

Terminology Translation and the "Rebirth" of Comparative Literature in

Peina Zhuang
Sichuan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [Translation Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Recommended Citation

Zhuang, Peina. "Terminology Translation and the "Rebirth" of Comparative Literature in." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 19.5 (2017): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.3104>>

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

The above text, published by Purdue University Press ©Purdue University, has been downloaded 288 times as of 11/07/19.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and CultureISSN 1481-4374 <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>>
Purdue University Press ©Purdue University

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 19 Issue 5 (December 2017) Article 3
Peina Zhuang and Huan Pi
"Terminology Translation and the 'Rebirth' of Comparative Literature in China"
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol19/iss5/3>>

Contents of **CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 19.5 (2017)**
Special Issue **Against the "Death" of the Discipline of Comparative Literature**
Ed. Shunqing Cao
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol19/iss5/>>

Abstract: In their article "Terminology Translation and the 'Rebirth' of Comparative Literature in China" Peina Zhuang and Huan Pi discuss terminology translation during the rise of Comparative Literature in China. They argue that, while great headway has been made in Comparative Literature here, it is not free from the challenges inherent in terminology translation, an important part in intercultural dialogue. Analyzing the status quo in terminology translation from three aspects, namely, the lack of unity, standardization, and accuracy, they argue that more attention should be given to this aspect in the scholarship. In particular, they advocate more concrete empirical research, such as dictionary compilation, so as to avoid disputes on key terms, as a way of promoting the real and sustainable "prosperity" of Comparative Literature.

Peina ZHUANG and Huan PI

Terminology Translation and the "Rebirth" of Comparative Literature in China

The history of Comparative Literature as a discipline is highlighted by waves of crises. The first such crisis was initiated by B. Croce, who regarded comparative literature as comparing literature, or the comparison of literature, and thus as not a discipline in its own right. For Croce, "comparative" only has a methodological significance. A similar attack was found in René Wellek's famous 1958-essay "The Crisis of Comparative Literature." "I've never been sure what the field, or the discipline, is," claimed Wellek, "and I never sure that I could really claim to teaching it or working in it" (Bernheimer 97). The mid and late part of the 20th century saw even more supposed crises for Comparative Literature, with frequent doomsday predictions that the field "has had its day" (Bassnett 161), concerned itself with "exquisite cadavers" (Saussy 3) or faced "death of a discipline" (Spivak 1).

The constant sense of crisis for Comparative Literature in the West stands in sharp contrast with the flourishing of Comparative Literature in China. More and more universities have recently begun to set up programs or research bases bearing the name of comparative literature. For instance, *Sichuan Comparative Literature Research Base* was launched in 2014 by the College of Literature and Journalism of Sichuan University with a view to promoting the development of multi-ethnic literature comparison and expanding the research scope of Comparative Literature by initiating multi-faceted activities. These programs have begun to expand the boundary of Comparative Literature, beginning to discuss topics such as world literature, comparative poetics and literary anthropology, and more. Three such programs in "literary anthropology" have won the bid for Major Research Project by the National Social Science Fund. At the same time, publications in the field are more numerous than ever before. For instance, *Series of Contemporary Comparative Literature Research in China* (24 volumes) co-edited by Xie Tianzhen, Chen Sihe and Song Binghui demonstrates the course and achievements of Comparative Literature in China during the past three decades. In addition, scholars are beginning to publish their works in English. *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature* by Cao Shunqing (2014) and *Christianity and the Question of Culture* by Yang Huilin (2014) are two major successful efforts in this regard. As a result, the research of Chinese comparatists has started to take on the international dimension. The seventh *Sino-US Bilateral Comparative Literature Symposium* has just come to a complete ending in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, and the China Comparative Literature Association has won the bid for hosting the next *International Comparative Literature Conference*.

Similar things seem to be happening in other places outside the West, as Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek Steven and Louise O. Vasvári. observe: "What is remarkable—and this is paid scant attention to in Anglophone comparative literature or world literatures scholarship—is that both the concept of the discipline, as well as its institutional presence are advancing in so-called 'peripheral' languages and cultures including Iberian Spanish and Portuguese, Greek, etc., and this is the case also in Latin American languages, Chinese, Indian languages, in Arabic or Farsi" (Tötösy and Vasvári 4). This is certainly true in China, but does not mean that the situation here is free from problems. Though great headway has been made in terms of theory and practice, this progress remains largely unrecognized in the West, where the theoretical and practical fruits of Chinese Comparative Literature have made little impact. As a result, these advances constitute only the first step in going global, and the next step—introducing them through translation—becomes a daunting challenge. Without successful translation of its developments, however, the state of Chinese Comparative Literature cannot be termed successful in a real sense, let alone engage in dialogue with the Western counterpart. And the translation of key terms lies at the heart of any such introduction in the initial period. Ulrich Weisstein raises the challenge of terminology in response to the possibility of a Chinese School of Comparative Literature: "an urgent task here is not the theoretical discussion but to find a set of systematic and scientific methods and accurate terms" (Han 381). Clearly, the issue of terminology is complicated by its translation in an inter-cultural context.

Terminology, literally speaking, refers to words or phrases that designates certain concepts, phenomena or objects in a field. G. Rondeau defines it as "a linguistic unity composed of signifier and signified" (19; unless indicated otherwise, all translations are by Zhuang and Pi). Rondeau distinguishes terminology from other linguistic signs by pointing out that "the semantic denotation of a term is decided by its signified relation rather than that of signifier" (19). In other words, the definition of a concept comes before the adoption of a certain term for that concept, a consequence of the professional and scientific dimensions of terminology. This feature of terminology means that any term functions as an important sign for a certain discipline, indicating its history, status quo and level.

"Basic terms are the starting point of academic research. If the starting point is not correct, there would be low possibility for one to go in the right direction" (Gu 21).

The development of Comparative Literature entails the creation and interpretation of new terms, especially those used to develop peripheral languages and cultures. Thus, the systemization of terminology translation plays a key role in the spread of these advances across cultures. As a result, it will be helpful to offer a quick overview of the terminology of translation research in China before stepping into more concrete issues. A survey of disciplinary trends suggests that terminology translation has not received the attention its importance deserves. According to relevant statistics, only about 120 papers got published from 2000 to 2015, less than one for a month on average (Chen 59). Books such as *术语翻译研究 (Terminology Translation Studies)* (2011) and *术语与术语翻译研究 (Terminology and Its Translation Studies)* (2015) have only begun to appear since 2010, and even then only in low quantities. Although many dictionaries are edited on the subject, their quality remains problematic; they are often repetitive in terms of subject and content. This status quo is even more disappointing when we begin to analyze the above publications more closely. For instance, research on terminology translation for the humanities and social sciences lags far behind that on natural sciences. Fewer than ten papers discuss the translation of literary terminology, and the attention given to terminology in Comparative Literature accounts for almost nothing. The same is true of the books and dictionaries. But this lack of attention does not mean that translation of terminology in these disciplines poses no problems. We used terms such as 比较文学 (comparative literature), 变异学 (variation theory) and others such as "title", "key word" or "subject" in search of relevant papers from year 2000 to 2015 in the database CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure). We analyzed the English translation of those terms in the abstract so as to base our research on real data with a view to calling attention to this important yet much neglected aspect of the discipline. We will summarize the problems we found in terms of the following aspects before discussing relevant strategies for addressing them.

The first aspect of the problem is rather basic: the lack of unity in terminology translation, which usually takes the form of one term being translated differently in different sources. Take 变异学 (variation theory) as an example. As Marx and Engels suggest, "A new idea in a discipline would give rise to the evolution of the terminology in the discipline" (Marx and Engels 34). Comparative Literature has mainly undergone three stages, the first one being Influence Studies of French school, the second one in expanding the scope of the discipline to interdisciplinary research by American School, and the last one being the practice of Comparative Literature across heterogeneous civilizations. Against the new backdrop of this discipline, 变异学 (variation theory) of Comparative Literature is one of the major breakthroughs by the Chinese scholars. Although literary variation has long existed, ancient and modern, domestic and foreign, it is the Variation Theory that first systemizes the study of variation and serves as guide for research on literary variation. Thus, "it not only demonstrates the insights of Chinese scholars in the theoretical construction in Comparative Literature, but also fills the theoretical gap in world Comparative Literature" (Zhuang 154), as demonstrated by its advocacy for heterogeneity as the basis of comparison. In this way standardized and unified translation of the terminology is essential in introducing Chinese advancements of the discipline to the West.

But this term has been translated in as many as nine different ways: namely as "variation" in "The Research Field of Literary Variation in Comparative Literature" (Cao & Li 2006), as "mutation" in "The Localization of Mutation: Dissemination of Folk Tales in the Cross-ethnic Groups" (Wang 2006), as "variationology" in "A Review of Influence Study of Comparative Literature from the Perspective of Variationology" (Li & Cao 2006), as "variationology" in "China's Debate on Modernism in Late 1970s and Early 1980s: A Perspective of Variationology" (Li 2012), as "variation theory" in "Comparative Literature, the Chinese School and the Variation Theory: An Interview with Douwe Wessel Fokkema" (Wang 2008), as "Theory of Variation" in "The Academic Background and Theoretical Assumptions of the Theory of Variation of Comparative Literature" (Cao & Zhang 2008), as "the Variation" in "The Variation: The Breakthrough in Theories of Comparative Literature" (Cao 2008), as "variation study" in "The Concept of Cross-cultural Difference and the Construction of Variation Study in Comparative Literature" (Liu 2009) and as "variation theory" in "Variation Theory: A Breakthrough in Theorizing Comparative Literature Studies" (Cao & Xu 2010). This diversity can be rather confusing at first glance. But the publication of Cao Shunqing's book *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature* by Springer in 2014 marked the debut of this theory in the Anglophone world, and in doing so standardized the term and ended the confusion over its translation. The introduction of new ideas and concepts necessarily means the import or export of new terminology, and a mature theory usually has a unified and stable translation. But this basic aspect of terminology translation is largely neglected by

the Chinese scholarship and sometimes the adoption of different translated versions for the same term in one paper makes the problem more pronounced.

Another aspect of this problem lies in the lack of standardization for terminology translation, referring mainly to the issue of capitalization, for instance 比较文学 (comparative literature) and 世界文学 (world literature). The uncapitalized "comparative literature" is used interchangeably with Comparative Literature. We hold that the latter one with capitalization should be adopted so as to display its status as a discipline. Comparative Literature has been defined in different senses from the very beginning both in China and the West, and scholars characterize it variously as a field, subject, method, discipline, or science, as in the following examples. The Hungarian scholar Hugo Meltzld Lomnitz, who founded first journal of comparative literature, regards it as "slowly emerging discipline of the future" (Hans-Joachim 56); Charles Mills Gayley, the former chairman of the English Department at University of California-Berkeley holds that it is "more than a method and a new discipline" (Hans-Joachim 103); German scholar Louis Paul Betz, who compiled the first bibliography for comparative literature, views it as "new area of literary scholarship" (Hans-Joachim 137); and Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett, who first used the phrase "comparative literature" in the title of a book, calls it a "new science" (Hans-Joachim 187). From this, it is possible to observe the changing identity of comparative literature throughout its history. Currently, the status of Comparative Literature as a discipline in China is well established, though wide controversy still surrounds the question of its theoretical framework: "Comparative Literature in Chinese is today—and has been for several decades—one of the most incisive and institutionalized disciplines in Mainland China's humanities and social sciences" (Wang 2). This observation is well grounded, judging from the requirements for establishing a discipline. Chen Dun and Liu Xiangyu in *比较文学概论 (An Introduction to Comparative Literature)* propose three requirements for defining a discipline: "forming basic theory and method; setting up academic organizations and journals; entering the class of universities and colleges; or in one word, it should become a knowledge system, setting great store by both teaching and researching" (40). Without question, Comparative Literature in China fulfills the above requirements. It has formed its basic theoretical framework by combining the academic research of the French and American schools combined with recent developments, such as variation theory, that explore the new context of Comparative Literature across different civilizations. The Chinese Comparative Literature Association was founded in 1985 and a conference was convened in 2015 to celebrate its thirtieth anniversary. The authoritative journal *Comparative Literature in China* was founded in 1984. It entered into universities first as teaching and researching institutions in the 1980s, and programs training Ph.D candidates have increased to about 30 programs in mainland universities. The academic output is even more encouraging: "According to relevant statistics, publications on this discipline amounts to 10,000 in the past two decades" (Liu 42). Thus, it is clear that Comparative Literature now functions as a discipline, and it is appropriate to capitalize the term so as to distinguish it from other relevant research areas or fields in this discipline, such as world literature.

Comparative Literature as a discipline has undergone some changes in its naming. It was first affiliated under the Foreign Language and Literature in the national discipline catalogue, and then included as Chinese Language and Literature before changing its name to Comparative Literature and World Literature. But in China, it is common practice to abbreviate this title as Comparative Literature. It is, however, a totally different case for world literature since people usually do not use this name alone to refer to the discipline. The concept of world literature could be traced back to Goethe who first proposed the term *Weltliteratur*. Since then, the term has been expounded by different scholars in its definition and scope. For instance, David Damrosch's *What is World Literature?* defines world literature as a way of reading and circulation of works. Generally speaking, the term can be interpreted at three levels. The first understands World Literature as a discipline in its own right. This discipline initially was categorized as Foreign Literature, and was combined with Comparative Literature to form a subdiscipline called Chinese Language and Literature in 1998 by Ministry of Education of China. "Scholars in World Literature usually have 'comparison' and 'transcending' in their mind since they would do research under two knowledge and cultural backgrounds. Thus, World Literature can also be seen as kind of Comparative Literature. Combining these two disciplines together demonstrates deepening understandings of World Literature" (Huang 96). It is also possible to understand world literature, not as a discipline, but as a research field. This is what Steven Tötösy has in mind when, in his book *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures and Comparative Cultural Studies*, he refers to "the field of world literatures" (5). Finally, world literature can be understood as a concept, in the sense that when people talk about world literature today, they tend to emphasize the historical development of literature in different nations as well as the mutual

understanding and influence among them. In spite of these varied meanings, however, it is only when combined with Comparative Literature that the term should be capitalized as a discipline.

A final aspect of the problem of terminology translation pertains to inaccuracy. The accurate translation of terms plays an important role in the construction and transmission of a theory because inaccuracy could entail misinterpretation of the terms. To illustrate this danger, let us look at several such problematic terms in Comparative Literature, beginning with the translation of 跨文明 (cross-, trans-, or inter-civilization). The course of Comparative Literature as discipline has been entangled with the word 跨 (cross-, trans-, or inter-) in its development from 跨国 (trans-national), to 跨学科 (inter-disciplinary), to today's 跨文明 (inter-civilization). Though wide controversy exists as to the object for 跨, scholars generally agree in the act itself and "view '跨越性' (transcendence) as the basic feature for the discipline (Cao 150)," or "regard it as one of the essential elements for comparability (Xiong 116)." As an important theoretical concept in Comparative Literature in China, 跨文明 (inter-civilization) was first proposed by Cao Shunqing in 2002 as a replacement for the rather confusing term 跨文化 (cross-cultural), though he has more than once emphasized that "culture" here refers to heterogeneous cultures. 跨文明 focuses on the two major elements of heterogeneity and complementarity, the indispensable basis for concepts such as the principles and channels of dialogue among heterogeneous civilizations, the interpretation of literature from one culture by literary theory from another, and others. Thus, 跨 not only has the significance of "transcendence, but also is a sign of connection, communication and dialogue. The stage of 跨文明 embraces the epoch of globalization of Comparative Literature by adopting a broader perspective in breaking down barriers among different civilizations, during which the identity with and understanding of another civilization becomes the core of Comparative Literature (Yue 2-12)." Thus, the translation of this term should manifest such implications rather than simply regard it as an act of moving or crossing from one side to another. Both the version of the term as "cross-civilization" (Chang 1) and "trans-civilization" (Zhang & Liang 10) fail to cherish such rich connotations of the term.

Literally speaking, it is sound to render 跨 into "trans-" or "cross-" since both of the prefixes have the meaning of "across," indicating action or position from one to another. But this only signifies the first step in 跨文明, that of moving from one civilization to another, while neglecting its overarching aim of "exploring the possibility for a harmonious coexistence between East and West and bridging the communication between heterogeneous civilizations on an equal footing so as to contribute to the development and stability of the whole mankind" (Cao 82). Thus, the translation of this term should take this sense of interactivity, commonality and bi-directionality into consideration; the above-mentioned versions only transmit its literal meaning by indicating a one directional leap or movement. We hold that "inter-" could better accomplish this crucial conceptual task. On the one hand, "inter-" shares with "trans-" and "cross-" a sense of moving from one to another. On the other hand, it also carries a sense of reciprocity or intermingling that is absent in the other prefixes. This between-ness characterizes the scope of 跨文明, that is, mainly between East and Western civilizations. "Heterogeneous comparison between Chinese and Western civilizations on the whole is a brand new and much neglected subject to the Western scholarship and also one pronounced issue for practice of Comparative Literature in China from the very beginning" (82). It signifies the dimension of communication and dialogue of the term, and indicates the everlasting endeavor by mankind to achieve the long-cherished common aim of mutual understanding and harmonious coexistence. For further clarification, we can refer to the translation of 跨文化 (intercultural) in English scholarship, as seen in representative books such as *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* by Samovar and Porter (1972) and *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* by Condon and Yousef (1975) as well as the *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication* founded by National Communication Association in 2008. "Though having roughly the same meaning in English, intercultural communication and cross-cultural communication differ in that the former emphasizes more the research with a comparative nature and aim, while the latter focuses on the penetration process of one culture into another," thus indicating one directional orientation (Chen 146). Clearly, the rendering of 跨文明 as "inter-civilization" better displays its inner characteristics and connotations, and in doing so captures the theoretical orientation of Comparative Literature with respect to heterogeneous civilizations.

Another problematic term has proven to be 研究 (research, study), as used in 影响研究 (influence studies) to mean scholarship, research, study or studies. The theoretical framework of Comparative Literature in China is mainly grounded in the influence studies of the French school, parallel studies by American school, and new developments by Chinese scholars such as variation theory. Almost every

book on Comparative Literature would devote some part to one or more of these terms but with different translations mainly on the rendering of 研究 (study, research). Take 影响研究 (influences studies) for example: influence studies, influence study, Influence Study, Influence Research, and Impact Study appear as translations of this term in different papers. "Scholarship," "research," "study," and "studies" are the four main ways of translating 研究. Of these, scholarship has the following three meanings: methods, discipline and attainments of a scholar; knowledge resulting from study in a certain field and a financial aid granted to a student (*The Free Dictionary*). The first and third meanings are obviously not fit for the meaning of 影响研究. And though the second meaning of "knowledge" overlaps with the term 影响研究, it does not capture its status as a discipline in that 影响研究 is nowadays used more in the sense of a theoretical framework for the discipline, and not simply as a kind of knowledge. In a similar fashion, the word "research" usually has the general meaning of investigating or carefully studying of a particular subject or problem so as to discover facts or solutions. It is often used to designate any kind of study in social and natural sciences focusing on the act of exploration and investigation, rarely referring to certain terms in a discipline. And finally, "study" and "studies" signify the effort to acquire knowledge by reading, observation, and so on; an act or effort made in the pursuit of knowledge; a branch of knowledge or department of learning (*The Free Dictionary*), with the last meaning usually adopting its plural form "studies" to designate a research theory, field or subject in a discipline. Thus, 影响研究 here should be translated as influence studies; it is the same case for similar terms such as parallel studies and interdisciplinary studies. The use of influence rather than impact is due to the fact that 影响 (influence) in the term refers to any kind of influence, minor or major, as long as it is based on empirical study. Paul van Tieghem holds that every influence could be further divided into countless minor ones that should be investigated one by one (Van Tieghem 59). But impact usually indicates strong force and effect, thus being inappropriate for this term.

A third and final problematic term for Comparative Literature has proven to be 译介学 (media-translatology or translation studies). 译介学 (media-translatology or translation studies), an important part of the theoretical framework of Comparative Literature in China, has no clear and definite counterpart in English scholarship, though it overlaps with Translation Studies in research content and method. Because of this overlapping, Susan Bassnett once advocated for the inclusion of Comparative Literature as part of Translation Studies. For this reason, the term is translated as translation studies or media-translatology, despite the fact that the former term is also used to designate a totally different discipline in China, 翻译学 (Translation Studies). Though sharing the same name in English as translation studies and having overlapping research scope and content, 译介学 and 翻译学 are rather different both in discipline category inclusion and orientation.

翻译学 is included under Foreign Linguistics and Applied Linguistics as a subdiscipline in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, while 译介学 belongs to the subdiscipline Comparative Literature and World Literature in the Department of Chinese Languages and Literatures in mainland universities. What's more, the research content and aims of these two disciplines diverge significantly. 翻译学, as a discipline, is aimed at exploring and establishing the definition, nature, processes, requirements, and standards of translation both theoretically and practically. Though the last several decades witnessed a "cultural turn" in 翻译学, it still takes the linguistic aspect of translation as its disciplinary core, as shown by George Steiner's book *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*: "The 'cultural turn' should not be taken as a sign of replacing translation studies with cultural studies if we want to keep the discipline boundary and independence of translation studies. The center in this discipline is and should always be 'translation'. Otherwise it would lose the status as a discipline in the process of expanding the research scope" (Cao 5). 译介学, on the other hand, mainly focuses on the phenomenon of literary translation. Xie Tianzhen in his book *译介学 (Media-translatology)* summarizes the content of 译介学 into three aspects: "The recreative nature of literary translation so as to identity its common features with literary creation; the position of translated literature in the national literature; the history of translated literature" (334). Thus, 译介学 focuses more on the product of translation, the underlying causes for the variation, distortion and filtering in a translated work, and on the influence of such phenomena in the development of a nation's literature, while paying no attention to fidelity in translation and airing no value judgement on this as 翻译学 does. Thus, using "translation studies" in reference to both 译介学 and 翻译学 is incorrect and confusing because it elides these differences.

As it is used in English scholarship, the term "translation studies," though much broader than either term, relates more to the concerns of 翻译学 than to those of 译介学. This affinity is evident in such

representative books as *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* (James S. Holmes) and *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Gideon Toury), both of which discuss basic issues such as definition, scope, and method, and seek to map the blueprint for translation. As a result, "translation studies" is more suitable for rendering 翻译学.

Gong Jingcai has pointed out that "from the perspective of historical and cultural semantics, the investigation of a term, including its creation, development and changes, should proceed from three aspects: historical clues, case study and leading figures" (27-43). Thus, in order to establish an appropriate translation of 译介学, it is necessary first to understand its historical origin in Comparative Literature. The origin of 译介学 can be traced back to the media studies first mentioned by Paul Van Tieghem, in particular to the concept of mesology developed in his book *La Littérature comparée* in 1931. It researches comparisons between the original and translated version of a text so as to analyze the accuracy in translation as well as the translator's biography, literary life, and social status. The scope of 译介学 is coextensive with that of Van Tieghem's mesology. For instance, the history of literary translation, an important part of 译介学, takes the translation history "as a historical process where the basic features of cultural and literary communication are expounded. Thus, 译介学 could no longer be seen as an 'affiliate' under influence studies" (Zhu & Zhu 3). It is for this reason that the term gains its independence as a separate part in Comparative Literature. The translation of this term should on the one hand display its historical connection with "mesology," while also retaining its own features. In this regard, the term medio-translatology serves better. For "medio" reminds one of mesology under influence studies, while "translatology", although it once served in Western scholarship as a term for 翻译学 before James Holmes suggested "translation studies" as a replacement, indicates that translation stays at the core of 译介学. Xie Tianzhen, who first systematizes the theory of 译介学, also chose to adopt this version for his publication.

Such is the status quo of terminology translation with respect to Comparative Literature in China. The reality is even more complex but rarely does it receive adequate attention. Identifying this problem, however, is not the same as solving it. Rather, the discipline's long term development in China hinges upon developing strategies for addressing the situation. In this regard, great priority should be given to terminology translation within Comparative Literature by scholars and publication press agencies. Among the papers selected, the translation for certain terms is often inconsistent even within the abstract and key word metadata for a single paper. Though terminology translation has begun to receive some attention recently, it still lacks a systematic approach for certain subjects, especially in the social sciences and humanities. As a result, some common consensus should be reached by the discipline on the general problems in terminology translation before embarking on more targeted research in this regard. Besides, reading of the original work should be encouraged, wherever terms have their origin in the English scholarship, so as to reduce unnecessary misunderstandings and disputes of translation.

Furthermore, empirical studies of terminology translation are necessary, for instance through the compilation of Chinese-English terminology dictionaries by scholars in this discipline. Currently, such dictionaries remain underdeveloped, and even Chinese reference books are often of poor quantity. 比较文学学术语汇释 (*Glossary of Terms in Comparative Literature*) by Yin Jianmin, published in 2011 by Beijing Normal University Press, is one of the very few Chinese Dictionaries for Comparative Literature. We could also refer to the practice of dictionary compilation in the Western scholarship where "one may not always find clear definition for every term in the Western terminology dictionaries but rather detailed discussions about the term's origin and evolution, investigating its meanings in a series of contexts in its development" (Liu 46). Additionally, authors could consider appending the translation of key terms at the end of their books so that those interested could trace the original source of the term.

A final consideration in addressing the problem of terminology translation is the dialectical attitude towards the standard and requirement for terminology translation. The ideal terminology translation emphasizes both the scientific and artistic representations of the original terms. This aim is rarely achieved in reality, since one can often accomplish one or two requirements in translation, but not all standards. In descending order of importance, a translation conceived with this dialectical attitude in mind would focus on accuracy, unity, readability, transparency, and artistry. The difficulty of addressing all of these concerns is often further aggravated by the ambiguity of the original term itself. As a result, a descriptive perspective could be a good supplement to the prescriptive one in interpreting and valuing the quality of terminology translation.

The maturity of a discipline is inseparable from the creation, utilization and interpretation of its key terms. "Terms created in history, ancient or modern, foreign or domestic, are the core of academic

achievements. Every step forward in science and technology by mankind is encoded in forms of terminology. A professional knowledge framework is dependent on a systemized terminology structure" (Feng 12). It is the same case for terminology in social sciences and humanities. The sound development of a discipline cannot do without terms that name and explain its object. As the ancient Chinese saying goes "if the name is not correct, the words will not ring true." The name and meaning of key terms usually indicate a discipline's scope and orientation. And terminology translation is another invisible kind of naming within a cross-cultural context, bringing the term to a different land. It is not simply an act of translating, but also entails the introduction and interpretation of the theory encoded in a disciplinary term to the foreign land, sometimes even indicating value judgements and positions. Sinologist C. H. Wang views the translation of Chinese literary terms as a "naming of the Chinese concept in English that turns out to be the interpretation and even the evaluation of them. A successful translation may prove more effective and convincing than a lengthy paragraph of arguments and explanations in an essay about traditional Chinese philosophy of literary art," (534). The same can be said of terminology translation. Cao Shunqing divides the development of Chinese School of Comparative Literature into the "foundation (1978-1987), constructing (1988-1997) and advancing stages (1998-until now)" (Cao & Wang 127). "Advancing" here not only means marching forward, but also an external orientation where translation of the theoretical and practical outcomes of the Chinese School have a great role to play. The standardized and accurate translation of key terms remains essential at the very beginning of its this stage of advancing outward. If the issue of unity remains rather elementary and could easily be overcome if paid due attention to, the second and third aspects are fundamental in interpreting the term and introducing its core meanings in cross-cultural context. If not dealt with properly, these issues may cause misunderstanding or even confusion, as is evident in the translation of 翻译学 and 译介学. Otherwise, the rebirth of Comparative Literature here could be understood as prospering only domestically, and consequently as unqualified to emerge globally in any real and sustainable sense. Were this to be the case, it would be in opposition to the Chinese School's orientation toward a Comparative Literature with a truly inter-civilization context, and would also prove not conducive to achieving real dialogue with our Western counterparts for the foreseeable future.

Note: The article is funded by Sichuan University (skbsh201726).

Works Cited

- Bernheimer, Charles. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Cao, Minglun (曹明伦). "Translation Studies 在中国的名与实——兼谈翻译学的学科范围和界线问题" ("The Chinese Names and Natures of Translation Studies"). *Shanghai Journal of Translators* 3(2006): 1-6.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天). "建构比较文学学科研究新范式" ("The Construction of a New Paradigm of Comparative Literature Studies"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 2(2006): 150-60.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天) and Zhang, Deming (张德明). "跨文明研究—21 世纪中国比较文学的理论与实践" (Cross-civilization Study: Theory and Practice of Comparative Literature in the 21st Century China). *Foreign Literature Studies* 5(2003): 81-87.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天) and Wang, Lei (王蕾). "比较文学中国学派三十年" ("Chinese School of Comparative Literature: Thirty Years of Development"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 1(2009): 125-34.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天) and Li, Weitao (李卫涛). "比较文学学科中的文学变异学研究" ("The Research Field of Literary Variation in Comparative Literature"). *Fudan Journal* 1(2006): 79-83.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天). "变异学: 比较文学学科理论的重大突破" ("The Variation: The Breakthrough in Theories of Comparative Literature"). *Journal of Sun Yat-sen University* 4(2008): 34-41.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天) and Zhang, Yu (张雨). "比较文学变异学的学术背景与理论构想" ("The Academic Background and Theoretical Assumptions of the Theory of Variation of Comparative Literature"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 3(2008): 142-48.
- Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天) and Xu, Huan (徐欢). "变异学: 世界比较文学学科理论研究的突破" ("Variation Theory: A Breakthrough in Theorizing Comparative Literature Studies"). *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies* 7(2010): 10-13.
- Chang, Fang (常芳). "中国比较文学研究的现状与学科建设问题——曹顺天教授访谈录" ("The Current Situation and Disciplinary Construction of Comparative Literature in China: An Interview with Professor Cao Shunqing"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 4(2005): 1-7.
- Chen, Zhijin (陈智淦), and Wang Yufeng (王育烽). "中国术语翻译研究的现状与学术术语翻译研究的缺失" ("A Probe into the Terminological Translation Studies and the Lack of Literary Terminology Translation Studies in China"). *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*, 3(2013):59-67.

- Chen, Dun (陈敦) and Liu, Xiangyu (刘象愚). *比较文学概论* (Introduction to Comparative Literature). Beijing: Beijing Normal UP, 2000.
- Chen, Guoming (陈国明). "跨文化传播术语和学科的生成发展" ("The Generation and Development of the Terms and Studies of 'Intercultural Communication'"). *Academic Research*, 11(2010): 141-48.
- Feng, Tianyu (冯天瑜). "封建"考论 (Investigation on "Feudalism"). Wuhan: Wuhan UP, 2006.
- Gong, Jingcai (宫敬才). "历史文化语义学何以可能" ("The Possibility of Historical and Cultural Semantics?"). *语义的文化变迁* (Cultural Changes in Semantics). Ed. Tianyu Feng (冯天瑜), Changshun Nie (聂长顺) and Jianhui Liu (刘建辉). Wuhan: Wuhan UP, 2007.
- Gu, Zhengkun (辜正坤). "外来术语翻译与中国学术问题" ("Chinese Translation of English Terminology and Its Academic Significance"). *Chinese Translators Journal* 6 (1998): 16-21.
- Hans-Joachim, Schulz and Phillip, H. Rhein. *Comparative Literature: The Early Years*. North Carolina: The U of North Carolina P, 1973.
- Han, Jining (韩冀宁). "维斯坦因教授谈比较文学中国学派" ("Professor Weisstein's View on the Chinese School of Comparative Literature"). *Comparative Literature in China* 1(1986): 380-81.
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language* (Fifth Edition). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 2011. The Free Dictionary <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/>>.
- Huang, Zhongshun (黄忠顺). "《中图法》世界文学批判—以中文译丛观点" ("Criticism of the Category of World Literature in Chinese Library Classification—From the perspective of the Chinese-language Stack Room"). *Library Tribune* 5 (2009): 94-97.
- Liu, Xiangyu (刘象愚). "比较文学危机说辨别" ("Reflections on the Crisis of Comparative Literature as a Discipline"). *Journal of Peking University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 3 (2008): 33-42.
- Liu, Yameng (刘亚猛). "风物常宜放眼量—西方学术文化与中西学术翻译" ("A Cultural Turn for Scholarly Translation in China"). *Chinese Translators Journal* 6(2004): 44-48.
- Liu, Shengpeng (刘圣鹏). "跨文明差异性观念与比较文学变异学建构" ("The Concept of Cross-cultural Difference and the Construction of Variation Study in Comparative Literature"). *Journal of Jishou University* 2(2009): 101-105.
- Li, Mingyong (李明英). "变异学视域下的新时期初现代主义论争研究" ("China's Debate on Modernism in Late 1970s and Early 1980s: A Perspective of Variationology"). *Journal of Zhejiang Normal University* 6(2012): 22-27.
- Li, Yan (李艳) and Cao, Shunqing (曹顺天). "从变异学的角度重新审视比较文学的影响研究" ("A Review of Influence Study of Comparative Literature from the Perspective of Variationology"). *Comparative Literature in China* 4 (2006): 1-10.
- Marx, Karl (卡尔·马克思) and Engels, Friedrich (弗里德里希·冯·恩格斯). *马克思恩格斯文集: 第23卷* (The Collected Works by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Vol 23). Trans. and Ed. Central Compilation and Translation Bureau (中央编译局编译). Beijing: Renmin P, 1972.
- Rondeau, Guy. (G. 隆多). *术语学概论* (Introduction à la terminologie). Trans. Gang Liu (刘刚). Beijing: Chinese Science Publishing & Media Ltd, 1985.
- Saussy, Haun. "Exquisite Cadavers Stitched from Fresh Nightmares: Of Memes, Hives, and Selfish Genes." *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Ed. Huan Saussy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. 3-43.
- Spivak, G. Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven and Louise O. Vasvári. "The Contextual Study of Literature and Culture, Globalization, and Digital Humanities." *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures, and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. New Delhi: Cambridge UP India, 2013. 3-35.
- Van Tieghem, Paul (梵·第根). *比较文学论* (La Littérature comparée). Trans. Wangshu Dai (戴望舒). Beijing: The Commercial P, 1937.
- Wang, C.H. "Naming and Reality of Chinese Criticism." *Journal of Asian Studies* 3(1979): 529-34.
- Wang, Miaomiao (王苗苗). "Comparative Literature in Chinese: A Survey of Books Published 2000-2013." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.6 (2013): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss6/17/>>.
- Wang, Hong (王红). "变异的本土化: 民间故事跨民族传播研究" ("The localization of mutation: dissemination of folk tales in the cross-ethnic groups"). *Social Sciences in Ningxia* 5 (2006): 143-46.
- Wang, Lei (王蕾). "比较文学、中国学派和文学变异学——佛克马教授访谈录" ("Comparative Literature, the Chinese School and the Variation Theory: An Interview with Douwe Wesse Fokkema"). *World Literature Review* 1 (2008): 7-10.
- Xiong, Muqing (熊沐清). "扩张的危机与危机的超越" ("The Crisis of Expansion and the Transcendence of Crisis"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 4(1999): 116-22.
- Xie, Tianzhen (谢天振). *译介学* (On Medio-translatology). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education P, 1999.
- Yue, Daiyun (乐黛云). "全球化时代的比较文学—中国视野" ("Comparative Literature in the Era of Globalization: A Chinese Perspective"). *Comparative Literature in China* 1(2005): 1-12.
- Zhang, Xiaohong (张晓红) and Liang Jiandong (梁建东). "The Literary Exchanges in the Cross-civilization Context: A New Field of Vision Going beyond the Human-rights Debate" ("跨文明语境中的文学交流——一种超越人权争论的新视野"). *Journal of Shenzhen University (Humanities & Social Sciences)* 3(2008): 5-10.
- Zhu, Anbo (朱安博) and Zhu, Linyun (朱凌云). "译介学的名与实" ("The Name and Nature of Medio-translatology"). *Journal of Beijing International Studies University* 8(2008): 1-5.

Zhuang, Peina (庄佩娜). "填补世界比较文学学科理论的空白——曹顺庆教授英文专著《比较文学变异学》评介" ("Fill the Theoretical Gap in World Comparative Literature—A Review of Professor Cao Shunqing's The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature"). *Foreign Literature Studies* 3(2014): 154-57.

Author's profile: Peina Zhuang (庄佩娜) teaches Comparative Literature in the College of Literature and Journalism at Sichuan University. Her interests in scholarship include Comparative Literature, inter-cultural studies, and translation studies. Zhuang's publications include "国内比较文学变异学研究综述：现状与未来" ("The Current Situation and Future of Variation Theory"), *Journal of South-Central University for Nationalities* (2015), and "On Relation Between 'Creative Treason' and Yanfu's Faithfulness, Expressiveness and Elegance in Translation", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* (2014). E-mail: <<http://peinazhuang@scu.edu.cn>>

Author's profile: Huan Pi (皮欢) studies artistic theory in the College of Literature and Journalism in Sichuan University and also teaches art in Sichuan Conservatory of Music. Her interests in scholarship include Comparative Literature, art, and music theory. Pi's publications include "四川地区基础音乐教育师资培养模式研究" ("Research on Teacher Training for Primary Music Education in Sichuan"), *Kaifeng Education Journal* (2015). E-mail: <<http://2015321030062@stu.scu.edu.cn>>