

On Translation and Interpretation (continued)

A Lecture by Dr. Henry Rosemont, Jr. at Berkeley Buddhist Monastery on April 5, 2013 | Chinese Translation by Wei Zhang and Yihuan Shi

翻譯與詮釋 (續)

आर्यालोकितेश्वरो बोधिसत्त्वो गम्भीरां प्रज्ञापारमिताचर्यां चरमाणो व्यवलोकयति स्म

亨利·羅斯蒙博士講於柏克萊佛寺 2013年4月5日
張煒、石義環 中譯



BODHI FIELD | 菩提田

This point bears emphasis. An important aspect of developing an interpretation of what a text is saying is to contextualize it: what cultural, political or religious issues were confronting the authors of the time?

What motivated Hobbes and Locke, for example, to say what they did and when they did about the grounds of political obligation? Then we must ask the same question of ourselves: what cultural, political or religious issues are confronting us that we feel a responsibility to confront?

Think of how much more pressing concerns about privacy, for instance, or the rules of engagement in warfare have become since the advent of technologies undreamed of 100 years ago.

There is another reason I believe translators should be native speakers of the target language; the nuances of meaning in the words and phrases you select can be extremely important beyond the confines of the text.

在這裏，我要強調詮釋作品的一點重要觀念，那就是要將所翻譯的文本置放在它所依存的時空脈絡裏，也就是要了解作者們當時書寫時所面對的文化、政治及宗教背景。

例如，當初是什麼背景激發了霍布斯（Hobbes）和洛克（Locke）各自提出了社會契約論？接著，我們必須反問自己同樣的問題：擺在我們眼前的文化、政治、宗教問題是什麼？我們所要肩負的責任為何？

舉例來說，我們試想在100年前，當科技時代尚未出現，人們從來沒有想要迫切關注隱私問題，或者是網路使用規則，然而在當今的社會已經越來越受到重視。

我堅持使用母語翻譯的另外一個原因是：翻譯者所推敲出來的字眼，任何與本文些微的差異，都將影響整篇語意的覆沒與否。

One classic case for me has to do with the Cold War. When Nikita Khrushchev was head of the Soviet Union he addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations, and in the course of his remarks said something quickly translated and broadcast immediately, which older people may remember: “We will bury you,” to the American delegation. Now, that’s scary, isn’t it? This speech came after the Soviets had been testing their hydrogen bombs, and the quote provided a seemingly clear rationale for building up our own arsenal. I have been told, however, that most of his remarks were really addressed to the representatives of the developing nations, talking about the significance of the difference between a planned economy and a market economy, and he turned to the United States delegation and said, “Our economy will soon be superior”; he then used an idiomatic expression which does literally translate, I understand, “We will bury you,” but which much more clearly has the connotation of the English “We will leave you in the dust.” Think of the difference between those two expressions. Surely the Cold War wouldn’t have ended if the latter expression had been the English translation from the Russian, but it certainly wouldn’t have had such a negative impact on the American peoples, who were already deeply in the throes of a very strong anti-communist ideology.

Transitioning now toward translating and interpreting the *Analects*, note that Roger and I subtitled our own version *A Philosophical Translation*, because we believed that in the end, as philosophers we were obliged to consider whether the ideas we were endeavoring to render into English had claims on the allegiance of people living today, in the English-speaking world no less than the Chinese. That is to say, are the ideas put forth in the text defensible 7,000 miles and more than two millennia distant from where and when they were first advanced?

We answered that question affirmatively on a number of counts, not least being the focus on the family as the foundation for all personal cultivation. But the stereotypical Chinese family (at least in imperial China) was that it was patriarchal, sexist, and valued loyalty and obedience much higher than individual development, freedom, creativity, or dissent — not the sort of qualities consistent with 21st Century values and ideas of how children should be raised.

But Confucius was by no means an authoritarian, nor was he simply concerned with the niceties of deference; his views on the family went well beyond sociology, ethics and etiquette, to include the profoundly philosophical, aesthetic and spiritual dimensions of our all-too-human lives, and he did it without appealing to any metaphysics or theology that might fly in the face of contemporary physics, geology or biology.

Thus, after translating the *Analects* we later turned to the *Xiaojing*, usually rendered as *The Classic of Filial Piety*, but which we rendered as

讓我舉一個美蘇冷戰時期的經典例子來說明。當年赫魯雪夫擔任蘇聯領導人時，他曾經在聯合國大會上發表談話。席間，他的一句評論被迅速翻譯並且廣播出去。年紀稍長的人可能還記得，當時他對美國代表團說：“We will bury you!”。乍聽之下的確可怕，不是嗎？畢竟，這番談話剛好發生在蘇聯進行氫彈試驗之後，而這句話彷彿提供美國一個正當的理由來加緊軍備。事實上，他這番話是針對發展中國家的代表，主要是談論計劃經濟和市場經濟的巨大差異。當時他轉向美國代表團其實是想表達：「我們的經濟很快就會超越你們。」然而他使用了蘇聯當地的俗諺來表意，這句俗諺被英文逐字翻譯成「我們會將你們埋了！」事實上，對應的英語翻譯應該是：「我們會讓你們望塵莫及！」想想這兩種表述的差異性。誠然，就算當時使用了精確的翻譯，冷戰一樣也不會結束，但至少不會帶給美國人民如此負面的感受。畢竟，當時的美國人民已深處在強烈反共的意識形態裏。

現在，我們回頭討論《論語》的翻譯。你如果留心注意，會發現我和安樂哲給這本書下的副標題是「哲學詮譯本」。因為我們相信，身為哲學家，始終有責任思維這些費力翻譯的思想是否還能體現當代人的需求，不管是中文世界的讀者，還是英文系國家的閱眾。也就是說，這些過去因地因時產生的觀點，在歷經7,000英里空間和兩千多年時間的跨度後，如今能否站得住腳？

針對這個問題，我們抱持著正面肯定的態度，尤其在「重視家庭是所有修行的基礎」這個觀點上。典型的中國家庭（至少在封建時代的中國）是父權體制，並以男權為尊，他們高度重視忠誠和順從的品格，至於個人發展、自由、創造力以及異議的能力則為次要。這與21世紀所要培養的孩童品質以及教養方式並不一致。

但是孔子並不是一位獨裁主義者，他並非僅僅關注於恭敬服從的細節問題，他對於家庭的知見遠遠超過了一般社會學、倫理學和禮教的範疇，他的見解蘊含了深刻的哲學、美學和精神層面。他在完全沒有訴求於任何神學或形而上學思想（有違當代物理、地質學或生物學）的情況下，做到了這一點。

我和安樂哲翻譯完《論語》之後，轉而翻譯《孝經》。《孝經》一般被稱為「孝道的經典」，我們

The Chinese Classic of Family Reverence, and in the course of our long introduction to it, defended much that it contained — referring back to the *Analects* frequently — because we thought that it had been very badly misunderstood by a wide range of people for a long period of time.

In contrast, there is another little book that deals with xiao. It is the *Twenty-Four Tales of Filial Children*. Most of those 24 children I personally find disgusting, one of whom, for example, covered himself with honey in order to attract mosquitoes away from his parents. They are extreme fanatics in their conduct toward xiao. I cannot imagine anyone taking any of these children seriously as models for behavior in the west in the 21st century. I can't imagine anyone in China taking the text seriously in China either. It should probably be translated because it can tell you about the evolution of the concept of xiao from the classical era in which remonstrance was a necessary element for revering parents through later periods of Chinese history where unquestioning obedience and selflessness just overwhelmed the earlier concept in which remonstrance and love were emphasized.

Now the moral of this little story is, always ask, when you read a translation, why did the translator translate it? What was his or her motive in doing the translation? What kind of impact did they hope their efforts would have? And of course as translators yourselves you must look into the mirror periodically and ask these questions of yourselves as you work. In just the same way, the sensitive translator will ask very similar questions of the texts themselves. Taking two very significant works as example, why did the authors of the *Bible* and of the *Analects* write what they wrote? And given the multiplicity of “authors” (“compilers” is probably more accurate) in both cases, over an extended period of time, were different authors writing for different reasons? Again, what kind of impact did they expect (hope) their work would have?

In the *Bible* it is fairly clear, to me at least, that much of what the authors were trying to do was describe the world created by God: what it was, what it is now, and what it will become. That is to say, a lot of what is written in the *Bible* are factual accounts of the world, descriptions of what the world is like. In the beginning, God created it — going back to the *Genesis' Chapter One*, plagues were put on the pharaohs, the locusts came, the Red Sea parted, Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and so forth. In both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament a good deal of factual information is being conveyed to the reader.

That is probably not the best way to approach the *Analects*,

卻起名為《古典中國的家庭之道》（編註：坊間出版譯為「生民之本：『孝經』的哲學詮釋及英譯」）。在長篇的序言裏，我們反覆提及《論語》，並試圖為它辯護，著實是因為長期以來《論語》遭到了各界人士的嚴重曲解。

相形之下，另外一本也談孝道的書，名為《二十四孝的故事》，我個人卻完全無法苟同書中孝子的行徑。例如，其中一位孝子為了避免父母遭到蚊蟲叮咬，而把自己全身上下塗滿蜂蜜，以吸引蚊蟲的注意。這些孝子為了盡孝，卻做出極端狂熱的行為，我無法想像在21世紀的西方，會有任何人認真看待這些孝行，並以這群孝子為楷模；同樣的，我也無法想像，當代中國會有任何人嚴肅看待這些故事。或許，我們應該翻譯《二十四孝的故事》，借此告訴大眾中國孝道觀念的演化過程：那就是如何從早期歷史裏的「孝」——強調對父母的勸誡和愛，演變到晚期逐漸成為絕對的服從和毫無個人主張，而先前規諫父母的觀念也消失殆盡了。

我這番話的寓意是，當我們在閱讀翻譯本時，永遠要保持疑情，質疑翻譯者為了什麼目的而翻譯？思索翻譯者的動機為何？好奇他們希望讀者從中獲得什麼訊息？同理，當自己做為翻譯者的時候，也應該經常攬鏡自照，問問自己這些問題。敏銳心細的譯者，通常也會對所翻譯的文本提出類似的疑問。就拿兩部影響極為深遠的作品來試問：到底《聖經》和《論語》的作者，他們寫作的企圖為何？兩部作品同樣都由多位作者書寫而成（稱呼他們「編輯者」似乎更為貼切），在如此漫長的歲月裏，不同時期的作者，其成書的目的是否相同？再者，他們期望作品如何影響讀者？

於我而言，《聖經》的寫作目的非常清楚，作者們試圖描繪這個世界乃由上帝所創造，並勾勒了過去、現在以及未來世界的樣貌；換句話說，《聖經》以大量的篇幅具體描述世界的種種樣貌。首先，在《創世紀》第一章，上帝創造了世界，然後瘟疫散佈，蝗蟲侵襲，再來紅海分離，耶穌降生於伯利恆等等。無論在希伯來舊約聖經或是新約聖經，我們都可以讀到大量的敘述性文字。

至於解讀《論語》最好的方法，別人或許不認同，不過對我來說卻最為受用，我的方法就是反問「孔子講這句話的時候，他試圖做什麼？」詰問孔子說這句話的時候，他的目的是什麼？而不是問「孔子到底說了什麼？」如果你能看出這兩種問法的差別，你的翻譯將有所不同。關於「孔子試圖做什麼？」，我的看法是，他試圖激發他的學生以特定的方式去感受、去行動。對於一位受過

or at least the way that it always seemed to me the best way to approach the *Analects*. Rather have I asked, “What is Confucius trying to do when he speaks?” Not what is he trying to say, what is he trying to do? And, if you see that as a difference, it will affect your translation of the text. The answer I came up with is that he is trying to get his students to feel and act in particular ways. That is straightforward for a philosopher trained in analytic philosophy to appreciate.

A lot of work has gone on in the philosophy of language for the last 75 years, with a very basic distinction being made between what you accomplish by saying something and what you accomplish in saying something. What are you trying to do? Are you trying to get people to understand something about the world, either a fact about the world or a theory that brings a lot of facts about the world together, or are you trying to evoke a particular response in your listener?

Let’s look at the difference in approaches, taking first the very famous passage 13:18 in the *Analects*, where the pretender Duke of She said, “**Aha, there goes Upright Gong, his father took a sheep on the sly, and his son turned him in.**” Confucius says, “**Aha, where I come from, son covers for his father, and father covers for his son and therein lies being good.**”

If you just read that straightforwardly it sounds like a kind of participant-observer anthropological observation. This is what we do in my village. But, clearly that’s not why Confucius says that. “If your dad does something wrong, stick by him.” That is what you have to evoke. He is trying to get a particular response from his student. The sentence is in declarative form, of course. We have to put this sentence in declarative mood in English. “In my village, a son covers for his father and a father covers for his son,” but, that is not what the Master is about. It’s a kind of imperative. “Never squeal on your father! Don’t do that!”

To take another example, one of the most important passages in the entire *Analects*, as I interpret it, is 11:22, which I commend to your attention. There you see most clearly what Confucius is trying to do. Zilu comes in and he said, “**Can I do this? Can I forge ahead in this activity?**” Confucius replies, “**While your parents (and elder brothers) are alive, how dare you do something like that!**” Then Ranyou comes in and asks the same question, and Confucius said in essence, “**Go get ‘em!**” Then a third student says, “**I am confused, they both ask the same question, you tell one no, you tell the other one yes. Why is that?**” He says, “**Ranyou is very diffident, so I had to encourage him. But Zilu has the energy of two, so I had to slow him down.**”

☞ To be continued

分析哲學訓練的哲學家來說，這個問題是很明確的。

在過去的75年當中，人們在語言哲學的領域裏投注了大量的心血，在「以言行事/施效」和「以言表意」這之間已確立了基礎的分界。他們研究說話者的意圖為何，比如當說話者透過真實事件或理論來描述世界時，說話者是為了幫助聽者了解所處的世界？還是為了引發聽眾有所特殊行動？

接下來讓我們閱讀一段《論語》裏面著名的篇章，看看不同解讀方法所造成的理解差異。《論語·子路篇》記載：葉公語孔子曰：「吾黨有直躬者。其父攘羊，而子證之。」孔子曰：「吾黨之直者異於是。父為子隱，子為父隱，直在其中矣。」葉公對孔子說：「我們這裏有個正直的人姓躬，他的父親偷了羊，躬便告發自己的父親。」孔子說：「在我的家鄉，正直的人可不是這樣。父親為兒子隱瞞過患，兒子也為父親遮掩過失，這樣的行為表現了正直的精神。」

如果你只是直白地讀這段話，這段對話於你而言，不過是一則人類學的觀察範例，也就是葉公與孔子分別述說了自家村民的行為模式。然而，這並不是孔子的初衷，我認為孔子真正想表達的是：「如果你的父親做錯事，你要與他休戚與共。」中文原句是敘述句，我們也以陳述的語氣翻譯成：“In my village, a son covers for his father and a father covers for his son,” 其實孔子是以迫切的心情告訴學生：「永遠不要告發自己的父親！千萬不可！」

容我再試舉一例。個人認為整部《論語》最重要的段落之一，便在〈先進篇〉的「聞斯行諸」，我也向各位極力推薦之。在這篇對話裏，孔子將他「因材施教」的目的表達得最為透徹清晰。子路問：「聞斯行諸？」子曰：「有父兄在，如之何其聞斯行之？」冉有問：「聞斯行諸？」子曰：「聞斯行之。」公西華曰：「由也問聞斯行諸，子曰『有父兄在』；求也問聞斯行諸，子曰『聞斯行之』。赤也惑，敢問。」子曰：「求也退，故進之；由也兼人，故退之。」子路問：「聽到一件合乎義理的事情，就該立刻去做嗎？」孔子回答：「你父親兄長都還健在，你怎敢不先請教他們就去做呢？」冉有問道：「聽到一件合乎義理的事情，就該立刻去做嗎？」孔子回答：「聽到了就去做吧！」公西華就問了：「我被弄糊塗了。他們倆都問了同樣的問題，為什麼你跟子路說別做，對冉有卻說去做？道理何在？」孔子說：「冉有非常懦怯，所以我必須鼓勵他即知即行。但子路好勇過人，我必須攔著點，讓他的步子慢下來。」

☞ 待續