

# 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)

何回皆福勝無行殊功德經誦

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

The significance of knowing the student, having a good sense of where the question is coming from, and therefore, trying to give an answer to fit that particular student, is central to the teaching style of the Master because he is consistently trying to evoke a particular response from his students — but the responses are geared to the students, not to abstract principles or universal generalizations.

If this view has merit, it suggests that when we look at the statements in the *Analects*, we should not ask whether or not they are true, as we would in the case of describing facts. We would rather perhaps ask is what the Master said appropriate (to that student, at that time)? Now, that of course is an interpretation, but it gains some support from the classical Chinese lexicon: there is no word for “true” in classical Chinese, so the student of Confucius could not ask such a question. Rather would he (and we) need a word like “appropriate,” which Roger and I use

從這裏，我們可以學習到在教學過程中，掌握學生特點，充份瞭解其問題的根源，繼而因人施教的重要性，這也是孔子教學裏的中心思想；正因為如此，孔子總是不斷啟發誘導學生，激發他們的學習和反應。孔子為每個學生所量身打造的教法，從來不是抽象的道理，也不是籠統的概念。

如果這個觀點具有說服力的話，也就表示當我們在面對《論語》多元的表述時，毋需質疑其正確或真實性，畢竟我們不在兩千年前的現場。我們應該對孔子當時所說的話（對某個學生，在某個時間點）是否合宜提出疑問。這當然是一種解釋。幸好，我們可以從古漢語的詞典中，找到一些支援及鼓勵。

先秦兩漢以前的文言文裏，沒有「真實」的字眼，所以你可以發現在《論語》中，孔子的學生無人觸及「真實」或「真假」的問題。不過，孔子

for the Chinese *yi*, a very common term. You are always to do what is *yi*, what is appropriate, and not just in your speech, it should permeate all of your behavior. *Yi* is usually translated as “righteous,” or sometimes as “moral,” but both of those, I think, are wrong. “Righteous” immediately brings to bear a Christian world orientation, or Hebraic, or Islamic. And righteousness, of course, is something that is out there, an objective standard, which we are expected to meet. But to do what is appropriate with Zilu, what is appropriate with Ranyou, and what might be appropriate with Yan Hui, are not necessarily the same thing.

All of these suggests that we are entering a somewhat different world than we are accustomed to when we read, for the significance of the oral nature of the *Analects* should not be overlooked. Certainly there were some books in Confucius’ time, for he regularly exhorts his students — including his son — to study the *Odes*, but that book was itself meant to be recited more than simply read. So, an appropriate translation of the *Analects* and reading of the *Analects* will focus on the nature of the conversation, and that means it is essential at all times to know who is asking the question to which Confucius is responding.

Remaining with the comparison between the *Bible* and the *Analects* for another moment, the two sacred texts can be seen to be similar in that one doesn’t tend to read them from beginning to end. You can, of course, start with *Genesis* and learn how it all began and it’s been downhill ever since the Eden encounter. But for the most part, and especially with the *New Testament*, you can open the book almost anywhere. You can open it in the middle, you can open it here, you can open it there. You can read *John* before you read *Luke*, you can read *Mark* before you read *Matthew*. You don’t have to read *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John* in that order. It is the same with the *Analects*. Beginning with 1.1, can be useful, because it makes clear the strictly secular, humanistic context that permeates the full text. But, none of us know why 1:1 is 1:1, we not even sure when 1:1 was set down, as opposed to 6:13, we may approximate a sequence — Book 4 is almost certainly older than Book 1 — but we can’t be exact temporally, nor is there a logic as to the order of the ideas expressed in the different Books.

So you look at the book a different way. In one sense the *Analects* isn’t even a book, in that it doesn’t have a single author or authors, or editor(s). Unlike the *Bible*, it isn’t a narrative that has a discrete beginning, development, and conclusion. It doesn’t give you an overall world view. Different people can infer world views from it, which is one reason it has been capable of being read and appreciated in varying times and circumstances

倒使用了「義」這個字，安樂哲和我將「義」翻譯成“appropriate”（中譯：恰當、合宜）。「義」，是一個使用率非常普遍的中國字，它提醒人們永遠要做合乎「義」的事，也就是恰當的事情。不僅僅說的話要合於「義」，所有的行為準則都要遵循著「義」。

「義」這個字，經常被英譯為“righteous（正義的、公正的）”或者是“moral（道德的）”，個人以為這兩種翻譯都是錯誤的。「義」翻譯成“righteous”，立即就有了基督教、希伯來教、或者伊斯蘭世界的指射和語義。當然，正義公理的確存在，並且有明確的客觀標準，我們是應該遵循的。但是在《論語》中，對子路來說合宜且應當做的事情，對冉有或顏回而言，都未盡相同。

因此，在閱讀《論語》的時候，我們其實進入了一個平常閱讀習慣裏不太熟悉的世界，原因是《論語》是口述的語錄體，這一點可不要輕易忽略了。誠然，在孔子的時代也有其它類型的書，例如他也經常敦促弟子們和他的兒子研讀《詩經》。但《詩經》的本意是與人傳唱記誦，而不僅僅是供人閱讀。所以，要將《論語》翻譯到位，或是解讀適當，都必須著眼於此書對話的本質。也就是說，我們必須隨時弄清楚孔子針對誰回答了問題，而問題又是誰問的。

《聖經》和《論語》這兩部聖典有一個共通處，那就是讀者通常不會從頭依序讀到尾。翻開《舊約聖經》，從第一章《創世紀》開始讀起，你可以了解世界如何被創造，然後在伊甸園事件後卻又每況愈下。從第一章以後的章節，特別在《新約聖經》，你幾乎可以從任何一頁開始展讀。你可以先讀《約翰福音》再讀《路加福音》，也可以先讀《馬可福音》再讀《馬太福音》，你並不需要照著次序來讀，雖然《新約聖經》的卷次是：《馬太福音》，《馬可福音》，《路加福音》，《約翰福音》。《論語》也是如此。不過，如果你從《論語》第一章第一節開始讀，其實也頗有助益，因為打從文章一開始，《論語》就清楚展現了貫穿全書的語言魅力：通俗易懂及其人文精神。我們無從知悉為什麼第一章在卷首，就算與第六章對照，我們也無法確定第一章完卷的時間。我們可以略估其順序，但是無法做到精確估計，例如，我們幾乎可以確定第四卷晚成於第一卷，除此之外，《論語》共20卷492章，這些文字在表述觀點上，也沒有一個邏輯上先後順序的關係。

所以，現在你看《論語》的時候角度就不一樣了。從某種意義而言，《論語》不能算是一本書，因為它





by so many millions of people. You must read the *Bible* to find out what Jews and Christians tend to believe by perusing the Hebrew Scriptures and *New Testament*, and you must add the *Quran* to understand what Muslims believe. It's probably not best, however, to open the *Analects* to ask what Confucius believed, because he does not spend much time telling you.

Or you will read seemingly conflicting statements from the Master in the text, of which what Confucius meant by *ren* is a prime illustration. I'll bet if you have looked at the *Analects* in any detail, you have been confused. You are not sure what *ren* means, but can draw sustenance from the fact that none of the students seem to know either, because they're asking him about it all the time, and he gives them different answers. With respect to translation issues then, I now believe it is probably best to just transliterate *ren*, giving it a significant gloss in the introduction to the texts in which it appears and simply say *ren*, and leave it at that — suggesting, of course, that there is more than one valid reading of the term, Zilu's probably being different from Ranyou's because they have different personalities and character traits. This is no more than to say that I believe Confucius felt that his fellows could exhibit *ren* in a variety of ways. There is no be-all and end-all *ren* up there in the sky, if you will, as there is for Plato's dike, which is eternal and unchanging. *Ren* is something that different human beings embody in different ways, as I interpret the text, and Confucius is trying to get each student to achieve it as best as he can, given his personality, his history, his age, his hopes and fears, and goals. Once more, no translation without interpretation.

沒有一位特定的作者，或者一群作者，也沒有特定的編輯。不同於《聖經》，《論語》不是有著明確開始、發展、結局的敘事文體；它並沒有提供給讀者一個整體的世界觀。因此，不同的人可以從此書中推論出不同的世界觀點，這也是為什麼它能夠在不同的時代和環境，讓千千萬萬的讀者不斷反覆咀嚼的原因。你必須讀《聖經》，才能弄清楚猶太教徒和基督徒他們分別在希伯來聖典（編註：又稱舊約聖經）和新約聖經中所追尋的信仰。同樣地，你也必須閱讀《可蘭經》，才能理解穆斯林教徒所信奉的真理。然而，想翻開《論語》借以瞭解孔子個人的信仰，可能收獲不大，因為他並沒有透露太多。

再者，在《論語》裏，你會發現孔子的某些話彷彿前後相互抵觸，其中以孔夫子所說的「仁」為最顯著的例子。我敢打賭，如果你仔細讀過《論語》，一定被「仁」弄糊塗過，因為你不能確定到底什麼是「仁」。不過你也並不氣餒，因為你發現孔子的學生們似乎也弄不明白「仁」為何義，因為他們持續在問「仁」，而孔子也給了每個人不同的答案。至於在翻譯上，個人覺得目前最好的辦法可能還是用音譯“ren”來翻譯「仁」，



然後在介紹《論語》的序文中，對「仁」字做出充足的注解，如此便可。這種處理方法自然也意味著「仁」字擁有多種不同的詮釋法，子路對「仁」的解讀可能與冉有不同，因為他們的性情和特質毫不相仿。我也相信孔子認為他的學生們可以用多元的方式來詮釋「仁」。「仁」並沒有一成不變的說法，不同於柏拉圖所談的「正義」（希臘原文：dike）這個字，它有著永恆及不變的定義。我對「仁」的詮釋是，不同的人有不同的方式來具



It has been a commonplace in sinological studies to refer to Confucius as a “moral philosopher,” and many of my colleagues in comparative philosophy howled when I suggested that he should not be described that way, because for starters there is no word for “morals” in classical Chinese, and in my opinion, if you attribute a concept to someone, there must be a term in that person’s lexicon corresponding to the concept. Of course it may be correct, or at least useful, to describe the Master as a moral philosopher, but there isn’t any direct evidence for it. You certainly can’t call him a theoretician because you cannot say someone is a theoretician of X if there is no term for X in the lexicon of that language.

I first advanced this claim in a discussion with Herbert Fingarette in a review of his book *Confucius: The Secular As Sacred*, more than 30 years ago, but it has been overlooked or ignored by my critics, and hence misunderstood. When I say there is no term for something in a language, it doesn’t mean the people couldn’t do the things for which the term stands. That is, the idea that there is no verb form for the word “skip” in a particular language doesn’t mean that people who speak that language couldn’t engage in that particular form of bipedal locomotion. But if there is no term for skipping in the language of the skippers, it would be very hard to find a theoretician of skipping in their written literature, because you would never know when you would be coming across such a theory.

現「仁」的意涵，而孔子試圖根據每個學生的個性、經歷、年齡、期望、恐懼和目標來分別教導，幫助他們盡可能地做到「仁」。這裏，我再次跟各位提醒了翻譯畢竟離不開詮釋的道理。

在西方的漢學研究領域裏，孔子被歸類成 “moral philosopher”（道德哲學家），當我指出孔夫子不該被如此形容后，便遭到許多比較哲學領域裏同儕們的挑戰。首先，我之所以不認同這個稱號，是因為在古漢語中，沒有任何與當代西方的 “morals”（道德）一字相應的術語。個人以為，如果我們要為他人貼上標籤，那麼這個標籤至少必須存在於他人文化背景的語彙中。當然把孔子勾勒成一位道德哲學家也許是正確的，或者至少有它的用處，但並沒有任何直接的證據來支持這個稱號。（怎麼可能會有？）你萬萬不能稱呼孔老夫子為理論家，如果在那個時代的語彙根本沒有這樣的名目，你自然不能冠以此名。

三十多年前，我首次提出這個論點時，我正在與赫伯特·芬格萊特（Herbert Fingarette）共同審讀他的著作《孔子：即凡而聖》。然而這個論點卻被評論家們忽視也被誤解了。當我說在某個語言裏沒有對應的詞彙術語，並不表示使用這個語言的人就不能做這個術語所代表的事。讓我進一步來解釋，假設在某種語言裏沒有「跳躍」這個動詞，並不表示使用這個語言的人就無法做「跳躍」的兩足運動。但是如果這些跳躍者的語言裏沒有「跳躍」這個詞彙，那麼想要在他們的文字著作裏找到精於「跳躍」的理論家，便會非常困難，因為就算我們看到關於「跳躍」的理論，我們也根本認不出來。

因此我的論點關注的是更本質的思考：我並不僅僅是關注



But my overall argument has long been much more basic: I have not been merely concerned with the term “morals,” but with what that term implies as well. If you think about what is it like to have a moral discussion in the contemporary English-speaking world you need a special vocabulary. Why does someone who is pro-life look so negatively at a woman who chooses abortion? Why? — Because the pregnant woman was free to have chosen otherwise. Yes, she faced a dilemma, a conflict between what to do, but she chose freely, as an autonomous individual, to do what the pro-life person would say is murder, or something close to it.

Think of the terms of you need to use for any discussion about morality. We need the word choice, we need the word rationality, we need the words freedom, autonomy, liberty, dilemma, ought. All of those terms cluster around the term “morals” in contemporary English for the description, analysis, and evaluation of a human conduct. Why I dug in my heels on “morals,” not wanting to call Confucius a moral philosopher, is because none of those terms appear in classical Chinese. There isn't a word for ought as such, or choice, or freedom, much less morals. If you try to make Confucius out to be a moral philosopher when the entire basic vocabulary of what we consider important for contemporary moral philosophy is absent, what are you going to get?

☞ To be continued

「morals(道德)」這個語彙本身，同時我也關注這個術語所暗示的內容。試想，如果我們要在當代的英語系國家進行一場關於道德的討論會議，我們必定會使用到與道德相關的專用詞彙。例如，為什麼反墮胎者會對選擇墮胎的婦女持有如此強烈負面的看法？其因為何？因為那個孕婦是可以「自由(free)」地「選擇(chosen)」不墮胎。是的，她面臨著一個「兩難(dilemma)」之境，並在「衝突(conflict)」中進行了抉擇，但是她選擇做為一個「autonomous individual」，一位自主的個體，但她可以自由選擇，並去做了件反墮胎人士們稱之為謀殺行為的事。

想想在西方議論道德時，我們所需要使用到的專用術語——「choice(選擇)」、「rationality(理性)」、「freedom(自由)」，「autonomy(自主)」、「liberty(解放)」、「dilemma(兩難)」，以及「ought(應當)」，在當代英語裏，這些意念相關的術語，統統圍繞著「morals(道德)」這個概念，這些專用術語方便了我們對人類的行為進行分析、描述以及評價。我之所以堅持己見，不願意把孔子稱之為「道德哲學家」，就是因為這些西方術語沒有一個出現在古漢語中。文言文裏沒有與西方概念中的“ought”、“choice”、“freedom”、“morals”相對應的詞彙。這些對於討論當代道德哲學非常基本且重要的詞彙，如果都不曾出現在孔子生活的環境裏，我們還試圖讓孔子成為一個西方定義下的道德哲學家，你想想看結果為何？

☞ 待續



萬佛城 聖觀音樓  
VAJRA BODHI SEA

訂閱萬佛城月刊〈金剛菩提海雜誌〉  
附上支票乙紙，抬頭：D.R.B.A.

I am enclosing a check made to D.R.B.A. for a subscription to VAJRA BODHI SEA for:

- ☐ 一年美金四十五元 US\$45.00 / 1 year  
☐ 二年美金八十五元 US\$85.00 / 2 years  
☐ 三年美金一百十元 US\$110.00 / 3 years

歡迎投稿，稿件請寄 vbs@drba.org  
 We welcome articles. Please send the articles to vbs@drba.org

歐美地區 In America & Europe, please send to:  
 Gold Mountain Monastery  
 800 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108  
 Tel: (415) 421-6117 Fax: (415) 788-6001

亞澳地區 In Asia & Australia, please send to:  
 Dharma Realm Guan Yin Sagely Monastery  
 161, Jalan Ampang,  
 50450 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia  
 Tel: (03) 2164-8055 Fax: (03) 2163-7118  
 Email: pgysm1@gmail.com

臺灣 In Taiwan 請寄法界佛教印經會  
 臺北市忠孝東路六段八十五號十一樓  
 電話：(02) 2786-3022 傳真：(02) 2786-2674

#### 訂閱單 Subscription Form

姓名 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

地址 Address: \_\_\_\_\_

電話 Tel. No.: \_\_\_\_\_