

POWER RELATIONS AND TRANSLATION INEQUALITY IN CHINA**HE Xianbin***Guangdong Polytechnic Normal University, China***INTRODUCTION**

Translation is increasingly studied from the perspective of the geopolitical relations and the political economy of literary production. It is considered an asymmetrical cultural exchange. The impact of uneven distribution of power on selection of texts, development of translation strategies and the international flows of translated works becomes a research topic of interest.

“Perhaps the best introduction to the problems of translating across power differentials is offered by Richard Jacquemond (Robinson, 1997: 31)”. Based on his analysis of the literary translation between France and Egypt, Jacquemond (1992: 139-57) hypothesizes that a dominated culture will invariably translate far more of a hegemonic culture than the latter will of the former; and that works translated from a dominated language are hardly received beyond very closed circles of specialists and ‘concerned’ readers while translations from a dominating language are received by the dominated culture readership on a much broader scale.

Venuti’s (1992: 5-6; 1995: 12-15; 1998: 160-2) analysis of translation patterns points to a serious trade imbalance: since the second world war, English has been the most translated language but the traffic of translation into English remains relatively very small. “In the geopolitical economy of translation, the languages of developing countries rank extremely low (Venuti 1998: 160).” He argues that the domesticating tradition in the UK and US produces an Anglo-American readership that is accustomed to fluent translations (Venuti 1995: 15).

Venuti’s findings verify Jacquemond’s first hypothesis, but contradict the second one. This implies that theorising about translation allows variation across cultures. This paper sets out to explore the role of translation to and from Chinese in the negotiation of power relationships between Chinese and two other languages: English and Japanese. It attempts to testify the above hypotheses and addresses a couple of other related issues: 1) How does power disparity specifically affect the Chinese translation? 2) Is domesticating and fluency an English strategy only? 3) How should we define and classify language dominance in translation discourse?

The article deals mostly with literary translation and consists of four parts. Part one discusses how the change of power relations between China and Japan influences the translation flow, linguistic borrowing and foreign language learning in the two countries. Part two reviews the history of translation between English and Chinese and examines how power difference relates to the imbalance in translation volume, text selection, readership scale, etc. Part three focuses on the

connection between English dominance and the practice of and discourse on translation between English and Chinese. Part four addresses the definition and classification of dominating/dominated languages to better account for the translation reality between Chinese and Japanese. The investigation aims not only to check some of the translation hypotheses and assumptions and uncover a few translation patterns across cultures, but also to reveal the interaction between translation and power relations in the Chinese context.

1.- JAPAN IN THE SINO-JAPANESE CULTURAL TRADE: FROM IMPORTER TO EXPORTER

Translation in China has been used as a tool to serve a variety of purposes: 1) to spread Buddhism (2nd to 11th century); 2) to spread Christianity (Jesuit translation from the late 16th to early 18th century and Protestant translation from the mid-19th to early 20th century); 3) for national survival and cultural modernization (mid-19th century to 1937); and 4) as a means of economic reform and innovation (since the 1980s). English, Russian, Japanese, French and German are the most translated languages. This paper focuses on Chinese translation to and from Japanese and English.

Contact between Japan and China dates back at least as far back as the first recorded official contacts in AD 57. In the third and fourth centuries, Korean scribes introduced the Chinese script to Japan, which lacked a script of its own, and by the sixth and seventh centuries, this was widely used amongst the elite. Rather than translating in the conventional manner, however, by the ninth century, the Japanese had devised an ingenious annotation system called *kambun kundoku* (interpretive reading of Chinese), which enabled them to read Chinese texts without translation. Special marks were placed alongside the characters of Chinese texts to indicate how they can be read in accordance with Japanese word order, and a system of grammatical indicators was used to show inflections. This directly converted the Chinese text into understandable, albeit rather unnatural Japanese that retained a strong Chinese flavour. (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 1998: 485-6).

The first true translations from Chinese were produced around 1611 (ibid: 486). In the next few centuries, the translation was almost unidirectional. Tan Ruqian's statistics showed that in the 300 years before the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95), 129 Chinese books were translated into Japanese, while only 12 Japanese books were translated into Chinese, of which 9 were produced by Japanese students in China or Sinologists (Quoted in Wang, 1997: 222-225).

“China had a great impact on Japan's intellectual, religious and cultural life in the 1,300 years between the adoption of the writing system and the opening up of Japan to the West in 1854 (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 1998: 485).” The 1894-5 war was the first serious one between the two Asian neighbours in the last three hundred years. China's defeat greatly changed the self-image of Japan. For the latter, China had turned from a copying model to a negative teacher.

The Chinese had always looked upon the Japanese as inferior, and militarily as only ‘bandits’. The crushing defeat by the Japanese produced profound psychological shock to the Chinese nation. For the Chinese, Japan's superiority now could be put down to only one cause: as fellow Asians, they had learned what the West had to teach a lot quicker and better than the Chinese (Pollard,

1998: 7). The translation volume in China rose sharply, and from 1896 on, the cultural trade imbalance reversed in Japan's favor. From 1896 to 1911, 958 Japanese books got rendered into Chinese whereas only 16 Chinese works were translated into Japanese (Tan Ruqian, quoted in Wang, 1997: 222-5). Between 1912 and 1937, 1,759 Japanese books were translated into Chinese. In contrast, a Japanese source listed 1,472 Japanese translations from various languages in the world by 1932, of which only 3 came from Chinese. (Wang, 2002).

Up to the nineteenth century, there existed two mediums of reading and writing in Japan: Chinese, used mainly for scholarly works, and Japanese, used chiefly for literature (Kondo & Wakabayashi, 1998: 485). After the 1894-5 War, the status of the Chinese language dropped sharply in Japanese schools, but large quantities of Japanese words began to be borrowed (or returned) into Chinese through translation.

From 1896, there was a sudden enthusiasm for studying in Japan. Chinese politicians also promoted the trend, arguing that it was less expensive than studying in Europe or North America and Japanese was much easier to study for containing Chinese characters. The number of students kept rising, and in 1906, as many as 8,600 Chinese went to study in Japan, making the Chinese students in Japan totalling 12,000. Marius Jansen, an American historian of Japanese Studies, estimated that this was probably the largest number of foreign students a single country could have had by then (Wang, 2002).

Before the Sino-Japanese War, Western books were translated from the chief European languages, but after 1900, there was a steep rise in indirect importation via Japan. One computation puts the number of Western books translated between 1902 and 1904 at 533; of these 89 were from English (16%), 24 from German (4%), 17 from French (3%), but 321 (60%) from Japanese (Xiong 1998: 33-4). Japan had translated a lot of Western works via English, so potential material in the form of existing Japanese translations was plentiful; the manpower was available; and the outlets were there, since the Chinese students published magazines in Japan. That is why relay translation from Japanese became popular among Chinese translators (Tarumoto 1998: 41).

On the other hand, most Chinese believed the Japanese culture was inferior to that of the West, and translating from Japanese was but a short cut to Western learning. "After 1911, there was a major shift from reliance on Japanese as an intermediary to direct translation from the European languages. And that in turn reflects the progress in teaching and learning European languages in China itself, and the redirection of Chinese students educated abroad from Japan to America and Europe (Tarumoto 1998: 42)".

Not surprisingly, during the wars (1937-49) and 'the Cultural Revolution' (1966-76), there was not much translation from Japanese. When China re-opened its doors to the outside world at the end of the 1970s, however, this most populous developing country decided it had a lot to learn from the world's second economic power. Another boom in translating appeared. Between 1979 and 2000, as many as 14,000 titles of Japanese literature were (re-)translated into Chinese. From 1980 to 1986, the volume of Japanese literature numbered five in China's translated literary works, just a little after the Soviet Union and Russia, the United Kingdom, the United States, and France (Wang 2001: 242-3). Japan, though, has translated much less out of Chinese. No statistics is available except the UNESCO Index Translationum, which shows that Japan has translated only 1,071 books from Chinese, but 70,344 from English.

2.- IMBALANCE IN TRANSLATING TO AND FROM ENGLISH

Translating between Chinese and the European languages began in the late 16th century, when the Jesuit missionaries arrived in China to spread the gospels. The translation was initiated by the source culture, done into the translator's foreign language, and dominated by collaboration. The missionaries learned Chinese to a varying degree, selected the source texts and interpreted them into Chinese, while their monolingual Chinese collaborators took notes of the ideas, polished the style and took charge of the circulation of the translations. To facilitate their missionary work, the Westerners rendered, besides the Bible and other Christian works, a large number of scientific works into Chinese. Of the 300 titles produced by the 70 or so missionaries, one third was scientific. The missionaries worked together with Chinese scholars and officials and the readership was confined to the cultural elite only.

For a large part of its existence, China regarded itself as the centre of the world; all other peoples and cultures were considered inferior. Two thousand years ago, the Chinese coined different characters to refer to their neighbouring states in the north, south, east and west. The component on the left of these characters means 'animals', which implies that all other cultures were barbarian. The barbarians to the West were known as *yi*. Accordingly, the Europeans and their inventions were called *yi* in the mid-19th century. China's repeated defeat in a series of wars and the signing of unequal treaties with the Western powers from 1840 on led to intense self-questioning and the search for a means of national survival and regeneration. This ushered in a huge wave of translating Western works, first of military sciences, and then of social and humanities sciences.

After the Opium War (1840-42) with Britain, the Qing dynasty was forced to cede Hong Kong and open up Canton (Guangzhou), Amoy (Xiamen), and several other coastal cities as trading ports. Protestant missionaries, who came to China in the mid-19th century, established schools and founded publishing houses in the treaty ports. "By the end of 1921, there were over 13,500 missionary schools in China (Hung 2002: 334)." Foreign languages began to be taught in the missionary and Chinese-run schools. It was officially introduced into China with the establishment of Tong Wen Guan (the College of Translators) in 1862. English was the first language taught, followed by Russian, French, German and Japanese. At the same time, the Qing dynasty sent 120 students to America and about 80 to Europe. It is estimated that, from the mid-19th century to around 1912, the Chinese students in Europe, North America and Japan, at the public investment and at their own expense, numbered at 100,000, and most of them returned after finishing their study.

Collaboration between missionaries and the Chinese dominated most of the 19th century translation. But with the rapid increase of native bilinguals, the traditional model was quickly disappearing. Liang Qichao's statistics in 1896 shows that of the 341 titles translated from 1840 to 1896, 139 were rendered by the Protestant missionaries, 123 through Sino-Western collaboration, 38 by Chinese scholars, and 41 did not list the names of the translators. Another statistics of the translations from 1900 to 1904 listed 526 translations from Japan and the West, of which 35 were rendered by foreigners, 33 through the traditional collaboration, 415 by the Chinese, and 43, by unknown translators. (Zheng, 2002: 120) In other words, of the translations that were not anonymous, between 1840 and 1896, 87.33% were rendered by Westerners or through Western collaboration, and 12.67%, by the Chinese alone. From 1900 to 1904, the figure is reversed. 85.92% were rendered by the Chinese, and 14.08%, by foreigners or through foreign collaboration.

In the 1890s and 1910s, there was a huge boom in translation volume. Between 1902 and 1907, the number of translated titles even exceeded that of original titles (Tarumoto, 1998: 39). The New Literature Movement (1917-37) was another decisive period, and in terms of output, it rivals two other high points of 20th Chinese translation history, namely, the first decade of the 20th century and the late-80s and early-90s (Chan, 2001: 195). Between 1978 and 1987, more than 5,000 Western social and humanities books were translated into Chinese, ten times the amount of the work done in the first three decades of the People's Republic of China. (Hung, 2002: 334) Literary translation also reached a new historical precedent.

English has been the leading source language for translation. Firstly, books from the UK and US make up the greatest part. Take literary translation for instance. Tarumoto (1998: 40) calculated 2,504 titles of fiction published between 1840 and 1920, of which 1,748 (approximately 70%) stated the nationality of the author. British and American fiction makes up the great bulk: 1,071 (61.27%). France follows with 331 works, then Russia (133), Japan (103), and Germany (34). These five make up about 96% of the total. And between 1917 and 1937, Russia had a little over 450 literary works translated into Chinese, Britain and France came next with a bit less than 400, the US came fourth with 200-250 titles, followed by Japan, Germany, Italy, Denmark, India, Greece, Belgium, and Poland (Chan, 2001: 223). Again English literature came on the top list. Secondly, a lot of Western works were rendered via English. Liang Shiqiu (1984: 123), translator of *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, noted that most of the French and Russian works translated in 1928 was done via English. The rivalling intermediary of Japanese steadily declined in prestige and importance (Hung, 2002: 327). Thirdly, there is a strong link between translation and language learning, and “except for a brief period when Russian was, for political reasons, the preferred foreign language, the dominance of English has been unrivalled (ibid: 332)”.

“The history of translation from Chinese into English is closely linked to the development of the diplomatic and missionary activity that accompanied British commercial and military intervention in 19th century China (McMorran, 2000: 279).” Joshua Marshman and Robert Morrison both published complete Chinese translations of the Bible in 1822 and 1824 respectively. Nevertheless, as early as 1761, an anonymous translation of a romantic Chinese novel had appeared and another translation of the same novel by J. F. Davis was published in London in 1829 under the title *The Fortunate Union*. Thus translation in both directions has an equally long history.

The emphasis of the missionaries was on translation into Chinese, particularly of the Bible and religious tracts. The translation pioneers of James Legge (1814-97) and Herbert Giles (1845-1935) rendered philosophy (notably the Confucian classics), and ancient poetry. In the early 20th century Chinese poetry received considerable impetus from Ezra Pound's *Cathy* (1915), Arthur Waley's *One Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems* (1918), and Amy Lowell's *Fir Flower Tablets* (1921). Between the two world wars, translations of major Chinese novels began to appear, including *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* (1925) by C. H. Brewitt-Taylor, *All Men are Brothers* (1937) by Pearl Buck, and *Jin Ping Mei* (1939) by C. Egerton. After World War Two, the Chinese scholars who immigrated to the United States became a major force of translation. And in an effort to make its culture known abroad, the Foreign Languages Press in Beijing has produced a veritable spate of English self-translations ranging from traditional literature, philosophy and history to modern and contemporary works. (ibid: 279-81)

Translation between English and Chinese has never been on an equal base. There is a huge imbalance in the volume of translations to and from Chinese. “Chinese literature is one of the least translated literatures into English; and perhaps one of the least read in America. If Chinese has been a less-translated source language, to be sure, as a target language, it may be one of the most translated languages in the world. Thus the paradox about the Chinese language is its imbalanced presence on the translation scene: an at once little and much translated language” (Zhu 2004: 332). The same is true of other types of translation.

In 1997, the Chinese publishers paid the Americans for the copyrights of 984 books, while their American counterparts purchased less than 100 Chinese works. The proportion is 10: 1 (Xu, 2002: 560-4). Similar figures were provided by Zhao Qizheng, head of the News Office of the State Council of China in 2002, who said that in the last few years, China bought the copyrights of 7000-8000 foreign [mostly Western] works every year, while those of less than 600 Chinese works were sold (in *Chinese Translators Journal*, No 2, 2002).

Cultural translation is normally done into one’s native language, so the number of foreign learners for each language is of considerable importance. The Chinese have been learning English ever since the mid-19th century, and the number of English learners in China surpasses the population of the United States and the United Kingdom put together. Chinese boasts 30,000,000 overseas learners now, but the majority are Asians and Chinese expatriates. Manchester, the third largest city in the UK, for example, has five Sunday Chinese schools and 7-800 students. But students from non-Chinese families account for less than five percent. When native English speakers with enough Chinese for translation work are extremely scarce, whom can you expect to translate out of Chinese?

When the English translators do turn their hands to translating from Chinese, they tend to focus on a limited number of classic genres: ancient philosophy and poetry, dynastical novels, etc. *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English* listed 17 Chinese authors and 10 Chinese works. In the author list are 12 poets, 2 philosophers, 2 novelists and 1 historian. Only two of them belonged to the 19th and 20th centuries respectively. And none of the works were written in the 20th century. When modern Chinese literature is indeed rendered, the favourite topics are controversial and sensational literature, or martial arts stories. The translations are produced by a small number of missionaries, diplomats, Sinologists or Chinese immigrants, published by an equally small number of presses, and read mostly by scholars and ethnic Chinese. The small number of self-translations published in China hardly reached the Western readership and are read mostly by the Chinese to improve their English proficiency.

A completely different picture is true of the English-Chinese translation. With a large number of potential translators and outlets for translations, nearly every aspect of the Anglo-American culture is translated and widely read. All major British and American writers have been introduced into China. Some classics have been translated dozens of times, but still have large sales. For instance, from 1990 to 1998, the Shanghai Translation Press published 26 world famous works, and sold 16 million books, including 1.46 million copies of *Jane Eyre*, 1 million copies of *Pride and Prejudice*; at 100,000 copies, *Ivanhoe* was a poor seller (Fan, 1999: 174).

3.- ENGLISH DOMINANCE AND CHINESE TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

The collaborative translators in the early stage invariably paid more attention to the style than fidelity. Chinese translators in the late 19th and early 20th centuries also took great liberty with the source texts and prioritized fluency and readability.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, intense debates occurred over whether translation should be literal or liberal. Lu Xun (1881-1936) and a few others advocated literalism, because this period witnessed a radical rethinking of the Chinese culture; the classical language (*wenyan*) was replaced by the immature vernacular language (*baihua*) and some people intended to enrich it by importing the Japanese and English vocabulary and syntax. Despite Lu Xun's fame as a literary giant, his translations did not sell well and in terms of influence, his theory of extreme literalism could never compare with Yan Fu's (1854-1921) fluent translation standards of "faithfulness", "expressiveness", and "elegance", which, some argue, was the only dominant translation theory in 20th century China. As a matter of fact, nearly all the canonical translations in China were liberal rather than literal, including the rendition of *Tess* by Zhang Guroo, *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* by Zhu Shenghao, and *Gone with the Wind* by Fu Donghua. Sun Zhili's (2002: 40) summary of the Chinese tradition is authoritative and similar:

With the exception of the fifteen or sixteen years following the May 4 Movement [1919], the first hundred years (from the 1870s to the 1970s) of the history of China translation was characterized by the domination of strategies of domestication. In the last two decades of the 20th century, due to the influences of Western translation theories, China's translation circles began to rethink the relationship between foreignization and domestication. As a result, more attention was paid to the strategies of foreignization, by theorists as well as translators.

In 1987, Liu Yingkai (1987/1994: 269-82) published a paper entitled "Domestication: a wrong track in translation", and initiated the translation debate of foreignizing and domesticating. This is just another traditional discussion of translation methods (He 2005), for Liu and Sun define 'foreignization' and 'domestication' in similar terms to literal and liberal translation. The majority in the debate are in favour of a 'foreignization-first' strategy in English-Chinese translation. The interesting part of the debate is that many prescribe that in Chinese-English translation, "domestication should be used as much as possible" (Xu and Zhang, 2002: 36; Yang, 2001: 4), for this can "facilitate communication between cultures (Xu and Zhang, 2002: 36-38)" and "represents our pursuit of standard English in translations". "It is a purely linguistic treatment, has nothing to do with politics, economy, or the power imbalance between English and Chinese, and does not mean that the Chinese culture should bow to the English culture (Yang, 2001: 4)". But one may ask: supposing we intend to produce standard translational English by domesticating the Chinese-English translation, why don't we pursue 'pure' Chinese by the same strategy in English-Chinese translation? Evidently, these scholars are unconsciously influenced by the unequal power relations between the two languages.

This attitude inevitably affects the translation practice. "In China, English is much better respected. In translation into English, people tend to restructure the idiomatic Chinese expressions to meet the reading expectations of the English readers. In translation into Chinese, however, translators take little care of the readers. The English structure is hardly changed, or translators risk a blame of being 'unfaithful'. In other words, it is always English that is respected, whether as a

source or target language. The two languages are not equal in the minds of Chinese translators and critics (Gao, 1994: 5)".

In self-translating the Chinese works into English, the principle of 'Western readers first' is often adhered to, and whatever risks being incomprehensible or meaningless to the Western readers gets deleted from the translations. The collaborative translators of *Selected Stories by Chen Rong* even tell the readers in a note that there are deletions in the English rendition.

Similar to the Chinese self-translators, on the whole, Western translators tend to produce more reader-friendly renditions of Chinese works. Translations into English are more often incomplete, and there are usually more cultural deletion, summary, and explanatory notes. The status of English and Chinese are by no means equal in the translation.

4.– TRANSLATING BETWEEN DOMINATED LANGUAGES?

Envisaged from the transnational vantage point, translation occurs in a strongly hierarchical universe. There have been several attempts to define the language hierarchy. Abram de Swaan (1998: 64), for example, distinguishes between central and peripheral languages and proposes to measure the centrality of a language by the number of multilingual speakers who speak the language in question.

To Casanova, the amount of literary capital distinguishes dominating languages from dominated languages. The former have a great deal of literary capital, due to their specific prestige, their age, and the number of texts which are considered universal and which are written in these languages (Casanova, in press). Following de Swaan's criterion, she measures the literary capital of a language by the number of literary polyglots who use it and by the number of literary translators in the circulation of texts from or towards the literary language. And she classifies dominated languages into four subtypes: 1) oral languages or languages whose writing system is being established, e.g. Yoruba, Gikuyu, Amharic and certain Creoles; 2) recently (re-)created languages that became national language after national or regional political independence, such as Korean, Gaelic, Hebrew, and 'new Norwegian'. They have few speakers or literary works and are familiar to few polyglots; 3) languages of ancient culture and tradition used in small countries, with relatively few speakers and little recognition outside their national boundaries, such as Dutch and Danish, Greek and Persian; 4) languages of broad diffusion such as Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi that have great internal literary traditions but are little known and largely unrecognised in the international marketplace (Casanova, 2004: 256-7).

According to the share each language has in the total number of translated books worldwide, Heilbron (1999: 433-4) divides all languages into three levels: central, semi-peripheral and peripheral. Based on the UNESCO statistics of 1978-80, languages with a translation proportion of over 10% are central (English, French, German and Russian); languages with a proportion of 1-3% are semi-peripheral (Spanish, Italian, Danish, Swedish, Polish and Czech); and all other languages with a share of less than 1%, including Chinese, Japanese, Arabic and Portuguese, occupied a peripheral position.

While justifying for their own research purposes, none of these theories is completely satisfactory. For example, Casanova's (2004: 256-7) four dominated language types were based on several competing criteria. Both Casanova and Heilbron took an absolute view of language power and ignored the hierarchy among the world's thousands of dominated or peripheral languages.

By the above standards, translation between English and Chinese is convincingly an uneven flow of cultural goods between dominating (central) and dominated (peripheral) languages, but the textual movement between Japanese and Chinese involves translating between dominated languages, which is "a rare occurrence" (Casanova, in press). This latter statement cannot fully explain the reality of translation between Japanese and Chinese. Firstly, translation between China and Japan has been ongoing for many centuries. Japanese has the 2nd largest number of learners in China now. The two countries are major trading partners for each other, translation between the two countries will not only continue, but very likely increase. It is not and will never be anything rare. Secondly, the book flow has never been even and the cultural exchange, never equal between the two countries. Thirdly, their economic power differs considerably. Japan is the world's 2nd richest country while China is the largest developing country. This invariably affects their language status.

To better accommodate the translation practice, it seems necessary to distinguish first between a diachronic and synchronic view of language power. In considering the spatial relationship, we need to take into account not only the status of a language in the world translation system in terms of the number of foreign learners and share of translation volume, but also the use of this language in specific regions and on particular occasions. Chinese and Japanese are peripheral languages in the world system, but are comparative stronger in East Asia. Chinese is a working language of the UN, but for the late 1980s, the estimated economic strength of Japanese (1,277 billion dollars) is nearly three times as much as that of Chinese (448 billion dollars) (British Council, 1997: 28-9).

To account for the translation between two specific countries, we also need to look at the status of one language in relation to the other. Currently, China has more students in Japan and more learners of Japanese, and translates much more from Japanese than the Japanese do from Chinese. In this sense, Japanese is dominating and Chinese, dominated. This understanding better reflects the actual cultural exchange and the power relations between the two countries.

CONCLUSION

Translation between Chinese and Japanese offers a precise barometer of how the change of power relations affects the translation flow, linguistic borrowing and language learning in the two countries. Recognition of the Western power led to the disappearance of the foreigner-dominating collaborative translation and spurred the Chinese to learn foreign languages. Translation to and from English has never been equal. The latter far exceeds the former in both volume and variety. The English translations are published by a small number of presses and read mostly by closed circles. The self-translations in China are used mainly by the Chinese themselves to improve their English. This verifies Jacquemond's first hypothesis and some assumptions about intercultural exchange.

But the Chinese case proves Jacquemond's (1992) second hypothesis only partially. It is true that Chinese works are read by a small number of people in the English culture and English works

are received by a much broader readership. But unlike the Arabic-French translations, whose reception is mainly influenced by the Oriental criterion of ‘scientific accuracy’ and the literal strategy (Jacquemond 1992: 149), translation between Chinese and English is dominated by fluency. The Anglo-American culture does not ignore the translations on account of their poor readability, but because they lack knowledge about and/or interest in the Chinese culture.

The Chinese data also indicate that fluency is not an American strategy only, as Venuti suggests. But since the 1980s, some scholars advocate foreignization for English-Chinese translation and domestication for Chinese-English translation. English is far more respected as a source and target language. This further indicates the power of English dominance and reveals cultural variations in translation strategies.

In defining and classifying language dominance, one needs to take into account not only the power of a language at the world and regional levels, but also the relative strength of one language in relation to the other. This may better accommodate the translation between specific countries.

Translation reflects and confirms the power relations between languages and cultures, which in turn influence the translation selection, flux and reception. Their relationship is dynamic and interactive.

REFERENCES

- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. M.B. Debevoise (trans.) Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Casanova, Pascale. (in press) Consecration and accumulation of literary capital: translation as unequal exchange. S. Brownlie (trans.), in M. Baker (ed.) *Critical Concepts in Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Chan, Leo Tak-hung. 2001. What’s modern in Chinese translation theory. *TTR* 14(2): 195-223.
- De Swaan, Abram. 1998. A political sociology of the World Language System: The Dynamics of Language Spread. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 22(1): 63-75.
- Fan, Shouyi. 1999. Translation of English fiction and drama in modern China: social context, literary trends, and impact. *Meta* 44 (1): 154-77.
- Gao, Jian. 1994. Relative factors in translation. *Foreign Languages* 17(2): 1-7.
- He, Xianbin. 2005. Foreignization/domestication and *yihua/guihua*: a contrastive study. *Translation Journal* 9(2).
- Hung, Eva. 2002. Translation and English in 20th century China. *World Englishes* 21(2): 325-35.

- Jacquemond, Richard. 1992. Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French- Arabic Translation, in Lawrence. Venuti (ed.) *Rethinking Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 139-58.
- Kondo, Masaomi and Judy Wakabayashi. 1998. Japanese tradition, in M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 485-94.
- Liang, Shiqiu. 1984. On Translation. In Chinese Association of Translators (ed.) *Papers on Translation Studies*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, pp. 123-4.
- Liu, Yingkai. 1987. Domestication: a wrong track in translation. *Modern Foreign Languages* 10(2). Also in Yang Zijian (ed.) (1994) *New Essays on Translation*. Wuhan Hubei Education Press, pp. 269-282.
- McMorran, Ian. 2000. Chinese literary translation into English, in Olive Classe (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publisher, pp. 278-81.
- Pollard, David. (ed.). 1998. *Translation and Creation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Robinson, Douglas. 1997. *Translation and Empire*. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publishing.
- Sun, Zhili. 2002. China's literary translation: from domestication to foreignization. *Chinese Translators Journal* 23(1): 40-44.
- The British Council. 1997. *The Future of English*. London: Glenton Press.
- Tarumoto, Tarumoto. 1998. A statistical survey of translated fiction 1840-1920, in Pollard D. (ed.) *Translation and Creation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 37-42.
- UNESCO (1963-1999) *Statistical Yearbook*.
- UNESCO Index Translationum. Online documents at URL <http://databases.unesco.org/> [10 January 2006]
- Venuti, Lawrence. (ed.). 1992. *Rethinking Translation*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Wang, Kefei. 1997. *Cultural History of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press.

- Wang, Xiangyuan. 2001. *The Chinese Translation History of the Japanese Literature in the 20th Century*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
- Wang, Fansen. 2002. Chang of intellectual resources before and after the 1898 Chinese Constitutional Reform: with special reference to the Japanese factor. *Twentieth-first Century* (Internet edition), Number 6. Online documents at URL <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/ics/21c/supplem/essay/971221g.htm>. [1 January 2006]
- Xiong, Yuezhi. 1998. Degrees of familiarity with the West in late Qing society, in David Pollard (ed.) *Translation and Creation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 25-36.
- Xu, Jianping et al. 2002. Foreignization and domestication in cross-cultural translation. *Chinese Translators Journal* 23(5): 36-38.
- Xu, Shigu. 2002. A case study of a linguistic and cultural hegemony. In Zhang Boran & Xu Jun (eds) *Translation Studies in the 21st Century*. Beijing: The Commercial Press, pp. 560-4.
- Yang, Liu. 2001. New concepts in translation studies and translation teaching. *Chinese Translators Journal* 22(5): 3-5.
- Zheng, Dahua. 2002. Characteristics of the eastern transition of Western learning in the Republican era. *Academic Journal of Zhongzhou* 22(5): 118-123.
- Zhu, Chunsheng. 2004. Translation studies in China or Chinese-related translation studies: defining Chinese translation studies. *Babel* 50(4): 332-345.