International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies
ISSN 2202-9451
Vol. 5 No. 2; April 2017
Australian International Academic Centre, Australia
Flourishing Creativity & Literacy

A Study of the English Translations of "Shen Si" in Wen Xin Diao Long

Zhu Defen
South China Normal University, China

Received: 24-02-2017 Accepted: 28-04-2017 Published: 30-04-2017
doi:10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.5n.2p.54 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.5n.2p.54

Abstract

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

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

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

1. Introduction

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

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

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

2. Literature Review

2.1 Translations and Studies of Some Classical Texts

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

the groups of specialists are formed. By citing the translations of these important works, we are aiming at providing a general background[ii].

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

Dian Lun: E. R. Hughes (*The Art of Letters*: *Lu Chi's "Wenfu", 302 A.D., A Translation and Comparative Study,* 1951); Sui-kit Wong (*Early Chinese Literature Criticism,* 1983); Stephen Owen (*Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*, 1992); *The Poetic Exposition on Literature*: E. R. Hughes (*The Art of Letters*: *Lu Chi's "Wenfu", 302 A.D., A Translation and Comparative Study,* 1951); Sui-kit Wong (*Early Chinese Literature Criticism,* 1983); Stephen Owen (*Reading in Chinese Literary Thought, 1992*); Hou Simeng (侯思孟, *Literary Criticism in China in the Early Third Century A.D.*, 1974); Chen Shixiang (陈世骧, *Essay on Literature*, 1965); Fang Zhitong (方志彤, A. Fang, "Rhyme prose on Literature: the *Wen fu* of Lu Chi", 1951; 1994); Sam Hamill (Sam Hamill, *Lu Chi*: *Wen Fu 'The Art of Writing'* Translated and with an Introduction, 1986); J.D. Frodsham, (A*n Anthology of Chinese Verse*: *Han Wei Chin and the Northern and Southern Dynasties*, 1967); J. Zhou[iv] (周，"An Introduction to Lu Chi's *Wen F*u", 1950); *Shih-p'in*: Sui-kit Wong (*Preface to the Poet Systematically Graded* 1983); J.T. Wixted (*The Literary Criticism of Yuan Hao-wen*1976); Stephen Owen (*Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*, 1992); *The Twenty-Four Categories of Poetry*: Herbert Allen Giles (*A History of Chinese Literature*); L. Cranmer-Byng (L. Cranmer-Byng, *A Lute of Jade*: *Being Selections from the Classical Poets of China*, 1911); Stephen Owen(*Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*, 1992); Xianyi and Gladys Yang (*The Twenty-four Modes of Poetry*,1963); Wang Hongyin (王宏印, *Translation of the The Realm of Poetry and Studies of Si Kongtu's Poetics*, 2002).

2.2 Translations of WSDL

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

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

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

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

Wong's translation was published in 1999. The preface gives a brief account of the background of Liu Xie's writing *WXDL*. Very few notes are provided, for which the translator makes an explanation on the first footnote of Chapter 1: Notes are provided in this translation only if they are essential; they are intended more as an aid to the comprehension and appreciation of the original for a popular audience than as bibliographic or expository apparatus for specialist. Care

has been taken not to make the notes unduly cumbersome and distracting (*The Book of Literary Design*, trans. Sui-kit Wong, 1). A prominent feature of the book is the translation of "*zan*" (summary, 赞): they are translated into free verses and are consisted of four sentences and eight lines. Detailed bibliography is given. The transliterations are based on the modern *pinyin* system.

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

2.3 The Translations of *WSDL* under Criticism

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

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

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

3. A Comparison of the English Translations of "Shen Si" Chapter in *WXDL*

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

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

"Shen Si" is the first chapter of the Composition Theory and is commented by Huang Kan (黄侃) as the essential creed of composition (孔祥丽, "《文心雕龙·神思》辩疑", 语文学刊, 2007,9). The era of Wei, Jin, Southern and Northern Courts is an epoch in which when "literature was made consciously". Wang Xianpei (王先霈: 2007, 40-41) thinks one of the evidences is that at this time theorists began to pay attention to the creativity in literary thinking[vii], thus making *shen si* an important category. Also, Chinese traditional poetics values individual experience very much and the close relationship between it and the term *shen si* (神思) again guarantees its crucial place in Sino-west comparative poetics.

" 'Shen Si' (《神思》) succeeds to Luji's *Wen Fu* but has its own fresh merits" (章培恒, 骆玉明: 2005, 472). Taking into consideration of the reasons above, we believe that the analyzing of the English translations of this chapter in *WXDL* will help us tackle our research question, or at least provide some clues for us.

We will now look at the structure and the content of "Shen Si" chapter. Concerning the topic in question, Jiang Fan and Yu Yuan's *A Course of Ancient Chinese Literary Theory*[viii] and especially, Zhou Zhenfu's "Liu Xie on Shen Si" [ix]probably are the most related sources.

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

3.2 Translations of "Shen Si" Chapter in WXDL

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

3.2.1 Section one: the observation and preparation of writing

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

古人云:"形在江海之上，心存魏阙之下。" 神思之谓也。文之思也，其神远矣。

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

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

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

Yang: An ancient said, "My physical form is on the sea; my **heart** lingers in the **court**." This is ***shensi***, or **imagination**, at work. A writer's imagination travels far.

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

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

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

caution in dealing with the literary terms. Wong translates the term into "inspiration" and he renders *shen* (神) as "magical". Yang uses *pinyin* and free translation.

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

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

吟咏之间，吐纳珠玉之**声**；眉睫之前，卷舒风云之色；其思理之致乎！

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

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

筬全御过，故**文**资**确切**；铭兼褒赞，故**体**贵**弘润**。(铭筬第十一)

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

The period of Wei and Jin was a time when the practice of *pin ping ren wu* (appreciating people's character) is in its prime. It was a time when a literary work was naturally and usually associated to its author. Some scholars have pointed out the close relationship between literary criticism and *pin ping ren wu*. For example, Zhan Ying thinks that the development of Chinese literary theories is based on the "*cai xing lun*" (Theory of Talent and Character, 才性论) that categorizes people[xiii] (詹锳: 1982, 4). There is a whole chapter in *WXDL* that is devoted to the very topic – "Ti Xing" (《体性》). Owen must also have noticed it. He says, "Generic typology and the typology of personality arose together in traditional China, and they are unified by a largely shared vocabulary of manner and quality" (Stephen Owen: 1992, 65). And the relationship between the two is that "a given personality type will manifest a corresponding manner and will appear at his best in those forms in which his manner is naturally appropriate" (ibid)[xiv]. If the translators could bear this in mind, it would be easier for him to understand the word properly. *Run* (润)'s original meaning, according to *Shuo Wen Jie Zi* (《说文解字》), or *Xu Shen's Etymological Dictionary*), is "rain falls to moisten everything on earth"[xv]. The image of the flowing of water conveys the meaning of "gentle", "gracious", "not drastic or violent", which also indicates a certain type of personality as Owen has said. It is not of so much significance as for which one is the most accurate since "there is some prior unity 'at the root', but that unity devolves into a multiplicity of particulars" (Stephen Owen: 1992, 64).

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

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

After a metaphorical description of how *shen si* (神思) can affect what one sees, contrasting to the fact that what is in the writer's mind usually can only be half expressed, Liu Xie begins to explain the relationship of *shen si* (神思), *yi xiang* (意象) and *yan ci* (言辞). To indicate the relationship, among the most important sentences are: 是以意授于思，言授于意，密则无际，疏则千里。

Shih: Therefore, although the **idea** takes shape from **spiritual thinking**, and the **language** receives its form from the idea, idea, thought, and language may be so closely related that they are experienced as one, or they may differ as strikingly as if they were a thousand *li* from each other.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

淮南崇朝而赋《**骚**》，**枚皋**应诏而成**赋**，**子建**援牍如口诵，**仲宣**举笔似宿**构**，**阮禹**据案而制**书**，**祢衡**当食而草**奏**，

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

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

Wong: **Prince Huainan** wrote a **descriptive piece** on the *Li Sao* well within a morning, Mei Gao completed a ***fu*** as soon as it was commissioned, Cao Zhi composed, not with the mind, but with the mouth, Wang Can took up the brush and put down what seemed to have been put together the night before, Ruan Yu drafted a **letter** on horseback, Mi Heng dashed down a **memorial** over a meal.

Yang: **The Prince of Huainan** wrote a work of **rhyme-prose** in one morning; Mei Gao penned one right in front of the emperor. Cao Zhi wrote as easily as if reciting a piece form memory, Wang Can as quickly as if he had been prepared in advance. Ruan Yu dispatched a **letter** on horseback; Mi Heng drafted a **report** to the throne over a meal.

First let's look at the names of people. According to Yang Guo Bin (2005, 39), there are over 500 people all together have their names mentioned in *WXDL* and the forms of addressing are various. Sometimes an official title is used, sometimes the family name is used, and other times the first name or *zi* (字). In the example we cited above, six authors are mentioned. For the first one, the official title is used; for the third and the fourth one, *zi* (字) is used; for the others, names(first and family) are used. In all the four translations, the official titles are reserved. In Shih's translation, the translator translates directly from the original text but provides the name in a bracket in cases the *zi* (字) appears. All other translators uniformly use the names without any noting of the *zi* (字). This method is good because it avoids confusion. In Owen's translation, he notes the living years in a bracket after each name. People's names and titles may seem irrelevant to the discussion of poetics, yet sometimes they do bear important information about the author and his writing. The choices of names often suggest the author's characteristic. And traditionally, a person's social status is related to his literary achievement.

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

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

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

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

伊挚不能言鼎，轮扁不能语斤，其微矣乎！

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.1 Shen Si and Shen Si Theory

What is *shen si* (神思) anyway? According to Wang Xianpei (王先霈: 2007, 41-48), in talking about "thinking", ancient Chinese sometimes use *si* (思), *lu* (虑), *nian* (念), sometimes use *xiang* (想). The *Shuo Wen Jie Zi*

(《说文解字》)'s explanation for *si* (思) is: "*si* means containing" ("思, 容也"). And for *xiang* (想), the explanation is: "*xiang* means looking forward to something" ("想, 冀思也"). Wang thinks *si* (思), *lu* (虑), *nian* (念) "are often used to refer to the thinking that is logical"(王先霈: 2007, 41-48) while *xiang* (想) is used to refer to the yearning of something, which is less logical" (ibid). Jin Yuelin (金岳霖), in his essay "*Si Xiang*" ("Thinking", 《思想》), as introduced by Wang, distinguishes the difference of "*si*" (思) and "*xiang*" (想). He calls *si* "considering" ("思议") and *xiang* "imagining" ("想象"). The object of "imagining" ("想象") is "*xiang*" (象), or "image", and the object of "considering" ("思议") is idea or concept. So *si* (思) is a kind of abstraction.

Then what does *shen* (神) mean? Wang Xianpei says that "in Chinese, *shen* (神) is a word with many meanings and the meaning of it in *shen si* (神思) should be understood by placing it in the Chinese philosophical system" (王先霈, 2007: 46). He thinks that it mainly has three references. First, it may refer to "god" or "goodness", which represents the highest transcendental and absolute power in both the natural and human world. Since the kind of thinking in literary creation is subtle and surpasses lingual description, people attribute it to the endowment of god. Secondly, it may refer to the super-ability that one gains after undergoing some kind of austerities. Thirdly, *shen* (神) refers to the quality of subjecting to alteration and the unpredictability.

So, *shen si* (神思) as a poetic term entails two aspects of the artists' mentality (王先霈, 2007: 49). One is the creative thinking which Liu Xie describes as "when spirit thought is set in motion, ten thousand paths sprout before it" ("神思方运, 万途竞萌", 《神思》) and can be approximately understood as "imagination"; the other is the state of mind of the artists, which usually is seen as "inspiration".

Indeed, the implication of *shen si* (神思) is so abundant that a body of theory is generated from it. Wang Xianpei (王先霈, 2007: 41) thinks the discussion of Liu Xie and his contemporary poet-critics can be referred to as the "Shen Si Theory". And if we trace back further, "Shen Si Theory" finds its source in the Taoist classics and the *The Book of Changes*. Liu Jiemin says: "Chinese 'Shen Si Theory' can be traced back to *Lao Zi* and *Zhuang Zi*'s discussion of "*xu jing ning shen*" (虚静凝神) and the *guan wu qu xiang* (观物取象) theories in *The Book of Changes*"[xix](刘介民: 2003, 167). That is why James Liu places the "Shen Si Theory" under the label of "Metaphysical Theories" (James Liu, 1975: 33).

4.2 Shi Si Theory under Comparison

How is *shen si* (神思) seen as compared to its counterpart in the West? Or does it have a counterpart at all?

Shen Si Theory is often compared with romanticist's Imagination Theory in the west. Some scholars would equate *shen si* (神思) to imagination. Others mostly think the two concepts have both similarities and differences. They can be divided into two distinctive groups: those who emphasize the similarities and those who emphasize the differences.

Cai Zongqi, Chi Ch'iu-lang and Yang Guobin should belong to the first group. Cai Zongqi ("华兹华斯和刘勰的文学创造诗学", 《文心雕龙研究》第三辑, 205) thinks "by taking writers' inner thinking as one respect of literary, Wordsworth became one of the western critics who approached Chinese criticism earliest. His theories obviously have much in common with Liu Xie's theories". In this article Cai observes that what Liu's theory and Wordsworth's theory have in common is their identification of the four aspects in the process of the creation of literary work. That is the writer usually begins by "observation" in order to grasp what he is going to write. At this moment, he is in the state of *Xujing* (虚静, what Wordsworth terms as tranquility). Then the writer's emotion reaches a new height, that is what Liu Xie describes as "if one climbs a mountain, one's affections are filled by the mountain" ("登山则情满于山"). The last phase is the writing. Chi Ch'iu-lang in his article "Liu Hsieh's Shen-Ssu: Its Positive and Negative Capability" (*Tamkang Review*, 1985, Vol. XVI, No.2), "for a mutual illumination", carries out a parallel comparison between the Romantic poet-critic Wordsworth, Coleridge and Liu Xie. He finds a lot of "similar views" in their theories. Yang Guobin thinks "*shen si* (神思) and imagination share some important similarities" (2003, 57) and those that he identifies are as followed: first, both *shen si* (神思) and imagination refer to a kind of spontaneous and creative power; secondly, they both presuppose experience and learning; finally, both Liu Xie and Coleridge believe that imagination needs a time of patient preparation.

James Liu, Stephen Owen and Liu Jiemin should belong to the other group. James Liu (1975:123-125) insists that "various modern scholars have identified Liu Hsieh's 'intuitive thinking'(*shen-ssu*) with 'imagination' or its modern Chinese equivalent , *hsiang-hsiang*, but in fact it is only the active mode of *shen-ssu* that corresponds to 'imagination', as the word has been used by Coleridge and most critic writing in English since". According to Liu, in "Shen Si", or the chapter of "Intuitive Thinking", Liu Xie advises the writers to empty his mind and keep it still, but at the same time, he advises them to "accumulate learning to store up" and so on. The seemingly contradicting views, James Liu points out, actually is a modification of Taoist concept by Liu Xie, "thus making it possible to admit expressive and technical views into his metaphysical theory". So *shen si* (神思) has both a "passive" mode and an "active" mode. And one more thing is different. "Coleridge asserts that the imagination is 'essentially, just as all objects (as objects) are essentially dead'". Then James goes on to assert that Liu Xie, "in common with practically all other Chinese critics, does not regard things as 'dead' but as possessing their own 'spirit' (*shen*, 神). It is therefore somewhat misleading to translate *shen-ssu* as 'imagination'. As for Owen, although he does not make any comparison between "Shen Si theory" and imagination, his translation of *shen si* (神思) into English as "spirit thought" (s*hen-ssu*) indicates that he does not equate the two terms, but rather he emphasizes the differences. Liu Jiemin (刘介民, 2003:172-173) also thinks "*Shen si* (神思) and imagination are similar in some ways, but their differences exceed the similarities". He says, "what Liu Xie emphasizes is the breaking of the time-space restriction, "when spirit thought is set in motion, ten thousand paths sprout

before it" (神思方运, 万涂竞萌 trans. Stephen Owen)." In comparison, "the Western imagination theory does not emphasize the transcending of time and space." Also, Liu thinks "Almost all Chinese artistic imagination theories do not pay attention to the difference between imagination and fantasy". So "there is no tense in Chinese poetry and it strives for the one integrated mass". He quotes James Liu by saying that "it makes Chinese poetry usually contains a quality of eternality".

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

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

5. Summary of the Comparison and Analysis

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

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

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

References

T'ai-fen. Chiang., Chin-jung.Ch'iu.(1984). "Vincent Y.C. Shih's Translation of the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*: A Note on Literary Translation"[J]. *Tamkang Review*, Vol. XV, p233-253.

Ch'iu-lang. Chi., (1985). "Liu Hieh's Shen-Ssu: Its Positive and Negative Capability"[J]. *Tamkang Review*, Vol. XVI, p124-137.

Hughes. E. R. (1951). *Lu Chi's* "*Wen Fu*", *A.D.302—A Translation and Comparative Study* [M]. Bollingen Foundation Inc., New York.

Hamill, S (trans.)(1991). *Lu Chi's WEN FU, the Art of Writing* [M]. Minnesota: Milkweed Editions.

James, L. (1975). *Chinese Theories of Literature* [M]. Chicago: the University of Chicago Pres.

Siu-Kit W. (trans) (1999). *The Book of Literary Design* [M]. Hong Kong University Press.

Owen, S. (1985). *Traditional Chinese Poetry and Poetics* [M]. The University of Wisconsin Press.

Owen, S. (1992). *Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*[M]. Harvard University Press.

Tokei, F. (1971). *Genre Theory in China in the 3rd-6th Centuries* [M]. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest.

Vincent Yu-Chung S. (trans.)(1957). *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons* [M]. 敦煌书局有限公司.

Guobin.Y. (trans)(2003), *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*[M], Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Zong-qi Cai (ed).(2001). *A Chinese Literary Mind* [C]. Leland Stanford Junior University

陈跃红. (2005)《比较诗学导论》[M]. 北京: 北京大学出版社.

范文澜(1958).《文心雕龙注》[M]. 北京: 人民文学出版社.

江原. "中国古典诗论在西方"[OL].

http://www.zftrans.com/bbs/read.php?tid=4525.

蒋凡, 郁源. (2005).《中国古代文论教程》[M]. 中华书局.

孔祥丽. (2007). "《文心雕龙·神思》辩疑" [J]. 语文学刊.

刘介民. (2004).《中国比较诗学》[M]. 广东高等教育出版社.

马祖毅, 任荣珍. (2003).《汉籍外译史》[M]. 湖北教育出版社.

穆克宏. (1997)《魏晋南北朝文学史料述略》[M]. 北京: 中华书局.

秦华. (2002). "精理为文·秀气成采——<文心雕龙>译文两段评析" [J]. 西安外国语学院报.

王晓路. (1998).《中西诗学对话——英语世界的中国古代文论研究》[M]. 博士论文, 四川联合大学中文系.

王晓路. (2002).《西方汉学界的中国文论研究》[M]. 成都: 巴蜀书社.

王宏印. (2002).《诗品注释与司空图诗学研究》[M]. 北京图书馆出版社.

王先霈. (2007).《中国古代诗学十五讲》[M]. 北京大学出版社.

王丽娜, 杜维沫. (1984). "国外对〈文心雕龙〉的翻译和研究" ,《文心雕龙学刊》第二辑.

许慎（汉）.《说文解字》（现代版）[Z]. 北京: 社会科学文献出版社.

杨国斌. (1991). "《文心雕龙·神思》—英译三种之比较" [J]. 中国翻译.

宇文所安. (2002).《中国文论: 英译与评论》[M]. 王柏华, 陶庆梅译. 上海社会科学院出版社.

詹锳. (1982).《<文心雕龙>的风格学》[M]. 人民文学出版社.

章培恒, 骆玉明. (1997).《中国文学史》[M]. 复旦大学出版社

张文勋. (2001).《文心雕龙研究史》[M]. 昆明: 云南大学出版社.

中国《文心雕龙》学会编.(1998).《文心雕龙》研究 (第三辑). 北京大学出版社.

中国《文心雕龙》学会编. (2005).《文心雕龙》研究 (第六辑). 北京: 学苑出版社.

赵新林. (2005).《Image 与 "象"--中西诗学象论溯源》[M]. 中国社会科学出版社.

周俏娜. (2006). " '归化'和 '异化'关照下《文心雕龙·才略》两英译本评析" [J]. 湖南经管干部学院报.

Notes:

[i] This inequality refers to the different status of the two languages: Chinese and English (author's note).

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

[3]The book titles all adopt Stephen Owen's English translations.

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

[5] The original words are: "《文心雕龙》是中国古代文学理论史上独一无二的体大, 思深, 虑周的文学理论巨著"

[6]The present thesis will adopt the modern *pinyin* system, but all the quotations from the English translations will take after the *pinyin* system as are used by the translators.

[7]See *Wen Xin Dao Long Zhu* (《文心雕龙注》, 范文澜), 1958, page 1. The original words:一、总论(一至四篇);二、文体论(五至二十五篇); 三、创作论(二十六至四十三篇); 四、鉴赏论(四十四至四十九篇); 而以自序性的序志一篇为第五十篇, 总结全书.

[8]See *Fitteen Lectures on Ancient Chinese Poetics*(《中**国**古代诗学十五讲》,王先霈, 2007), page 40: "到了六朝时期, 文**学**艺术取得了长足的发展, **它**们的**独**立性凸显出**来**, 人们对于文艺创作思维的特殊性也有了切近的认识, 在此基础上, 诗学家们开始认真细致地**研**究文**学**创作思维".

[9]**蒋**凡, 郁源, <<中**国**古代文论教程>>, 83.

[10]周振甫, "**刘勰**论神思", <<周振甫讲<文心雕龙>>>, 92-106.

[11]Refer to 3.1.

[12] Shih refers to Vincent Shih; Wong refers to Sui-kit Wong; Yang refers to Yang Guobin and Owen refers to Stephen Owen. The examples are cited in order of time when the translations appeared.

[13]All the words in bold face are marked by the author of this thesis.

[14]A typing mistake may have occured here. "Your" should be "you" (author's note).

[15]The original words of Zhan Ying are: "中**国**的文论就是在品人的'才性论'基础上发展起**来**的。

[16]Stephen Owen's comment is made on the passage in "*A Discourse on Literature*" by Cao Pi: 夫文本同而末**异**，盖奏议宜雅,书论宜理, 铭诔尚实, 诗赋欲丽.此四科不同, 故能之者偏也; 唯通才能备其体.

[17]See *Shuo Wen Jie Zi* : 润, 水曰润下.

[18] Refer to Zhao Xinlin (赵新林,《Image **与** "象"—中西诗学象论溯源》) , page 187-207.

[19]For details please see Stephen Owen, *Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*, page 594.