 See J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, Language and Language Learning 8, General Editors, Ronald Mackin and Peter Strevens (London: Oxford University Press, 1965) and Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964). As I have already pointed out on more than one occasion, a translation theorist with no knowledge of linguistics cannot go very far. Of all the translation theorists I have read over the past decades, not many of them appear to be familiar with linguistics. Of those who disparage Catford and Nida, none appear to have been equipped with sufficient knowledge of linguistics to understand the two theorists’ work. Having taught translation students at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels for more than thirty years, I notice that students find it much easier to understand André Lefevere, Gideon Toury, Itamar Even-Zohar, Katharina Reiss, and Hans J. Vermeer than to understand Catford and Nida. After attending a couple of seminars on Lefevere, Toury, Even-Zohar, Reiss, and Vermeer, they will be able to produce fairly satisfactory papers on translation and rewriting, on descriptive translation studies, on literature and the “polysystem,” and on Skopos theory, whereas the theories of Catford and Nida will remain too advanced for them even by the end of an academic year. This also explains why the non-linguistics-oriented approach is
By adopting the above approach, I hope that I can proceed from the point where theory and practice meet, and that, on finishing reading the nineteen papers, the reader will have acquired a deeper understanding of translation through translation.

—Laurence K. P. Wong
March 2016
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**NOTE ON ROMANIZATION**

Chinese characters are romanized according to the *Hanyu Pinyin Fang’an* (the Chinese Phonetic Alphabet). Thus, “Cao Xueqin” stands for “曹雪芹,” “Hong lou meng” stands for “紅樓夢,” “Zhonghua shuju” stands for “中華書局,” and so on. When Chinese characters already romanized in the Wade-Giles (or Wade) System are quoted, the Wade-Giles (or Wade) System is retained. Well-known place names like Peking (instead of Beijing) for 北京 are also retained when publications are cited. In the Wade-Giles System, aspiration is indicated differently by different scholars; thus the Wade-Giles romanization for “曹” can be “Ts’ao,” “Ts’ao,” or “Ts‘ao.” In this collection, the mark for aspiration is standardized, that is, only the apostrophe “’” is used.

According to *Hanyu Pinyin*, the name of a person, when it consists of two characters, such as “寶玉,” “黛玉,” “寶釵,” and “熙鳳,” is normally written as one word; thus, when romanized, “寶玉” is written as “Baoyu,” “黛玉” as “Daiyu,” “寶釵” as “Baochai,” and “熙鳳” as “Xifeng.” However, in David Hawkes’s version of the *Hong lou meng*, romanized personal names are hyphenated. When these names are quoted from Hawkes’s version, they are all written as hyphenated names (“Bao-yu,” “Dai-yu,” “Bao-chai,” “Xi-feng,” and so on), that is, following Hawkes’s practice.
NOTE ON CHINESE CHARACTERS

The Chinese characters that appear in this collection of papers are all in *fantizi* 繁體字 ‘traditional Chinese characters.’ Quotations which appear in *jiantizi* 簡體字 ‘simplified Chinese characters’ have been standardized, so that they all appear as *fantizi*. Today, *jiantizi* is used in mainland China and Singapore, whereas *fantizi* is used in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and many Chinese communities overseas. To avoid ambiguity in quoting classical Chinese texts, which were always printed in traditional Chinese characters before the People’s Republic of China introduced *jiantizi* in the 1950s, I have opted for *fantizi*. For example, while classical Chinese makes a distinction between “鬱” (as in “憂鬱”) ‘melancholy’ and “郁” (as in “馥郁”) ‘strong fragrance,’ simplified Chinese characters make no such distinction: “鬱” is simplified as “郁.” Similarly, in simplified Chinese characters, no distinction is made between “云” (as in “子云” ‘Confucius said’) and “雲” (as in “白雲” ‘white clouds’). Under normal circumstances, simplified Chinese characters do not give rise to any problems, but when distinctions like the above are essential to the understanding of a passage written in classical Chinese, simplified Chinese characters become “defective.” As this collection contains many quotations from classical Chinese texts, such as the *Shi ji* 史記, the *Lie Zi* 列子, and so on, traditional Chinese characters are used throughout.

---

1 The Chinese term *fantizi* 繁體字 is also translated as “the original complex form of a simplified Chinese character.” See Wu Jingrong 吳景荣 et al., eds., *The Pinyin Chinese-English Dictionary* (Peking / Hong Kong: The Commercial Press; New York / Chichester / Brisbane / Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.; 1983), 185. I have not used this translation—for two reasons. First, it is simplified Chinese character-oriented. Second, it is too wordy and sounds like a detailed explanation rather than a translation.
NOTE ON CHINESE NAMES

In Chinese names, the surname (family name) goes before the given name, which is different from the way names in European languages are written. Thus, the name of the author of the Chinese novel *Hong lou meng* 紅樓夢 ‘*Dream of the Red Chamber*’\(^1\) is written as “Cao (surname) Xueqin (given name) 曹雪芹” and that of the author of the *Xi you ji* 西遊記 ‘*Journey to the West*’ as “Wu Cheng’en 吳承恩,” not “Xueqin Cao” and “Cheng’en Wu,” which would “chime in” better with English names like “William Shakespeare” and “John Milton.” In this collection, the traditional way of writing Chinese names is retained (in Chinese characters as well as in romanization).

---

\(^1\) As translators and scholars have pointed out, the widely popular English translation (“*Dream of the Red Chamber*”) of the Chinese novel’s title is problematic; alternatives suggested (like “*Red Chamber Dream*”) are less misleading, less ambiguous. But as “*Dream of the Red Chamber*” is probably the best-known English title of the novel in the West, I have retained it here, risking contributing to its undesirable currency.
NOTE ON GLOSSING

In glossing words, phrases, sentences, and passages in my papers, I have consulted the following dictionaries:

**English:**


Catherine Soanes and Angus Stevenson, eds., *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*.


French:


Louis Guilbert et al., eds., Grand Larousse de la langue française en sept volumes (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1971-1978). On the title page of Vol. 1, Vol. 2, and Vol. 3, the words indicating the number of volumes are “en six volumes” [in six volumes] instead of “en sept volumes” [in seven volumes]; on the title page of Vol. 4, Vol. 5, Vol. 6, and Vol. 7, the words “en sept volumes” [in seven volumes] are used. As a matter of fact, the dictionary consists of seven volumes instead of six. The
publication years are 1971 (Vol. 1), 1972 (Vol. 2), 1973 (Vol. 3), 1975
(Vol. 4), 1976 (Vol. 5), 1977 (Vol. 6), and 1978 (Vol. 7).
Paul Imbs et al., eds., Trésor de la langue française: Dictionnaire de la
du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1971).
J. E. Mansion, revised and edited by R. P. L. Ledésert, Margaret Ledésert,
et al., Harrap's New Standard French and English Dictionary, Part
1972-1980).
Alain Rey et al., eds., Le Grand Robert de la langue française, deuxième
édition dirigée par Alain Rey du dictionnaire alphabétique et
analogique de la langue française de Paul Robert, 6 vols., 1st ed.
1951-1966 (Paris: Dictionnaires le Robert, 2001). In the list of
“PRINCIPAUX COLLABORATEURS” [“PRINCIPAL
COLLABORATORS”], however, the six-volume edition is described
as “Édition augmentée” [enlarged or augmented edition] “sous la
responsabilité de [under the responsibility of] Alain REY et Danièle
MORVAN,” the second edition being a nine-volume edition published
in 1985.
Alain Rey et al., eds., Dictionnaire historique de la langue française, 6

German:

1957, based on the editions by Karl Breul (London: Cassell &
Günther Drosdowski et al., eds., DUDEN: Das große Wörterbuch der
deutschen Sprache, in acht Bänden [in eight volumes], völlig neu
bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage herausgegeben und bearbeitet
vom Wissenschaftlichen Rat und den Mitarbeitern der Dudenredaktion
unter der Leitung von Günther Drosdowski (Mannheim / Leipzig /
Wolfgang Pfeifer et al., eds., Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen, 3
W. Scholze-Stubenrecht et al., eds., Oxford-Duden German Dictionary:
German-English / English-German, 1st ed. 1990 (Oxford University
Gerhard Wahrig et al., eds., Brockhaus Wahrig Deutsches Wörterbuch, in
Where Theory and Practice Meet


*In August 1998, a spelling reform began in Germany, of which the 2005 (third) edition of the Oxford-Duden German Dictionary, edited by W. Scholze-Stubenrecht et al., has given a succinct account (see page 1727). Part of this account reads: “German spellings in this dictionary are in accordance with the reforms in force since August 1998 and reflect modifications of the reforms agreed in June 2004. Most newspapers and new books use the new spellings. Key points of the reforms are summarized below.” “[T]he most important changes” relate to (1) the ß character; (2) nominalized adjectives; (3) words from the same word family; (4) the same consonant repeated three times; (5) verb, adjective and participle compounds; (6) compounds containing numbers in figures; (7) the division of words containing st; (8) the division of words containing ck; (9) the division of foreign words; (10) the comma before und; (11) the comma with infinitives and participles. As four of the five dictionaries I have consulted were all published before 1998, I have not tried to standardize German spellings in my glosses.

Italian:


Giorgio Cusatelli et al., eds., Dizionario Garzanti della lingua italiana, 1st
Note on Glossing


Spanish:

Lidio Nieto Jiménez and Manuel Alvar Esquerra, *Nuevo Tesoro Lexicográfico del Español* (S. XIV-1726), Real Academia Española

**Chinese-English:**


**Greek:**


**Latin:**

Dictionary, 1st ed. 1959 (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 5th ed. 1968). In writing the papers collected in this volume, I have consulted both editions.


With the exception of English, when a lexical item is singled out for discussion, it will be glossed, normally as literally as possible, so as to highlight its semantic content. When a gloss is added, it is put in single quotation marks.

In the case of Chinese lexical items in the Chinese script, their pinyin 拼音 (the Chinese Phonetic Alphabet) romanized forms are normally given first. Tone marks are not given when Chinese lexical items are transliterated, unless the tones of the lexical items are relevant to the discussion.
Note on Titles of Works

To date, there is no consensus as to how the initial “a,” “an,” or “the” in titles of works should be treated when it is preceded by the author’s name in the genitive (or possessive) case or by a possessive adjective (his, her, or their): “Dante’s The Divine Comedy” or “Dante’s Divine Comedy”? “His The Divine Comedy” or “His Divine Comedy”? It is possible to get round the problem by rephrasing what has to be said: “Dante’s masterpiece The Divine Comedy,” “Dante’s poem The Divine Comedy,” and so on. Sometimes, however, one may be compelled to choose between “two evils.”

With respect to this dilemma, Pam Peters has made the following recommendations:

The titles of many publications include the, witness Michael Ondaatje’s novel The English Patient and reference books such as The Gentle Art of Flavoring. In such cases, The needs a capital, as an intrinsic part of the title, even when cited in mid-sentence:

Ondaatje’s novel The English Patient became an Oscar-winning movie. However style guides agree that if retaining the The makes an awkward sentence, it can be dropped:

Have you read his Gentle Art of Flavoring?

Likewise it’s accepted that when referring to titles prefaced by A or An (e.g. A New English Dictionary), the indefinite article may be replaced by the. It would not be capitalized as part of the title:

Information on many a cultural question can be found among the words listed in the New English Dictionary.¹

Two other equally authoritative style guides, the MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing and the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, contain no such recommendation. In giving examples of titles with the definite article the following a name in the

Note on Titles of Works

In the genitive case, *the* is retained even though its inclusion makes the style “awkward” by Peters’s standards:

French’s *The Minute Man* (sculpture)

Another style guide, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, which is equally authoritative, has the following to say:

*An initial “a,” “an,” or “the” in book titles.* An initial *a*, *an*, or *the* in running text may be dropped from a book title if it does not fit the surrounding syntax. When in doubt, or if the article seems indispensable, it should be retained.

Fielding, in his introduction to *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*, announces himself as a professional author.

Fielding’s *History of Tom Jones*…

That dreadful *Old Curiosity Shop* character, Quilp…

*but*

In *The Old Curiosity Shop*, Dickens…

In L’Amour’s *The Quick and the Dead*…

*In Where Theory and Practice Meet: Understanding Translation through Translation*, I have followed the recommendation of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. This is because it has taken care of the needs of both rigorous scholarship and “stylistic grace.” Thus, while dropping the article *the* in phrases like “In Homer’s *Iliad*” and “In Dante’s *Divine Comedy,*”

---

2 *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*, 3rd ed. (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2008), 118. The same example is also given by the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, 7th ed. (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2009), 88. The authority of these two books is suggested by the information given on the copyright page of the 2009 *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*: “The Modern Language Association publishes two books on its documentation style: the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* (for high school and undergraduate students) and the *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing* (for graduate students, scholars, and professional writers). These volumes provide the most accurate and complete instructions on MLA style.”


4 Even with Shakespeare, the definite article “*The*” in *The Taming of the Shrew* can be found in scholarly writing when the title is preceded by the playwright’s name in the genitive case: “The real test of the relationship between the poet and