

Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation?

Wei Teng (corresponding author)

Department of Global, Cultural and Language Studies,
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NEW ZEALAND
and

Ineke H. M. Crezee

School of Language and Culture, Auckland University of Technology,
Auckland, NEW ZEALAND

ABSTRACT

This article presents a critical review of translation theories advocated in the context of the Chinese language with a focus on their applicability to Community Translation (Taibi & Ozolins, 2016). Community Translation often aims to provide information crucially important to the basic human rights of linguistic minorities. Yet, Chinese translation theories have been largely developed for the translation of literary and religious texts, relying on literary critique of impressionistic and subjective ideas. Therefore, such an approach would not work in the field of Community Translation. A discussion of Community Translation in the context of the Chinese language could add a functional perspective, considerations of the pragmatic functions of both the Source and the Target texts and the perspectives of both the ‘producers’ and the end-users. Discussion in these aspects could help better investigate and evaluate a translated text that aims to help members of linguistically disadvantaged communities participate in the mainstream society.

KEYWORDS: Chinese translation theories; Community Translation; pragmatic equivalence

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic, which has been testing the efficacy of public health systems globally

Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135

since the first outbreak in 2020, shows again that disease does not differentiate races, cultures and languages (Roat & Crezee, 2015). The pandemic also demonstrates the importance of translation disseminating information related to the disease (e.g. symptoms, treatments) and implementation of new guidelines (e.g. self-quarantine, social distancing) to linguistically disadvantaged people in multicultural and multilingual societies. This is particularly true for refugees and migrants whose first language is not the mainstream language and who rely on translations to receive information related to their daily lives (e.g. healthcare, social welfare; de Bres, 2020). For instance, the outbreaks in Victoria, Australia in 2020, were said to be related to vital COVID-19 information not being available in migrant languages (Grey, 2020; Yu, 2020).

Chinese immigrants are often one of the largest minority groups in multicultural and multilingual societies such as New Zealand, Australia, and Canada, making Chinese¹ one of the most widely spoken languages. As an example Mandarin Chinese is one of the five most spoken community languages in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2013)². There is also an increasing number of minority groups living in some Chinese-speaking societies, who rely on translations to receive publicly shared information. As an example, the Special Autonomous Region of Hong Kong has a significant number of non-Chinese speaking residents (Leung, 2020). Likewise, the immigrant³ population in Taiwan has increased by almost 52 percent since 2013, reaching 785 thousand in April 2020 (Ministry of the Interior National Immigration Agency, 2020), and the demand of translation services has likewise increased. In Taiwan, the demand for translation is in the area of information aimed at the general public, composed of a variety of language communities (e.g. Vietnamese, Thai and English). For instance, information regarding the COVID-19 pandemic is available in seven languages⁴ on a webpage published by the Pingtung County Government in Taiwan (Pingtung County Government, 2020).

Community Translation (hereafter CT) concerns translation of texts which aim to provide

¹ The term Chinese in this study is mainly concerned with properties of linguistic traits, unless otherwise indicated. For instance, when used in conjunction with immigrants, as in 'Chinese immigrants' the adjective indicates that they are Chinese-speaking immigrants, whose first language is Chinese

² Aside from the three official languages (English, Māori and New Zealand Sign Language), the five most-spoken languages in the country are Samoan, Hindi, Mandarin, French and Cantonese.

³ These immigrants are holders of Alien Residence Certificate residing in Taiwan.

⁴ The seven languages are Chinese, English, Japanese, Indonesian, Vietnamese, Thai and Korean.

information which is crucially important to the basic human rights of linguistic minorities in a multicultural and multilingual society (Taibi, 2011; Taibi & Ozolins, 2016). CT may serve to facilitate the ability of members of minority communities to exercise their basic human rights, such as exercising legal rights and receiving health services, among other things. English to Chinese translators based in multilingual countries (e.g. Canada, New Zealand) may have received translation training to some extent in a Chinese-speaking society (e.g. mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan).

This article explores the work of translation scholars working with the Chinese language past and present to examine their perspectives on assessing translation quality. We will argue that translation theories and methods developed in the context of the Chinese language have been largely developed for the translation of literary and religious works (Teng, 2020), and often highlight the subjectivity of the translator, i.e. their motivation, interests and preferences. This article aims to offer a review of such theories with a focus on their possible applicability to Community Translation (CT), since the aim of CT is to facilitate the social inclusion of minority group members (Crezee, Burn, & Teng, 2020). Although present-day translation studies relating to Chinese language is not always about literary and religious translation, they usually do not focus on Community Translation, but translation of other types of texts, such as public signs, healthcare-related surveys/questionnaires (e.g. assessment of mental health), brand names and so on (C.-Y. Chen, 2017; Feng, 2016; Ko, 2010). In other word, those studies have not touched on the discussion of Community Translation, where the translation quality may have broader influence on the general public. For studies on Community Translation quality assessment criteria, please see our previous publications where case studies have been conducted in the frameworks in relation to functional translation theories, systemic functional linguistics, and the perspectives of translators and the end-users have been taken into consideration (e.g. Crezee et al., 2020; Crezee, Teng, & Burn, 2017; Teng, 2019, 2020; Teng, Burn, & Crezee, 2018). This article focuses on theories developed within the Chinese-language context, discussion can therefore be widely considered in other contexts of language pairs.

Theories and methods are briefly reviewed and critiqued in chronological order, starting with theories proposed as early as two thousand years ago, with a focus on their applicability to

Community Translation. The review will show that these theories often advocate a lot of freedom to translators, allowing them to introduce personal opinions in order to achieve the goal they aim for with the translation. One example of such freedom is seen in the English to Chinese translation of the Treaty of Tientsin between China (the Qing Dynasty at the time) and the British Empire in 1858. Article L of said Treaty states that in the case of a discrepancy, the English version will be taken as the correct text as it is the source text. The Chinese version (the translation) of this article, however, omitted that part and added information implying the need to set up an institute of foreign language training in China. This addition seems to be related to the establishment of a government-run institute because four years after the treaty was signed, China established its first institution of foreign language training, *tóngwénguǎn*/同文館. (Wang and Fan 1999:18–9).

Through reviewing those theories and methods, we argue that they are, firstly, often of a subjective nature, providing impressionistic ideas derived mainly from the practice of translating literary texts and religious classics. Secondly, Chinese translation theories largely treat translation studies on a par with literary studies, and place an emphasis on the translator's subjectivity (i.e., personal motivation, preferences). Such theories hence do not provide clear practical solutions or guidelines for the development of criteria that are useful to assess the quality of Community Translation. The following section will provide an overview of ideas developed in relation to the translation of religious texts.

Subjectivity in Theories Relating to the Translation of Religious Texts

Translation of Buddhist classics from Sanskrit to Chinese⁵ began in around the 1st and 2nd century CE and was mainly undertaken by monks who did not have a Chinese language speaking background. For instance, An Shigao/安世高 (around 148-180 CE), translated Buddhist texts word for word and maintained the original word order in his translations, taking a literal translation approach. Around a century later this preference for literal translation was criticized for not conveying the original meaning expressively due to the poor readability of the translation.

⁵ The term Chinese used in this article refers to the mainstream languages that were and are currently used in mainland China – e. g. Mandarin Chinese is the current mainstream language used in mainland China.

Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135

In other words, translators started to pay attention to the readability of the target text in order to convey the original meanings expressively (G. Luo, 2013; K. Wang & Fan, 1999).

Zhi Qian/ 支謙 (around 223-252), while pointing out the tension between literal and free translation, did not actually offer a solution to this conflict. He appears to have gone to the other extreme, creating translations by omitting original messages and adding in personal interpretations in order to make the translation more readable for the target audience (K. Wang & Fan, 1999). In other words, what he proposed was actually akin to advocating free translation (Wang, (2012). Even so, Cao (2006b) argued that it is difficult to determine Zhi Qian's preference for either literal or free translation.

Cao (2006b, 2006a) held that Zhi Qian's preference represents on-going arguments about previous translators' preferences, without providing any in-depth discussion of practical solutions or guidelines. The lack of such discussions is also observed in studies on translators and translation critics who succeeded Zhi Qian.

Dao An/ 道安 (312-385) described features observed in translation with the term, *wūshībēn*/ 五失本 (*five instances of lost origins*), referring to five conditions under which linguistic features in the origin were not maintained (Cao, 2006a; Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Lu, 1988; Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; Zhou, 2002). However, scholars have interpreted the term rather differently, asserting that the term *five lost origins*:

- identified five difficulties dealing with untranslatable terms (K. Wang & Fan, 1999),
- illustrated five cases in which original linguistic features and semantic meanings could be easily lost in a translation (Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Xuanmin Luo & Hong, 2004),
- defined five conditions in which translators were allowed not to follow the original linguistic arrangements, i.e. word order, formality in expressions (Cao, 2006a; G. Luo, 2013), or
- included five conditions that translators needed to avoid in order to produce a faithful translation (Zhou, 2002).

However, no further discussion has been provided as to:

- how the five difficulties can be dealt with,
- how the five difficulties can be assessed,
- how the original meanings can be maintained in the five cases,
- why the translators are allowed not to follow the original,
- why the five conditions can be excluded,
- what the influence on a translation could be, and
- how avoiding the five conditions can help maintain faithfulness in a translation.

Scholars have agreed on an interpretation of Dao An's comments to the effect that translations do not maintain the syntactical structures and semantic meanings of the Source Text in accordance with the linguistic features of the Chinese target language. (Cao, 2006a; Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; Xuanmin Luo & Hong, 2004; K. Wang & Fan, 1999; Zhou, 2002).

However, there has not been any discussion about the change of status of information in the original source text. That is, the original arrangement of word order is not simply a result of syntactical rules in the source language, but decisions made to ensure the information flows in such a way as to make the source text cohesive and coherent (Fang, McDonald, & Cheng, 1995; Halliday & Kress, 1976). Changing the original word order in a translation would inevitably change the original arrangement that facilitates the readability of the messages (Baker, 1992; Burns & Kim, 2011; Teng, 2005). In other words, cohesiveness and coherence would very possibly be compromised, and a translation lacking these features may not be considered faithful to the original.

Kumarajiva/鳩摩羅什 (334-413) proposed producing a translation in parallel with the original in order to ensure a faithful translation. This has been interpreted by some scholars (Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Zhou, 2002) as being consistent with Dao An's *wūshīběn*/五失本 (*five instances of lost origins*). These scholars commented that even though target-text (hereafter TT) readers' needs and abilities should be the foremost concern for a translator, faithfulness should not be

jeopardized (Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Zhou, 2002). These scholars still did not clearly address what Kumarajiva's notion of faithfulness refers to. If we interpret the notion of faithfulness as being faithful to the original semantic meaning, syntactical structures (i.e. a word-for-word translation which maintains the original word order), then what Kumarajiva advocated was in fact a literal translation. However, some other scholars (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; K. Wang & Fan, 1999) argue that Kumarajiva asserted that the only focus should be on retaining the meanings and focusing on the main theme of a text, while less important messages could be shortened or substituted. In other words, translators are given some freedom as to what to keep and what to leave out. From this perspective, Kumarajiva advocated a form of relatively free translation (Lu, 1988; Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; K. Wang & Fan, 1999).

Xuan Zang/ 玄奘 (around 600-662) was also concerned with faithfulness. He proposed the term *wúbùfān*/ 五不翻 (*five non-translatable elements*) to achieve a balance between literal and free. He suggested transliteration should be the favoured strategy in five different circumstances in order to achieve a balance between faithfulness and readability. His concept offered a more practical guideline for translators to achieve a balance between favouring the original features or favouring the linguistic features of the Chinese target text (Chang-qing Liu, 2009; Xuanmin Luo & Hong, 2004; K. Wang & Fan, 1999; Xu, 2005). However, entailing transliteration of source text terms may raise a number of issues. Firstly, a transliterated term may not make sense to a Chinese reader. This may in turn cause the reader to misunderstand the meaning or lead to a very personal and subjective – and possibly incorrect – understanding. If this concept were to be applied to Community Translation, it might result in the reader being unable to grasp the meaning, thereby missing out on important information.

Secondly, when encountering terms that are difficult to translate, the semantic context in a translation may provide clues as to the meaning of those terms. However, the translator may still interpret these incorrectly or transliterate such terms in a way that may hinder target readers' understanding of those terms. In this case the semantic meanings and illocutionary intent (e.g. to inform and/or to persuade) may be distorted by the translator's incorrect and subjective interpretation – especially when the text relates to health and the translator does not have a healthcare background. Such incorrect interpretations and the resulting distortions in meaning

will be in contrast with the faithfulness and accuracy advocated by Xuan Zang.

Such issues of incorrect interpretation and the resulting inaccuracies must be addressed when we try to establish criteria that can be applied to present-day Community Translation, which aims to facilitate access to and use of public services (Taibi, 2011; Taibi & Ozolins, 2016).

Pragmatic Function

Turning away from the concept of faithfulness, other studies in the Chinese context have touched on the issue of the pragmatic function of the source text. Here pragmatic function relates to the intended effect on and response from the target reader, which may have been expressed through particular styles of expression and deliberately repeated phrases. However, there has been no discussion of the significance of establishing assessment criteria which can be used to ensure the original pragmatic function is maintained in a translation. Neither has there been discussion of how the original pragmatic function can be objectively deduced (e.g. through linguistic analysis), rather than the translator's personal interpretation.

When Xuan Zang expressed his concerns about transliteration, Zan Ning/贊寧 (919-1001) contributed to the discussion by proposing six types of lexical term where literal translation or transliteration should be used (X. Li, 1992; Chang-qing Liu, 2009; G. Luo, 2013) – using the term *liùlì*/六例 (*six instances*) to describe these instances. However, Zan Ning did not indicate specific strategies respectively for each category, but only offered a specific term *zhézhōng*/折中 (*compromise*), without specifying what this entailed. To return to Xuan Zhang's concerns about transliteration, we would like to present a modern day example where transliteration of a health term fails to achieve pragmatic equivalence. The term *ECMO* (*Extra-Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation*) is transliterated as *yèkè mó*/葉克膜 in Taiwan. While the literal meaning of *mó*/膜 refers to a thin and pliable layer, the combination of the first two characters is not a natural collocation in Chinese. Therefore, this term may not easily be understood as a technique used to rescue patients with cardiac and respiratory failure. Such a barrier in understanding a medical term is not consistent with the custom in Chinese translation practice, since Chinese usually expresses medical terms by using characters which refer to the organs or tissues related to a

condition or treatment. Hence, the pragmatic function of using characters delivering such meanings can be considered as diminishing barriers between medical jargon and general readership – so that when lay readers see the term, they understand the meaning straight away. For instance, the translation of *CPR (Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation)* is *xīnfèifūsūshù/心肺復甦術* (literal translation: heart lung resuscitation technique). These two examples show that maintaining the pragmatic function of original medical terms in translation deserves in-depth discussion, as well as criteria to assess if and to what extent pragmatic function has been maintained.

As stated, Zan Ning did not expand on the term *zhézhōng/折中 (compromise)*, even though this term represents an awareness of the need for translators to consider the original style of expression. The concept of *zhézhōng/折中 (compromise)* would appear similar to translators trying to achieve an equivalent pragmatic function. Zan Ning's concept of *compromise* is not mentioned in either Xuan Zang's *wǔbùfān/五不翻 (five non-translatable elements)*, or Dao An's *wǔshībēn/五失本 (five instances of lost origins)*. Similarly, the much more recent Variational Translation Theory (Huang, 2001), though not proposed for religious texts, suggests that the translator should be flexible and does not need to closely follow the original text in order to meet the reader's needs within a specific context. Huang's (2001) theory again "highlights the translator's subjectivity" (Yang, 2019, p. 17), allowing the translator to expand, delete, edit, comment, condense, combine, and reform the original text in translation process (Song, 2012; Xu, 2003; Yang, 2019).

Clear translation strategies are required to avoid a significant degree of introducing subjective opinions into translation. Such strategies could then be applied to develop operable criteria for the community translation of health texts which can be used to see if the pragmatic function has been maintained.

Subjectivity in Theories Relating to the Translation of Literary Works

Large scale translations of Buddhist classics had ceased by the 11th century (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; K. Wang & Fan, 1999), and discussions on the translation of religious texts did not lead to

Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135

any noteworthy ideas which might assist the development of translation assessment criteria. Discussions of ideas proposed by translators and scholars⁶ working on the translation of literary works from Europe started to increase in the 19th century. Ideas relating to the translation of European literature appear largely based on the traditional critiques of Chinese poetry, literature and other works of art. The discussion around such literary translations often shows an emphasis on the translator's subjectivity, hence leading to epistemological vagueness and a blurring of the line between literary studies and translation studies. We will discuss some of these ideas in the next section.

Thoughts Based on Literary Critique

Yan Fu/嚴復 (1854-1921) coined the phrase *yìshì sān nán: xìn dá yǎ* 譯事三難: 信、達、雅 (*three difficulties in translation: xìn dá yǎ*) to sum up what he saw as the three major difficulties in the process of translation. Yan Fu's *xìn*/信 roughly denoted faithfulness, *dá*/達 roughly represented readability, and *yǎ*/雅 roughly suggested elegance. However, *roughly* is not an appropriate word to help define the three terms. Yan Fu himself did not elaborate on the three terms in any detail, resulting in inconsistent or sometimes conflictive interpretations by other scholars (Chan, 2004, p. 5). Therefore, it is still not clear:

- what exactly *xìn*/信 refers to and whether Yan Fu meant faithful to the original or to the translator,
- what exactly *dá*/達 refers to and whether Yan Fu meant appropriate lexical collocation and syntactical structures, coherent structures for conveying messages, making sense to the TT reader, acceptable to the TT reader, fulfilment of the original/translator's purpose, and
- what exactly *yǎ*/雅 refers to whether Yan Fu meant expressions in a translation being elegant and flamboyant in style, or appropriate to the TT reader.

⁶ Names of translators and scholars practicing in the 19th and 20th century are provided in accordance with the norm of Chinese names, which is the family name comes before the given name. Such convention is also commonly seen in studies on these translators' and scholars' translation ideas.

In spite of this, the three terms *xìn dá yǎ*/信達雅 are still often regarded as a guiding principle, providing criteria in discussion of translation quality (Bai, 2007; Chan, 2004; Y. Chen, 2017; Gu, 2010; Xinzhang Luo, 1988a; Ma, 2012; Qiu, 2016; Sun, 2012; Tung, 2010; D. Wang, 2012; Xiong, 2015; Ye, 2013; Zhu, 2004).

Some believe that *xìn dá yǎ*/信達雅 were derived from Zhi Qian's ideas on translation (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; D. Wang, 2012). However, according to some scholars (Cao, 2006b; Xinzhang Luo, 1988a; Xuanmin Luo & Hong, 2004; D. Wang, 2012; K. Wang & Fan, 1999), Zhi Qian's proposal focuses on readability and elegance in translation, not faithfulness to the original, since interpreting *xìn*/信 as faithfulness to the original would be problematic.

The epistemological vagueness between studies focusing on translation and those focusing on Chinese literary works (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; D. Wang, 2012) is equally problematic. The criteria used to evaluate the quality of a literary work, *xìn dá yǎ* / 信達雅 could also be used to assess whether the work faithfully reflects the author's ideas, expressively conveys the ideas to the reader, and elegantly expresses these ideas. These same three terms could then be applied to evaluate the quality of a translation because what a translator does is "convert linguistic symbols from one language to another without losing meanings contained in the symbols" (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; first author's translation)⁷. However, if a translation were considered to be a literary work, would *xìn*/信 refer to being faithful to the author or the translator? Without clarifying this issue, some other scholars argue that Yan Fu's translations served to introduce Western thoughts to Chinese scholars in the 19th century, and facilitate the acceptance of such ideas (Chan, 2004; Gu, 2010; G. Luo, 2013; Sun, 2012; Xiong, 2015). Therefore, Yan Fu considered *dá*/達 (*acceptability*) to be the most fundamental matter for any translation to achieve (Gu, 2010). Further, in order to create a text that looked like a genuine Chinese text, Yan Fu himself also proposed that linguistic features in the original should not hamper the translator's privilege to "re-create" (Chan, 2004, p. 5) the original meaning with personal interpretations combined with Chinese philosophy. Therefore, it would be reasonable to argue that *xìn*/信 should be interpreted

⁷ The original statement in Chinese is 翻译是把一种语言文字换易成另一种语言文字, 而并不变更所蕴含的意义, originally published in simplified characters.

as faithfulness to the translator's own purpose of undertaking a translation. If we interpret *xìn/信* in this way, this results in the following paradox: some scholars argue that a translation can achieve *xìn/信*, if it achieves *dá/達*, and that it can only achieve *dá/達*, if it also achieves *yǎ/雅* (Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; Ma, 2012; Xiong, 2015). However, if a translation achieves *yǎ/雅* (i.e. elegant and flamboyant expressions in accordance with Chinese literary criticism), this inevitably involves subjectivity, compromising or even sacrificing faithfulness to the original.

The aforementioned paradoxical interpretation of the three terms *xìn dá yǎ/信達雅* may result from the epistemological blurring of lines between studies of literary criticism and translation from the 3rd century right through to the 19th century. Such a blurring of lines can still be seen in translation ideas proposed in the 20th century (Tan, 2009) as later scholars and translators may also be said to borrow ideas from literary criticism – in particular ideas as to how to produce a ‘good translation’ (e.g. Chan, 2016; C. Li, 2011; Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; Xuanmin Luo & Hong, 2004; Wu, 2009; Ye, 2013). In the last decade, translation studies in the context of the Chinese language have still shown a tendency towards including translation of works as a part of literary studies. One example would be medio-translatology (e.g. Guo, 2017; Liang, 2019; Xie, 2017), which aims to establish the position of literary translation in the Chinese context of comparative literature. Translator behaviour criticism proposed for Chinese comparative literature (e.g. Y. Li, 2020; Qi, 2019) also centres on the discussion of translators’ belief in translation activities. The theory of three beauties (i.e. beauty in sense, sound and form) is particularly applicable to comparative studies on translated poetry (e.g. Xia, 2020; Xian & Chai, 2020). Theories intertwined with literary criticism may apply to literary translation and comparative literature studies, but we argue that they do not assist the development of objectively operable assessment criteria for Community Translation.

Thoughts Based on Aesthetic Critique

The subjective nature of Chinese translation is also reflected in terms borrowed from traditional

Chinese aesthetics⁸ (Tan, 2009, p. 293), where translation ideas often seem to have been drawn from the critique of poetry and painting.

A 20th century Chinese translation scholar, Fu Lei/傅雷 (1908-1966), borrowed the term *shénsì*/神似 (*spiritual resonance*) from traditional Chinese painting criticism. He advocated that, with an emphasis on natural expressions in the target language (Ye, 2013, p. 148), the form in the target text should be similar to that of the original in order to create a spirit similar to that of the original (Chan, 2004, p. 6; Xinzhang Luo, 1988a, p. 8). However, interpreting the spirit of a text could be purely subjective, which then leads to the ambiguous interpretation of Fu's idea that translation is a work of creation (Wu, 2009, p. 12).

Another 20th century scholar, Qian Zhongshu/錢鍾書 (1910-1998), borrowed the term *huàjìng*/化境 (*realm of transformation*) from studies of the Buddhist classics. This term was also used for arts criticism and underpinned by traditional Chinese aesthetics. With this term, Qian advocated that translators should allow the original 'soul' of a text to undergo a process of transformation, and be realized in a new body. In doing so, translators should be given great freedom in order to make the translation a better product than the original (Chan, 2004, p. 9). One possible interpretation could be that what Qian Zhongshu was advocating in translation is not recreating the original spirit, but rather a spirit that the translator believes is similar to that of the original. Inevitably, subjectivity is one aspect very possibly present in such a translation, and this led to the term *huàjìng*/化境 being criticized as "impressionistic jargon" (Chan, 2004, p. 9).

As a result of "impressionistic jargon" and freedom of creation, scholars later began to emphasize that translation should not be considered the translator's creation but must be faithful to the original. Yet, scholarly debate has still often been confined to discussions of literary translation, while highlighting the translator's subjectivity. Again, we argue that such theories do not assist the development of evaluative tools for current day Community Translation, which requires

⁸ Traditional Chinese aesthetics refers to discussion of traditional art works and poetry, such as paintings conducted in a style known as *guóhuà*/國畫 as opposed to styles receiving influences from Western styles, and poetries conducted in accordance with rules in different periods of time, such as *tángshī*/唐詩, *sòngcí*/宋詞, and *yuánqǔ*/元曲.

considerations of the pragmatic functions of both the source and target texts as well as the perspectives of both the ‘producers’ and the end-users (e.g. Teng, 2020).

A Focus on Translators

While Yan Fu aimed to make sure that translations served to introduce Western thoughts to Chinese scholars in the 19th century, and facilitate the acceptance of such ideas (Chan, 2004; Gu, 2010; G. Luo, 2013; Sun, 2012; Xiong, 2015), 20th century scholars also proposed the idea that translations can be the realisation of the translator’s motivation, interests and personal feelings.

Lu Xun/ 鲁迅 (1881-1936), who translated European, Russian and Japanese literature into Chinese, advocated practicing absolute literal translation. He used the term *yìngyì*/ 硬譯 (*hard translation*) to describe a translation that is extremely close to the original: a word-for-word translation, adopting the syntactical structure of the source language. He believed that it is necessary to adopt the original syntactical structures in a translation in order to convey the original flavours and thoughts. He felt *yìngyì* would both enlighten Chinese readers of that era and facilitate the evolution of the Chinese language (Chan, 2004, 2016; F. Chen, 2012; Ching-chih. Liu, 1981; G. Luo, 2013; Shen, 2000). Discussions on Lu Xun’s insistence on *yìngyì*/ 硬譯 (hard translation) have often focused on the fulfilment of his political purposes at the time which were related to achieving a socio-cultural evolution in Chinese society – e.g. critique of the social hierarchy based on Confucianism (F. Chen, 2012; P. Wang, 2013; Zhang & Yang, 2006).

Lu Xun’s motivation in his translations seems consistent with the idea of “survival” proposed with eco-translatology (Hu, 2011; Hu & Tao, 2016, p. 125). While eco-translatology emphasises translator-centredness in translation activities (Guan, 2014; Zeng, 2019), the term “survival” refers to the translator’s motivations when undertaking a translation, which is subjective (Guan, 2014) and “filled with personal purposes” (Hu & Tao, 2016). However, in Community Translation, it should not be the translator’s motivation that matters. The source texts of Community Translation are predominantly produced for the welfare of the general public, and the purpose of having those texts translated is for linguistically disadvantaged communities to have access to the welfare and to exercise their rights (e.g., legal, healthcare). The motivation for

having a source text translated hence does not lie with the translator, but with the author and the commissioner (Nord, 1997), who often represent a particular public service (health, legal, other). For instance, a government agency (the commissioner) may ask a doctor (the author) to write a text about diabetes, and the agency then commissions the translation.

The concept of eco-translatology also proposes that translators must serve as a bridge in the communication between the ST and TT across the eco-environment where the two respectively exist (Guan, 2014). Translators are indeed expected to facilitate the communication between the ST (and the author) and the TT (and the reader). In Community Translation however, the source text and the target text co-exist in the socio-cultural context of the source language, and the purpose of such translations is to facilitate the social inclusion of the TT reader into mainstream society. In other words, if the translator's motivation is to be highlighted, the latter's motivation has to be consistent with the ST author's.

Debates around Lu Xun's *yìngyì*, led to this concept being both praised (F. Chen, 2012; G. Luo, 2013; P. Wang, 2013; Zhang & Yang, 2006) and denounced (e.g. Bai, 2007; Chan, 2004, 2016). One of Lu Xun's 19th and 20th century contemporaries, Liang Shiqiu/ 梁實秋 (1903-1987), who devoted himself to translating Shakespeare's works, severely criticized Lu Xun's translation approach for resulting in *sǐyì*/ 死譯 (*dead translation*) due to the unnatural lexical choices, and convoluted (and often unconventional) syntactical structures (Bai, 2007; Chan, 2016; Ye, 2013).

Liang used the terms *zhōngshí*/ 忠實 (*faithful*) and *liúlì*/ 流利 (*fluency*) to advocate the idea that a translation must be both faithful to the original messages and readable for the TT reader (Bai, 2007, p. 10). Liang also added the term *chuánshén*/ 傳神 (*conveying the spirit*) to indicate that a translation must also maintain the original spirit. Though arguing that translation is not the realisation of the translator's feelings toward and personal interpretations of the ST, Liang's suggestions were as ambiguous and open to interpretation as Fu Lei's concept of *shénsì*/ 神似 (*spiritual resonance*). Neither did Liang nor his followers offer specific explanations or guidelines as to how the spirit of the source text could be faithfully interpreted and such interpretations are obviously (always) subject to personal feelings.

Hence, debates over *yìngyì* (the tension between literal and free translation) did not contribute to the development of operable assessment criteria for achieving pragmatic equivalence. For instance, the phrase *Well Child check* in the pamphlet *Well Child Tamariki Ora* (Ministry of Health, 2017) was literally translated as *jiànkāng értóng jiǎnchá* 健康兒童檢查/health child check. This translation was problematic (Teng, 2019, pp. 102–103) because: while *Well Child* is a healthcare scheme provided to every child in New Zealand, the Chinese translation of *Well Child Check* read as *a check for healthy child*. As a result, the Chinese translation probably left the TT reader (i.e. the parents) wondering as to *why this check is for healthy children only*, instead of making them aware that this is a check for all children.

Remembering once again that CT aims to ultimately achieve social inclusion of the TT reader (i.e. members of minority communities), and any emphasis on the translator's subjectivity (i.e. their motivations, feelings or personal interpretation of the spirit and soul) may be decidedly unhelpful because:

- Community Translation serves linguistically disadvantaged communities in a multicultural and multilingual society. The motivation for having a translation done is not down to the translator's personal choice.
- Terms, such as *spirit* and *soul*, are difficult to apply to the context of Community Translation where the ST is usually of an informative nature, delivering facts (e.g. healthcare information) and socio-legal customs (e.g. laws, regulations).
- The TT may not meet the TT reader's expectations, which is what a successful translation crucially depends on (Brems & Ramos Pinto, 2013; Gutt, 1996; McAuley, 2015) because TT readers may prefer to read texts that sound natural so that messages in the texts are easy to understand (Burns & Kim, 2011; Ou, 2020; Teng, 2020).

Luo (1988a, p. 12) claims that the field of translation studies in the Chinese context has evolved along its own path separate from Chinese literary studies. However, this path seems to be filled with arguments in favour of traditional aesthetics and emphasis on the subjectivity of the translator, resulting from the aforesaid epistemological blurring between literary and translation

studies. For instance, Liang Shiqiu argued that literary translation should be considered a literary art. Such an argument is consistent with the idea that literary translations (i.e. the translation of literary works originally written in a non-Chinese language) should be considered a discipline in the Chinese literature (Xie, 2017). Such an argument will again result in an epistemological blurring of the lines between translation studies and the study of literature (Jiang, 2013; C. Li, 2011; Xinzhang Luo, 1988b; Xuanmin Luo, 2008; Mu, 1998).

Any rather general and non-specific debates based on translator's personal preferences have produced only "impressionistic assertions concerning translation" (Chan, 2004, p. 3), and hence cannot offer assessment tools for Community Translation to evaluate:

- how subjectivity of the translator can be minimized,
- how faithfulness is maintained in a translation, and
- how and whether a translation elicits a similar response as the original text does.

When trying to apply such impressionistic assertions to Community Translation, we find that they cannot be used to assess whether TT readers can be informed and/or persuaded by a foreign-sounding translation of a text which aims to deliver crucial messages regarding TT readers' legal rights, health or other important information.

The aforesaid impressionistic assertions also have never seriously focused on the potential change of pragmatic functions caused by pragmalinguistic failures (Hale, 2014; Thomas, 1983). Hale describes these as failures of pragmatic equivalence caused by cross-linguistic features between the source and target language. Distortion of the original pragmatic meaning could result from differences in syntactical or morphological rules between the two languages, from the change of the original flow of information, or from changes in non-semantic meanings. Interested readers are referred to textual and interpersonal meanings (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and pragmalinguistic failures in English-Chinese translation of healthcare texts (Teng, 2019, 2020).

In other words, we argue that translation scholars working in the Chinese language context, at least as represented by the present overview, have thus far not focused on developing criteria which can be applied to assess Community Translation.

Conclusion

We believe prescriptivism and descriptivism should work together in the realm of translator/interpreter education/training for students who are much more likely do community translation/interpreting in their future career. Indeed, we do want to tell the students what to do and what not to, yet we do not limit or define individual techniques for any language pairs. The purpose of doing community translation is to help members of minority communities have language access to information related to their rights, their daily life. This type of translation does not aim at entertaining, religious, literary purposes.

Newmark (1981, p. 4) used the term “pre-linguistic period” to indicate the time preceding the development of the academic field of linguistics from the mid-20th century onwards in light of the ongoing arguments over literal versus free translation. Yet, the more recent translation studies related to the Chinese language still seem to deliberately preserve the ideology that a translation should be considered a literary work (e.g. Hu, 2008; Jiang, 2013; C. Li, 2011; Xinzhang Luo, 1988a, 1988b; Xuanmin Luo, 2008; Mu, 1998; Xie, 2017). This then often results in the subjectivity of the translator being highlighted. It is not appropriate to consider all translation from the perspective of recreating a literary work (House, 2001), particularly when the translation aims to deliver information that is closely related to individual rights (e.g. health rights and legal rights) and does not allow introduction of translators’ personal opinions. There are specific types of text (scientific, technical, legal, medical and including Community Translation) which demand a different approach to translation theory (Baker, 1992). The impetus for Community Translation should not involve any personal motivation on the part of the translator, but should be underpinned by aiming to disseminate any information about benefits or welfare provided for the general public, with members of linguistic minority groups. In other words, we need different approaches and criteria for assessing whether a Community Translation text has achieved its intended purpose.

While there is still a paucity of assessment tools for Community Translation (Taibi & Ozolins, 2016), theories and methods relying on subjective judgement, literary criticism and aesthetics of art works may not produce operable assessment tools. A debate centred around impressionistic ideas may not help translators facilitate social inclusion of members of minority communities. In terms of the social function of Community Translation, we argue that translation scholars working with the Chinese language need to broaden the existing discussion by taking on a functional perspective and considering both the producers' and the end-users' perspectives. For instance, assessment criteria have been developed within the framework of Nida's equivalence and systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Crezee et al., 2017; Teng, 2019; Teng et al., 2018); surveys on actual users' reception of community translation can offer more real-life feedback to translation quality (Burns & Kim, 2011 e.g. Taibi, Liamputtong, & Polonsky, 2019; Teng, 2020). Taking on those perspectives will allow us to better investigate and evaluate the extent to which a translated text has maintained pragmatic equivalence in the context of Community Translation and facilitate social inclusion by diminishing language barriers in society.

While quoting ours and other scholars' studies in the last paragraph, we do see the value of analysing and describing what translators do, such as the techniques they have used to solve (or yet failed to solve) cross-linguistic and cross-cultural issues, the process of their decision making. We also see and promote the importance of taking consideration of end-users' perspectives in translation quality. That is one aspect which deserves more attention in translator education.

References

- Bai, L. (2007). Liang Shih Chiu Fanyi Sixiang Yanjiu [Study on Liang, Shih Chiu's Ideas of Translation]. *Tamkang Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 32, 1–32.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Brems, E., & Ramos Pinto, S. (2013). Reception and translation. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, 4, 142–147.
- Burns, A., & Kim, M. (2011). Community accessibility of health information and the consequent impact for translation into community languages. *Translation & Interpreting*, 3(1), 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.12807/T&I.V3I1.107>
- Cao, M. (2006a). Reading Dao An's preface to Chinese version of The Prajnaparamita. *Chinese Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135*

Translators Journal, 27(1), 51–54.

- Cao, M. (2006b). Rereading Zhi Qian's preface to Chinese version of Dharmapade. *Journal of Sichuan International Studies University*, 22(5), 122–125.
- Chan, L. T. (2004). *Twentieth-century Chinese Translation Theory: Modes, Issues and Debates*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Chan, L. T. (2016). What's Modern in Chinese Translation Theory? Lu Xun and the Debates on Literalism and Foreignization in the May Fourth Period. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 14(2), 195–223. <https://doi.org/10.7202/000576ar>
- Chen, C.-Y. (2017). *Examination of Psychometric Properties of a Translated Social-Emotional Screening Test: The Taiwanese Version of Ages and Stages Questionnaires: Social-Emotional*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, United States.
- Chen, F. (2012). Lu Xun: Practitioner and Thinker of Translation. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 148–153.
- Chen, Y. (2017). Translating legal contracts for court interpretation. *Chaoyang Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 15, 95–108.
- Crezee, I. H. M., Burn, J. A., & Teng, W. (2020). Community translation in New Zealand. In S. Laviosa & M. González-Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education* (pp. 245–263). New York: Routledge.
- Crezee, I. H. M., Teng, W., & Burn, J. A. (2017). Teething problems? Chinese student interpreters' performance when interpreting authentic (cross-) examination questions in the legal interpreting classroom. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 11(4), 337–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2017.1359756>
- de Bres, J. (2020, July 13). Our ethnic communities are not the government's free translation service | The Spinoff. Retrieved August 17, 2020, from <https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/13-07-2020/our-ethnic-communities-are-not-the-governments-free-translation-service/>
- Fang, Y., McDonald, E., & Cheng, M. (1995). On Theme in Chinese: From Clause to Discourse. In R. Hasan & P. H. Fries (Eds.), *On Subject and Theme : A Discourse Functional Perspective* (pp. 235–265). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Feng, X. (2016). *On Aesthetic and Cultural Issues in Pragmatic Translation: Based on the Translation of Brand Names and Brand Slogans*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor
- Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135*

& Francis Group.

- Grey, A. (2020, June 29). Australia's multilingual communities are missing out on vital coronavirus information - ABC News. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-06-29/coronavirus-multilingual-australia-missing-out-covid-19-info/12403510>
- Gu, L. (2010). Forward: "Xin Da Ya" in translation and virtue. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 37(4), 655–659.
- Guan, X. (2014). Eco-translatology and translation teaching. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 6(3), 61–64.
- Guo, W. (2017). Rebirth of comparative literature in China from the perspective of medio-translatology. *Comparative Literature and Culture*, 19(5). Retrieved from <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol19/iss5/6/>
- Gutt, E.-A. (1996). Implicit information in literary translation - A relevance Theoretic Perspective. *Target*, 8(2), 239–256.
- Hale, S. (2014). Interpreting culture. Dealing with cross-cultural issues in court interpreting. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22(3), 321–331.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Kress, G. R. (1976). Theme and information in the English clause. In G. Kress (Ed.), *Halliday: System and Function in Language: Selected Papers* (pp. 174–188). London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- House, J. (2001). How do we know when a translation is good? In E. Steiner & C. Yallop (Eds.), *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content* (pp. 127–160). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hu, G. (2008). An explanation of Eco-translatology. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 6, 11–15.
- Hu, G. (2011). Eco-translatology: Research foci and theoretical tenets. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 2, 5–9.
- Hu, G., & Tao, Y. (2016). Eco-translatology: A new paradigm of eco-translation-a comparative study on approaches to translation studies. *Sociology*, 115–132.
- Huang, Z. (2001). *Bianyi Lilun [Variational Translation Theory]*. Beijing, China: China Translation & Publishing Corporation.

Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135

- Jiang, Y. (2013). Translation equals creation: Yu Guangzhong's translational thought and practice. *Journal of Xiamen University of Technology*, 21(4), 97–100.
- Ko, L. (2010). Chinese-English translation of public signs for tourism. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 13, 111–123.
- Leung, E. S. (2020). Medical interpreting as an emerging profession in Hong Kong. In E. Ng & I. H. M. Crezee (Eds.), *Interpreting in Legal and Healthcare Settings: Perspectives on Research and Training* (pp. 151–263). John Benjamins Publishing, 2020.
- Li, C. (2011). Yu Guangzhong Fanyi Sixiang Shuping [A review on Yu Guangzhong's translational thoughts]. *Literatures*, 4, 28–29.
- Li, X. (1992). *Zan Ning Yixue Zhuzhang Shili [Exemplification of Zan Ning's Assertion in Translation Study]*. Hong Kong, China: Nei Ming.
- Li, Y. (2020). A study of Lin Yutang's translator behavior in the translation of six chapters of *A Floating Life* — Based on “truth-seeking-utility-attaining. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 6(1), 41–45.
- Liang, Y. (2019). English translations and studies of Zhouyi Cantong Qi from the perspective of medio-translatology. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 18(2), 50–54.
- Liu, Chang-qing. (2009). Exploration of Translation Theories in Buddhist Scripture Translating Centers. *Journal of Sichuan International Studies University*, 25(1).
- Liu, Ching-chih. (1981). *Fanyi Lunji [Essays on Translation]*. Hong Kong, China: Joint Publishing.
- Lu, C. (1988). *Zhongguo Foxue Sixiang Gailun [An Introduction to Chinese Buddhism]*. Taipei, Taiwan: Heavenly Lotus Publishing Co.
- Luo, G. (2013). Translational purpose governs evolution of translational essence: A historical investigation. *Language Education*, 1(2), 62–67.
- Luo, Xinzhang. (1988a). Woguo zichengtixi de fanyi lilun (shu) [The development of translation theories in China (continued)]. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 8, 8–12.
- Luo, Xinzhang. (1988b). Woguo zichengtixi de fanyi lilun [The development of translation theories in China]. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 7, 9–13.
- Luo, Xuanmin. (2008). Yu Guangzhong yu fanyi [Yu Guangzhong and translation]. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 5, 75–77.
- Luo, Xuanmin, & Hong, L. (2004). Translation theory and practice in China. *Perspectives*, 12(1),
- Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135*

20–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2004.9961488>

- Ma, Z. (2012). The importance and influence of “Faithfulness Smoothness Elegance” in Chinese translation history. *Journal of Yanan University (Social Science)*, 34(3), 120–122.
- McAuley, T. E. (2015). Audience attitude and translation reception: The case of Genji Monogatari. *Babel*, 61(2), 219–241.
- Ministry of the Interior National Immigration Agency. (2020). *Waiqiao Juliu Renshu Tongjibiao [Statistics of Foreign Resident Population]*. Taichung, Taiwan. Retrieved from <https://www.immigration.gov.tw/5382/5385/7344/7350/外僑居留/?alias=settleddown&sdate=202001&edate=202006>
- Mu, L. (1998). Yu Guangzhong tan fanyi [Yu Guangzhong’s talks on translation]. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 4, 37–41.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. London, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ou, K.-Y. (2020). A Taiwanese perspective on translationese: definition, Chinese name, typology, causes and remedies. *Compilation and Translation Review*, 13(2), 73–116.
- Pingtung County Government. (2020). Attention! Severe infectious pneumonia. Retrieved July 1, 2020, from <https://www.pthg.gov.tw/2019-ncov/cp.aspx?n=29AFDC2571D4E6A4>
- Qi, J. (2019). On the translator’s behavior criticism of the English translation of local language in Mo Yan’s novels. In *2019 International Conference on Humanities, Cultures, Arts and Design* (pp. 590–593).
- Qiu, J. L. (2016). Cultural translators of communication studies in Greater China. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 1030–1053.
- Roat, C. E., & Crezee, I. H. M. (2015). Healthcare Interpreting. In H. Mikkelsen & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting* (pp. 236–253). London and New York: Routledge.
- Shen, S. (2000). *Lun Xin Da Ya: Yan Fu Fanyi Lilun Yanjiu [Discussion of Xin Da Ya: Study on Yan Fu’s Theory of Translation]*. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu.
- Song, F. (2012). A study of the application of translation variation. *Foreign Language Research*, 2, 126–129.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 Census Totals by Topic*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Wei Teng and Ineke Crezee, Translation Theories in the Context of the Chinese Language – How Applicable are they to Community Translation? 110 - 135*

- Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/census/2013-census/data-tables/total-by-topic.aspx>
- Sun, Y. (2012). The shifting identity of translation studies in China. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 21(2), 32–52.
- Taibi, M. (2011). *Public Service Translation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Taibi, M., Liamputtong, P., & Polonsky, M. (2019). Impact of Translated Health Information on CALD Older People's Health Literacy: A Pilot Study. In M. Ji, M. Taibi, & I. H. M. Crezee (Eds.), *Multicultural Health Translation, Interpreting and Communication* (pp. 138–158). New York: Routledge.
- Taibi, M., & Ozolins, U. (2016). *Community Translation*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tan, Z. (2009). The 'Chineseness' vs. 'non-Chineseness' of Chinese translation theory. *The Translator*, 15(2), 283–304.
- Teng, W. (2005). *Thematicity and Informational Focus in English to Mandarin Translation: Maintaining Textual Equivalence*. The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia.
- Teng, W. (2019). When pragmatic equivalence fails: Assessing a New Zealand English to Chinese health translation from a functional perspective. In C. Ji, M. Taibi, & I. H. M. Crezee (Eds.), *Multicultural Health Translation, Interpreting and Communication* (pp. 85–122). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Teng, W. (2020). *It Makes Sense, but I Just Don't Get It. Translators' and End-users' Perspectives on the English to Chinese Community Translation of Health Texts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Teng, W., Burn, J. A., & Crezee, I. H. M. (2018). I'm asking you again! Chinese student interpreters' performance when interpreting declaratives with tag questions in the legal interpreting classroom. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 26(5), 745–766.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91–112.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91>
- Tung, C.-H. (2010). *The Three Requirements of Translation: A Reconsideration*. National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Wang, D. (2012). Interpretation on the arguments about Wen And Zhi raised in the preface of the Chinese version of Dharmapade. *China Academic Journal*, 12, 141–146.

- Wang, K., & Fan, S. (1999). Translation in China: A Motivating Force. *Meta : Journal Des Traducteurs*, 44(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.7202/004591ar>
- Wang, P. (2013). The Promethean translator and cannibalistic pains: Lu Xun’s “hard translation” as a political allegory. *Translation Studies*, 6(3), 324–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2013.811836>
- Wu, H. (2009). Space of Translation: On Fu Lei’s Theory of “Spiritual Similarity.” *Compilation and Translation Review*, 2(1), 1–25.
- Xia, J. (2020). A comparative study on the translation of fairy tale from the perspective of the “three beauties theory.” *US-China Foreign Language*, 18(4), 136–139.
- Xian, Q., & Chai, S. (2020). A comparative study of Chinese translations of Keats’s To Autumn under “three beauties theory.” *Canadian Social Science*, 16(7), 41–46.
- Xie, T. (2017). Medio-translatology: New Perspectives on Comparative Literature and Translation Studies. *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 1(1), 125–133.
- Xiong, X. (2015). Lun Yan Fu dui zhongguo chuantong fanyi huitong sixiang de jicheng he fazhan [Discussion of Yan Fu’s influence on the development of traditional translation theories in China]. *Theory and Practice of Contemporary Education*, 7(5), 116–119.
- Xu, J. (2003). Translation Variation Theory (in Chinese), Beijing, China Translation & Publishing Corporation. *Meta*, 48(4), 590.
- Xu, J. (2005). Brief History of Science Translation in China. *Meta : Journal Des Traducteurs*, 50(3), 1010–1021.
- Yang, X. (2019). On the Translation Strategy of English Version of the Legend of the Condor Heroes from the Perspective of Translation Variation Theory. In Q. Wang (Ed.), *2019 International Conference on Education, Management, Social Science and Humanities Research* (pp. 16–20). Manila, the Phillipines: Clausius Scientific Press. <https://doi.org/10.23977/emsshr.2019.004>
- Ye, Z. (2013). *Principles and Practice of English-Chinese Translation* (2nd ed.). Taipei, Taiwan: Bookman.
- Yu, A. (2020, June 24). “There was nothing”: Translation delay raises questions about virus information to migrant communities. *The Age*. Retrieved from <https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/there-was-nothing-translation-delay-raises-questions-about-virus-information-to-migrant-communities-20200624-p555us.html>

- Zeng, Z. (2019). A research on English translation of public signs in Shanxi Province - Based on three-dimension in Eco-translatology. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 9(8), 951–955.
- Zhang, Y., & Yang, J. (2006). Functionalism and Lu Xun's Translation Theory. *Journal of Anhui Institute of Education*, 24(5), 91–94.
- Zhou, Y. (2002). A Study on Buddhist Hermeneutics in Ancient China: Chinese Translation of Buddhist Sutra. *Journal of Sichuan University (Social Science Edition)*, 3.
- Zhu, C. (2004). Translation studies in China or Chinese-related translation studies: Defining Chinese translation studies. *Babel*, 50(4), 332–345.