

Attitudinal Shifts between *The Newcomer* and its English Translations: A Quantitative Exploration with Contextualization

Kan Wu

Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics Dongfang College

Received: 09/04/2019

Accepted: 26/06/2019

Abstract

Drawing on the framework of Appraisal Theory and inferential statistics, the present study examines possible attitudinal shifts between *The Newcomer* --- an influential Chinese short story of the communist theme and its two English translations. Such shifts are quantitatively explored in terms of the categories, block densities and prosodies of attitudinal units, revealing some typological and pragmatical features of the attitudes under translation. It is found that such attitudinal shifts may stem from certain contextual factors (e.g. linguistic distance, cultural diversity, ideological gap) that prompt the translators to adjust their translating strategies for attitudinal adaptations. Meanwhile, the effects of these attitudinal shifts upon different target readers are varied.

Key Words

Appraisal Theory, attitudes, literary translation, shift, quantitative



Introduction

Attitude is omnipresent in almost every aspect of communication, whether it is in spoken conversations, in written communication or in semiotic exchanges. In translation research, the shifts of attitude between source text (ST) and target text (TT) are gaining increasing attention and often considered as critical points in a translator's decision-making process (Munday, 2012). Studies have been conducted to unveil how original attitudes in a ST are maintained,

brightened up or toned down in different TTs and what roles translators might play in the process. Their research topics range from attitudinal manipulations by translators through ideological (Munday, 2015; Pan, 2015) and axiological (Zhang, 2002; Pérez-González, 2007; Vandepitte et al., 2011; Zhao, 2014) repositioning, ST-TT attitudinal transfers in terms of power shifts (Munday, 2009; Rosa, 2013; Romagnuolo, 2014), register shifts (Yu, et al., 2007; Mouka et al., 2015; White, 2016) and function shifts (Yang et al., 2017), attitudinal equivalence in translated products as manifested in discursive evaluation (Rodrigues-Júnior et al., 2013; Qian, 2017) and value-laden lexis (Al-Shunnag, 2014). These studies have showed us different ways attitudes are reconstructed in translation and different choices translators make in such reconstructions. However, many of them are textually based, leaving certain contextual factors (e.g. linguistic distance, cultural diversity, ideological gap) that might lead to such differences relatively underexplored. Therefore, we believe it would be of certain value to fill this gap.

The Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) views “attitude” as an extension of the interpersonal meta-function in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) that covers three dimensions: Affect, Judgement and Appreciation. Drawing on this concept of “attitude” and the techniques of statistical significance testing, the present work explores the attitudinal shifts between an influential Chinese short story *The Newcomer* (組織部新來的青年人) and its two English translations through quantitative lens, contextualizing such shifts from both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. In this way, quantitative results of ST-TT attitudinal shifts are linked to qualitative contextualization of the shifts. The reasons for choosing *The Newcomer* are simple: a) rich attitudinal resources. Since it is a short story of communist theme that depicts sharp ideological conflicts between the old Party bureaucrats and the young revolutionists in the early days of PRC (Bjorge, 1980: 229), it contains tons of attitudinal descriptions; b) status as a masterpiece of the contemporary Chinese literature. Its vivid depictions of communist idealism and author’s artistic skills in rendering fictional details make it a masterpiece of far-reaching influences in the history of contemporary Chinese literature (He, 2003:373, Wen et al., 2016: 144). Specifically, the present study is to address the following research questions:

RQ1: How *The Newcomer* and its two English translations potentially differ in attitudes as reflected in the distributions, densities and prosodies

of attitudinal units¹?

RQ2: What are the possible contextual explanations for such differences in attitudes between the ST and two TTs through the linguistic, cultural and ideological lens?

RQ1 focuses on the possible differences in attitudes between the ST and two TTs. Such differences are explored quantitatively through statistical lens in terms of the distributions, block densities and prosodies of attitudinal units. We believe that distribution and density may tell us some typological features of attitudes, while prosody may partly reflect the pragmatic features of these attitudes. RQ2 explores some possible contextual explanations for these attitudinal shifts between the ST and two TTs through the linguistic, cultural and ideological lens. By answering these research questions, ST-TT attitudinal shifts are expounded with quantitative results, while possible contextual explanations for such shifts are sought from qualitative perspectives.

1. Method

Four English translations of this short story are currently available in the market, including Geremie Barmé's 1983 version, Gary Bjorge's 1980 abridged version (only Chapters of 1, 3, 7 and 11 are translated) and two other reduced translations by anonymous translators in 1957 and 1981. The present research will focus on the two versions by Gary Bjorge (TT1) and Geremie Barmé (TT2), because their versions were produced in the same period (i.e. the 1980s) and are the only two versions corresponding to each other from chapter to chapter. This makes the two versions ideal samples for our quantitative analysis.

To ensure data accuracy, both the ST and TTs are post-edited and further aligned at the paragraph level² in ParaConc. In this way, possible shifts between the ST and two TT could be compared. To annotate attitudes in these texts, "attitudinal units" need to be located first. In the present research, we assign each attitudinal unit with an attitudinal tag based on the classifications (e.g. "Affect", "Judgement", "Appreciation") in the Appraisal Theory. According to

¹ Attitudinal unit is defined in this research as any words or collocates that carry attitudinal or value orientations.

² Sentence level alignment is rather difficult if not impossible, since Bjorge had omitted many details of the ST.

Martin & White (2005), “Affect” is about “registering positive and negative feelings” (p.42); “Judgement” the “attitudes towards behavior, which we admire or criticize, praise or condemn” (p.42). “Appreciation” the “evaluations of semiotic and natural phenomena” (p.43). To operationalize these concepts in this study, “Affect” used as “quality” for describing participants is tagged as “(AQ[D])”, “Affect” as “process” for affective mental is “(AP[M])”, etc. The annotation is manually conducted by four well-trained researchers of this area (two of them are English L1 speakers), with the inter-rater kappa \geq 0.84 between any of the two raters to ensure the consistency and reliability of our annotating results. Full tagging details are provided in Table A of the Appendix.

2. Results

This section illustrates how different types of attitudes are presented in the ST, TT1 and TT2 and whether there are any statistically significant differences in their overall distributions, block densities and prosodies. Both parametric and non-parametric statistical tests are employed to find out possible attitudinal shifts between each text.

2.1 Distribution of Attitudinal Units

Searching in the three annotated files (i.e. ST, TT1 and TT2) for attitudinal units of different categories, we attempt to find out the frequencies of these units in the three files respectively. Table 1 shows the frequencies of ‘Affect’ in ST and TTs, Table 2 of ‘Judgement’ and Table 3 of ‘Appreciation’.

	Quality			Process		Comment
	D	A	M	M	B	C
ST	3	17	36	13	9	0
TT1 by Bjorge	5	24	20	14	16	3
TT2 by Barmé	7	46	14	13	12	0

Table 1. Frequencies of affect units in the ST and TTs

	Social Esteem			Social Sanction	
	N	C	T	V	P
ST	18	18	15	3	13

TT1 by Bjorge	7	14	7	2	5
TT2 by Barmé	19	23	3	2	8

Table 2. Frequencies of judgment units in the ST and TTs

	Reaction		Composition		Valuation
	I	Q	B	C	V
ST	2	37	1	16	28
TT1 by Bjorge	12	43	6	11	19
TT2 by Barmé	3	72	1	15	38

Table 3. Frequencies of appreciation units in the ST and TTs

We use the Pearson’s chi-squared test to find out whether there are any statistically significant differences in the distributions of attitudes between the ST, TT1 and TT2. To be concrete, we will run the two-way chi-squared tests in the three comparison groups (ST-TT1, ST-TT2 and TT1-TT2) separately based on each of the three attitudinal types. For instance, to test the distributions of ‘Affect’ among the three texts, we run the chi-squared test based on the ‘Quality’ (D, A, M) and the ‘Process’ subtypes (M, B) in the comparison groups. In the same manner, we run the same test based on the ‘Social Esteem’ (N, C, T) and the ‘Social Sanction’ subtypes (V, P) when testing the distributions of ‘Judgement’. The same test and procedure are then repeated based on the ‘Reaction’ (I, Q) and the ‘Composition’ subtypes (B, C) when testing the distributions of ‘Appreciation’. However, direct comparison is possible for the ‘Comment’ subtype (C) in ‘Affect’ and ‘the ‘Valuation subtype (V) in ‘Appreciation’, since both of them contain only one group of attitudinal data. Detailed results of the chi-squared tests are retrieved from SPSS 24.0 crosstab reports and reproduced in Table 4.

		ST vs. TT1		ST vs. TT2		TT1 vs. TT2	
		χ^2	<i>p</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Affect	Quality	5.82	0.05	23.84	<0.001	5.65	0.06
	Process	0.79	0.38	0.24	0.63	0.16	0.69
Judgement	Social Esteem	1.69	0.43	8.29	0.02	5.68	0.06
	Social Sanction	0.27	0.60	0.01	0.94	0.17	0.68

Appreciation	Reaction	5.02	0.03	0.08	0.78	9.87	0.002
	Composition	4.49	0.03	0.01	0.97	4.16	0.04

Table 4. Chi-squared tests of attitudinal distribution (α is set at 0.05)

Tests results reveal that the differences of most attitudinal units within the three comparison groups are not statistically significant, yet such statistical significance are observed in the differences of certain attitudinal units: both subtypes of ‘Appreciation’ between the ST and TT1 as well as TT1 and TT2; ‘Quality’ subtype of ‘Affect’ between the ST and two TTs; ‘Social Esteem’ subtype of ‘Judgment’ between the ST and TT2 as well as TT1 and TT2. As for the results from the direct comparisons of the ‘Comment’ subtype (C) in ‘Affect’ and ‘the ‘Valuation subtype (V) in ‘Appreciation’, notable differences are observed in the distributions of the former: there are no attitudinal units as the ‘Comment’ subtype in both the ST and TT2, but three cases are found in TT1. In addition, notable differences also exist in the ‘Valuation’ subtype: 28 cases are found in the ST, 19 cases in TT1, but 38 in TT2. Therefore, we hold that the shifts in the distribution of attitudinal units, especially between the ST and two TTs, are noteworthy.

2.2 Attitudinal Block Density

Attitudinal block density is defined in this research as the number of attitudinal units in a specified text block. It may reflect certain typological features of an attitude. To get this density, the first step is equal segmentation, which allows us to obtain the attitudinal block density based on the frequencies of attitudinal units. The present study segments all the three texts (ST, TT1, TT2) into 10 blocks of equal words or characters respectively. Since it is unlikely that each block will contain a round number of words or characters each time after the segmentation, it is necessary to leave out some words or characters that contain no attitudinal units in the end sections of these texts to ensure that the number of words or characters of each block is round for easy segmentation.

The ST, with a total number of Chinese characters of 10,889, is equally segmented into 10 blocks with each block containing 1,088 characters (9 characters that contain no attitudinal tags are left out). TT1, with a total number 6,097 words, is divided into 10 blocks ; and each of these blocks carries 609 words (7 words that contain no attitudinal tags are left out). TT2 contains 7609 words in total ; when it is separated into 10 blocks, each of these blocks incorporates 759 words (19 words that contain no attitudinal tags are

left out). Raw densities of attitudinal units in each of the ten blocks in the ST and two TTs are presented in Table B of the Appendix.

Since the block length in the ST and TTs are different, the raw densities need to be normalized based on every 1000 occurrences for decent comparability. Results of normalized densities are presented in Table 5. Since SPSS 24.0 histogram reports that these block densities are not normally distributed (mean=30, median=31.7, mode=37), we will run the Mann Whitney U test, which is the non-parametric counterpart of t test for independent samples, to compare these normalized densities of attitudinal units between each of the three texts (i.e. the ST, TT1, TT2). The purpose is to find out whether there are any statistical significances in each of the three comparison groups.

Block	ST	TT1 by Bjorge	TT2 by Barmé
1	20.22	32.84	36.89
2	13.79	36.12	36.89
3	28.49	26.27	36.89
4	12.87	27.91	34.26
5	19.3	32.84	35.57
6	13.79	18.06	30.3
7	25.74	31.2	40.84
8	21.14	37.77	30.3
9	32.17	57.47	36.89
10	22.98	41.05	44.8
Mean	21.05	34.15	36.36
SD	6.51	10.44	4.36

Table 5. Normalized Densities of Attitudinal Units in ST and TTs

The results between the ST and TT1 show that the u score is -12.000 with a significance value of 0.004, which is way below the probability cut-off value of 0.05. This shows that the difference in block densities of attitudinal units between the ST and TT1 is statistically significant. The results retrieved by repeating the same test between the ST and TT2 reveal that $u = 2.000$ and $p < 0.001$ between the ST and TT2; and $u = 37.000$ and $p = 0.324$ between TT1 and TT2. This means that the difference in the attitudinal block density is

statistically significant between the ST and TT2, but not significant between TT1 and TT2. Hence, we conclude that the shifts in attitudinal block density between the ST and two TTs are largely significant through the statistical lens and worthy of further contextualization.

2.3 Attitudinal Prosody

The definition of attitudinal prosody in this work replicates that of the of semantic prosody and is conceptualized as the ways through which an attitudinal unit is perceived (e.g. neutral, positive, negative) in a linguistic context. It is expected to reflect part of the pragmatic features of an attitudinal unit. To find out whether there are any statistically significant differences in the overall attitudinal prosodies between each of the three texts and how strong are they correlated, these texts are segmented into ten equal blocks with the same rules and techniques employed in 3.2. Similar procedures have been applied to normalize the raw frequencies of the attitudinal prosodies of these three texts based on every thousand occurrences. The results of normalized frequencies (raw frequencies are listed in Table C of the Appendix) in the three texts are presented in Table 6.

Block	ST		TT1		TT2	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
1	13.79	6.43	18.06	14.78	19.76	17.12
2	7.35	6.43	22.99	13.14	21.08	15.81
3	11.95	16.54	9.85	16.42	15.81	21.08
4	2.76	10.11	13.14	14.78	14.49	19.76
5	5.51	13.79	16.42	16.42	13.18	22.4
6	4.6	9.19	11.49	4.93	15.81	14.49
7	15.63	11.03	16.42	14.78	21.08	19.76
8	11.95	11.03	9.85	27.91	14.49	15.81
9	13.79	15.63	29.56	29.56	27.67	9.22
10	14.71	8.27	16.42	24.63	25.03	19.76
Mean	10.2	10.85	16.42	17.73	18.84	17.52

SD	4.45	3.36	5.83	7.11	4.57	3.82
----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Table 6. Normalized Frequencies of Attitudinal Prosody

Since these quantitative data are normally distributed (mean=15.2, median=14.8, mode=16.4) and there is no clear one to one sentential correspondence between the ST and two TTs, we use t-test for independent samples to find out if there are statistically significant differences in the overall attitudinal prosodies between each of the three texts. Besides, we also use Pearson’s correlation coefficient test to examine how strong are these attitudinal prosodies correlated. Detailed results are presented in Table 7.

<i>df</i> =18		t	<i>p</i>	r	<i>p</i>
ST vs. TT1	Positive	-2.451	0.02	0.24	0.497
	Negative	-2.628	0.017	0.36	0.31
ST vs. TT2	Positive	-3.970	0.001	0.63	0.048
	Negative	-4.017	0.001	0.02	0.966
TT1 vs. TT2	Positive	-0.922	0.369	0.77	0.008
	Negative	0.080	0.937	-0.29	0.412

Table 7. Differences and Correlations of Attitudinal Prosodies (α is set at 0.05)

T-test results reveal that the p-values are all lower than 0.05 within the two ST-TT pairs, but invariably above 0.05 between the two TTs. This means that the differences in the overall attitudinal prosodies are statistically significant between the ST and two TTs, but not between the two TTs. On the other hand, the results from Pearson’s r reveal that the correlations of attitudinal prosodies are not statistically significant between the ST and two TTs, as the p-values are greater than 0.05 (except for the correlation of positive attitudinal units between the ST and TT2, where the p-value is 0.048), but significant between the two TTs in terms of positive attitudinal units, as the p-value equals 0.008. In terms of correlation intensity, we hold that the r value is in direct proportion to the strength of such correlation. Consequently, the strongest tendency is found in the positive attitudinal units between TT1 and TT2, while the weakest tendency is detected in the negative attitudinal units between the ST and TT2. All these results could possibly suggest that the shifts in attitudinal prosody are notable between the ST and two TTs, but less obvious between the two TTs.

3 Discussion

The results in Sections 2 reveal that the differences of attitudes as reflected in the distribution, block density and prosody of attitudinal units are far from being fully statistically significant between the two TTs, but somehow significant between the ST and two TTs. This might indicate that while Bjorge and Barmé share certain similarities in their translations of Chinese attitudinal descriptions, they both adjust the ST attitudinal resources in their TTs. Contextual explanations for such attitudinal shifts are worth exploring, as they reflect certain “critical points in translator’s decision-making” (Munday 2012: 41). As far as *The Newcomer* and its two English translations are concerned, we attempt to seek these contextual explanations through linguistic, cultural and ideological lens, discussing their potential effects of on the target readers.

3.1 Linguistic Distance and POS Conversion

While the English language belongs to the Indo-European language family, the Chinese language is a typical Sino-Tibetan language (Ekkehard 2013). This means that compared with language pairs from the same language family, Chinese and English are relatively distant, since they belong to different language families. Consequently, parts-of-speech (POS) conversion of some words between the ST and two TTs, as a possible means to lexically shorten the distance between Chinese and English, would be necessary if the translators were to produce translations of decent linguistic smoothness and semantic coherence. As far as *The Newcomer* is concerned, we argue that POS conversions (both obligatory and optional) are likely to trigger ST-TT shifts in the distributions of attitudinal units. This is because when some words of an attitudinal unit change their POS, the type of this attitudinal unit is likewise to change; and when the number of such POS conversion reaches a certain level, the overall distributions of attitudinal units would alter in the translated texts. Given the relatively great linguistic distance (i.e. Sino-Tibetan vs. Indo-European) between Chinese and English, POS conversion between the two languages could be frequent enough to become a critical point in a translator’s translating decision. Following are examples illustrating how the two translators converse “adjectives” and “verbs” into other POS categories and consequently alter the types of attitudinal units in *The Newcomer* and its two English translations:

Example (1):

ST: 她的蒼白(AR[Q])(/adj.) (/+)而美麗(AR[Q])(/adj.) (/+)的臉上, 兩隻大眼睛閃著友善(JSS[P]) (/adj.) (/+)親切(JSS[P]) (/adj.) (/+)的光亮... (Wang, 2003: 85)

(Literal translation: On her pale but beautiful face, her two big eyes shine with friendly and affectionate brightness...)

TT1: Two large eyes sparkled with friendliness (AQ[M]) (/n.) (/+) and affection (AQ[M]) (/n.) (/+) in her pale (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+), beautiful (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+) face ... (Bjorge, 1980: 230)

TT2: She had a pale (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+), yet very pretty (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+) face and her large eyes were smiling (JSE[N]) (/v.) ... (Barmé, 1983: 72)

Example (1) is the direct characterization of our female protagonist, where the two adjectives of “友善” (friendly) and “親切” (affectionate), being the information focus of the whole sentence, are translated into two nouns “friendliness” and “affection” in TT1, but into one verb “smiling” in TT2. This changes the attitudinal types of the two Chinese adjectives from (JSS[P]) in the ST to (AQ[M]) in TT1 and (JSE[N]) in TT2. We believe that such POS conversions are largely obligatory, because if we follow the sentence structure of the ST and literally render this sentence into English (as is the case in “Literal translation”), the information focus carried by the two Chinese adjectives will stay at the end of the translated English sentence. Consequently, this will convey a potentially different message to the target readers of English, since some studies (e.g. Cormack et al. 2000, Zhi-hong 2001, Benito 2009) claim that an English sentence sometimes follows the “fronting” principle by placing its information focus in the front for better emphasis. In our view, this also stems from the professed linguistic distance between the two languages; and to shorten such distance in translation, POS conversion would be obligatory. However, POS conversion of this obligatory kind is not everything. Sometimes, attitudinal shifts would be also triggered by an optional POS conversion, which is likewise a translator’s decision to lexically shorten the distance between the two languages. Example (2) is a case of the optional POS conversion.

Example (2):

ST: 他努力(JSE[T]) (/adv.) (/+)工作, 但是他做的少(JSE[C]) (/adv.) (/-)、慢(JSE[C]) (/adv.) (/-)、差(JSE[C]) (/adv.) (/-)。和青年積極分子們比較, 和飛奔(AR[I]) (/adj.)的生活比較, 難道能安慰(AP[B]) (/v.)自己嗎? (Wang, 2003: 93)

(Literal translation: He worked hard, but he also worked less, worked slowly and performed poorly . Compared with other young activists with dashing pace of life, how could he still comfort himself?)

TT1: He worked hard (JSE[T]) (/adv.) (/+), but if the amount (/n.) of work he did and the speed (/n.) with which he did it were compared to the accomplishments of the young activists or the swiftness with which his life was flying by, of what possible comfort (AQ[A]) (/n.) could this be to him? (Bjorge, 1980: 233)

TT2: He put all of his energy into his work, but he felt dissatisfied (AQ[A]) (/v.) (/-) with what he did when he compared himself with other young people, or considered the pressing (AR[I]) (/adj.) (/-) demands of life, he felt unfulfilled(AQ[A]) (/adj.) (/-) and empty(AQ[A]) (/adj.) (/-.). (Barmé, 1983: 73)

This example focuses on the narrator's comment on the work of our male protagonist, in which three adverbs “少” (less), “慢” (slow) and “差” (poor) in the ST are used to evaluate his work performance. Attitudinally, they all function as (JSE[C]), namely, the “Social Esteem” subtype of “Judgment” to show capacity. However, when they are rendered into English, they become one adverb and two nouns in TT1 and only one verb in TT2. Meanwhile, such POS conversion has attitudinally shifted the three adverbs in the ST from (JSE[C]) to some attitudinally-neutral words (e.g. “amount” and “speed”) in TT1 and to (AQ[A]) in TT2. Compared with the POS conversions in Example (1), we find that the conversion in Example (2) is more optional than obligatory, as a potential literal translation (as is the case in “Literal translation”) without neither POS conversions nor attitudinal shifts seems to work as a feasible alternative. Therefore, Example (2) might suggest that optional POS conversions may also become a translator's toolkit to shorten the linguistic distance between the two languages to produce smooth and coherent TTs. Worth stressing is the latent effect of such obligatory and optional POS conversions and the consequent ST-TT attitudinal shifts casued upon readers' comprehensions of the author's attitude. In the case of *The Newcomer*, it is possible that the target readers' impression of certain attitudes in the ST would

alter as they read the two English translations. For instance in Example (2), while all the bolded attitudinal units in the ST are likely to impress the target readers with author's strong negative attitudes towards the young protagonist's working manner for the "grand cause" of the communist party, the same attitude conveyed in the two TTs is weakened by converting the three adverbs into adjective, nouns or verbs in a fashion that mitigates the semantic intensity of the original. Consequently, such strong negative attitude in the ST is lost in the translation, leaving the target readers weakened attitudinal impressions.

3.2 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Manipulation

Cultural diversity between China and the English-speaking countries is another contextual explanation that may account for the attitudinal shifts between *The Newcomer* and its two English TTs. The present work believes that such cultural diversity will also affect a translator's translating decision, which is sometimes foregrounded as the manipulation of some cultural details. In the case of *The Newcomer* and its two English TTs, we find that both translators sometimes manipulate (i.e. omit or replace) the ST when there are fictional details that are culturally specific to the Chinese communist practices. This is likely to trigger shifts of attitudes between the ST and two TTs, especially in terms of the numbers and prosodies of some culturally-loaded attitudinal units. This is partly reflected in the observed statistical significance of the normalized attitudinal block density as well as attitudinal prosody between the ST and two TTs. Example (3) is an excerpt of indirect characterization, where both translators have replaced a culturally negative Chinese expression of the ST with something different in their TTs.

Example (3):

ST: 他從部隊裡轉業，在中央一個部裡作科長，他慢慢地染上了一種油條勁兒(JSS[V]) (/adj.) (/ -)，爭地位、爭待遇，和別人不團結....

(Literal translation: He was transferred from the army, and is now a section leader in the central government. He gradually got himself into a habit of oil-sticking, namely, fighting for promotion and position; and he is not cooperative with people around him.)

TT1: He had come out of the military and was a section head in a central ministry. Gradually he became rather slick (JSS[V]) (/adj.) (/ -), competing for position and material rewards, and failing to cooperate with others....

TT2: He'd just been demobilized and had been transferred to work in a central government ministry as a section head. He engaged himself in promotion (/+) and started competing with everyone for a better position and more privileges....

In this example, “油條勁兒” (the oil-sticking habit) is a Chinese metaphor, which often connotes a complete negative tone, referring to a worldly and irresponsible way of doing things. Nevertheless, “slick” in TT1 conveyed only a semi-negative attitude, since this attitudinal unit (word) also connotes an positive attitude in English³. Meanwhile, the expression “engaged himself in promotion” in the TT2 seems to imply something opposite, namely, a quasi-positive attitude. We argue that one possible explanation for this shift of attitudinal prosody could be the cultural specificity of this Chinese metaphorical expression, which has prompted the two translators to culturally manipulate and contextually adapt in their TTs. Such manipulation and adaptation may arise from the two translators’ considerations of the different cultural stances towards personal development in communist and capitalist countries: the former often values collectivism, in which sacrifice of personal gains and promotion to that of the masses (esp. Party organizations) is encouraged and valued, while failure to do so is often regarded as being irresponsible (Triandis 1995: 135); by contrast, the latter seldom associates personal gains and promotion with work responsibilities (Triandis 1995: 136). Even today, with an accelerated pace of intercultural communication, some differences in these cultural stances are still valid in P.R. China and many Western countries, let alone in the 1980s when the two English translations were produced. Therefore, we believe that the manipulation of this culturally-loaded word “油條勁兒” in both TTs may be the two translators’ intentions to minimize possible cultural misinterpretations of their target readers.

In addition to replacement, translators sometimes omit or retain certain culturally-loaded ST fictional details in their TTs. For instance, Example (4) is an excerpt of story setting that presents readers with some daily routines in the Chinese communist “Organizational Department”.

³ Based on two well-trained researchers’ generalization of its semantic prosody in the BYU-BNC concordances (top 100)

Example (4)

ST: 人們都在**忙碌**(AQ[A]): 一個穿軍服的同志夾著皮包**匆匆**(JSE[C])走過, 傳達室的老呂提著兩個大鐵壺給會議室送茶水, 可以聽見一個女同志**頑強地**(JSE[T])對著電話機子說: '不行, 最遲明天早上! 不行?' 還可以聽見**忽快忽慢的**(AC[B])啞啞聲—是一隻**生疏的**(JSE[C])手使用著打字機。

(Literal translation: People there are busy: a comrade in military uniform is hurriedly passing by; Mr. Old Lü is bringing two iron buckets of hot water to the conference room; a female comrade is talking on the phone in harsh and firm tone: 'No, tomorrow morning is the deadline! Never?'. One can also heard a novel hand hitting the keyboard of a typewriter with varied paces.)

TT1: **Everyone was busy** (AQ[A])

TT2: There was an air of **bustle**(AQ[A]): someone in uniform **brushed** (JSE[C]) past him with a briefcase, the porter in reception was taking a couple of thermoses to the conference room and a woman could be heard saying on the phone, 'No, **not good** enough (AR[Q]) (adj.) (-). Tomorrow morning at the latest. No...." He could also hear someone typing, but it was very **slow** (AR[Q]) (adj.) (-) and **unsure** (AR[Q]) (adj.) (-).

When rendering this fictional setting, Bjorge tends to omit these details in his TT1 while Barmé would keep them in his TT2. This makes the attitudinal block densities of the two TTs quite different. In our eyes, despite the two translators are different in the ways they manipulate this setting, they are similar as they have both paid due attention to those culturally-loaded fictional details about the daily routines of some communist bureaucratic organizations. It is assumed that target readers who are less familiar with the Chinese communist cultures may find this setting largely incomprehensible. Therefore, Bjorge's omission may gain his TT1 better accessibility, while Barmé's reservation of the same details is likely to make his TT2 comparatively inscrutable, since not all of the target readers will be familiar with the communist cultures in China. On the other hand, target readers with some knowledge of the communist cultures will find this very setting kept by Barmé reasonable, but may somehow regard Bjorge's omission of the same setting as a sort of under-translation.

3.3 Ideological Gap and Ideological Intervention

Ideological gap between communist China and capitalist countries in the West is likewise a contextual explanation that may interpret the attitudinal shifts between *The Newcomer* and its two English TTs. As *The Newcomer* sets its backdrop against the early years (the 1950s) of communist China, some of its ideological details may become the “critical points” in a translator’s decision-making when he/she renders them into English. Specifically, these details that contain certain communist memes might trigger the two translators’ ideological interventions, causing attitudinal shifts between *The Newcomer* and its two English TTs. Such shifts are sometimes echoed in the changed prosody values of some ideologically-loaded attitudinal units and supported by our results from Pearson correlation coefficient tests, which report some rather tenuous ST-TT correlations but a robust TT-TT correlation in terms of attitudinal prosody. This could possibly mean that the two TTs do deviate from the ST regarding attitudinal prosody, but when the TTs are compared with each other, they show certain similarities in the ways the two translators handle some attitudinal prosodies in the ST. Example (5) is a narrator comment which shows how a communist ideological component is attitudinally shifted between the ST and both TTs:

Example (5)

ST: 把党的生活建立在集体(JSE[C]) (/adj.) (/+) 领导、批评和自我批评
.... (Wang, 2003: 86)

(Literal translation: We live our Party life upon collective leadership, criticism and self-criticism...)

TT1: We are developing and strengthening the party, making the organization solid (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+), and increasing the power of the leadership, criticism and self-criticism.... (Bjorge, 1980: 231)

TT2: We must base the work of the party on collective (AC[B]) (/adj.) (/n) leadership, criticism and self-criticism.... (Barmé, 1983: 74)

The word “集体” (collective) in the ST functions as a positive attitudinal unit to praise the communist leadership, whereas such positive unit was omitted in TT1 and lost in TT2. In TT1, we tend to believe that Bjorge omits “集体” for a better ideological adaptation of his TT to the target readers. This could be partly justified from his translating strategy, as is explained in 4.1 and 4.2, which seems to emphasize a smooth TT reading experience. In TT2, Barmé

literally renders “集體” as “collective”, an attitudinal unit which, according to our generalization⁴ of its semantic prosody in the BYU-BNC concordances (top 100), seems to be mostly neutral. We believe this might be Barmé’s manipulation of the contextual meaning of this attitudinal unit, since his translating strategy as discussed in 4.1 and 4.2 makes us believe that he tends to keep the ST information in his TT. As a result, the target readers of both TTs might have different reading experiences: while TT1 may give its target readers better readability, it bars them from accessing to the author’s original attitude in the ST ideologically; TT2 might give its readers less readability, but presents them with the author’s original ideological stance in the ST. However, things would be more complex on the target readers’ side: readers of both TTs who are more familiar with the communist ideology are likely to find “collectivism” reasonable, while those who are less familiar with such ideology would find it ideologically alien. Such divided responses on the part of the target readers could be further illustrated in Example (6), which centers on the story plot about an argument between two characters over the use of their time in daily work.

Example (6)

ST: 他說:提意見是好的, 不過應該掌握分寸, 也應該看時間、場合。現在, 我們不應該因為個人意見侵佔黨支部討論國家任務的寶貴(AV)(/adj.)(/+)時間。’好, 不佔用寶貴(AV) (/adj.)(/+) 時間, 我找他提, 於是我們倆吵成了現在這個樣子。” (Wang, 2003: 83)

(Literal translation: He said: “it is fine to give advice, but you need to do it in a proper way: at the right time and in the right place. Now, we should not use the Party branch’s precious time for the discussion of national tasks to talk about your opinion.” Fine, I will not use this precious time. So, I went to him for suggestion, and this is how we ended up quarreling like this.)

TT1: (the corresponding part was OMITTED by Bjorge) ...

TT2: ‘It is good to make criticisms, but you should be sure of your facts, keep a balance, and choose the best (AR[Q]) (/adj.) (/+) time and place. We shouldn’t waste precious (AV) (/adj.) (/+) time at party meetings on personal (AV) (/adj.) views when we ought to be discussing our work for the State.’ But if I don’t take up the ‘precious (AV) (/adj.) (/+) time’ of our meetings and go and

⁴ The generalization is unanimously made by two well-trained researchers in Corpus Linguistics.

see him privately then we'll end up with a row like the one you've just seen."
(Barmé, 1983: 81)

Because the argument in Example (6) revolves around whether to use the precious time to voice personal opinions or discuss national tasks, different ideologies may have different views towards this issue. Hence, it is likely to become the two translators' "critical point" in their English translations. Ideologically, communist China values collectivism over individualism, and this is contrary to the general capitalist ideology that values individual rights (Schwartz, 1990: 140). In TT1, Bjorge omitted this content altogether, eliminating this ideological critical point. By contrast, Barmé adjusted by using two additional attitudinal units (i.e. "best" and "personal") to render this detail in his TT2. In our opinion, Bjorge's omission may once again limit his target readers' access to this ideological component in the ST; whereas Barmé addition of attitudinal units may explicate this communist ideological component to his readers. On the side of target readers, their varied familiarity with communist ideology may also give them different reading experiences. For those who are less familiar with the communist ideology, they may feel at loss when reading this fictional detail; but for those of certain familiar with this ideology, they are more likely to understand this fictional detail. Consequently, the "power shift" of this communist ideology would enjoy different levels within the two reader-groups: the level is expected to be higher among readers of greater familiarity with this ideology than those of the less.

3.4 Translators' Backgrounds

Based on the findings, we sense that while both Barmé and Bjorge attempt to bridge the linguistic distances between Chinese and English via POS conversions (obligatory and optional), they make different efforts on rendering some culturally- or ideologically- loaded fictional details in *The Newcomer*. Generally, Bjorge tends to omit those details in his English translation, bringing the ST author attitudinally close to his target readers. By contrast, Barmé inclines to keep or adjust those details, adopting a more attitudinally balanced translating strategy between the ST author and his TT readers. The present work believes that translators' different translating strategies might be connected to their different career backgrounds.

Bjorge is an American military historian dedicated to the translation of Chinese literary works into English (Huber et al., 2002:317). His English translations of Chinese literature cover a wide range of themes: from military histories,

communist fiction to feminist works (WorldCat Identities, 2019). Meanwhile, his career with the US Army Command and the General Staff College (Huber, 2002:317) also makes us believe that part of his motivation of translating Chinese literature into English may lie in equipping the US army with certain knowledge of China, so that they could better understand certain issues related to China. To some extent, this might also help explain Bjarne's translating strategies, which tend to adjust the ST form and content for a better adaptation of his TT towards the target readers.

On the other hand, online profile (Australian National University, 2019) shows that Barmé is an active Australian Sinologist, who received his education in China back to the 1970s. He had co-authored with the renowned Sinologist John Minford in translating Chinese classics and contemporary literary works. In his theory of New Sinology, he argues for a “robust engagement with contemporary China and Chinese” (Barmé 2005). In *The Newcomer*, such engagement is fully manifested in his translating strategies (e.g. foreignization, manipulation) which follow the ST closely. But in our view, such strategies would sometimes trigger ST-TT shifts in certain cultural or ideological components due to different contextual meanings of an attitudinal unit in a ST and its TT(s).

Conclusions

The present study, under the framework of Appraisal Theory, examines how attitudes are differently presented in *The Newcomer* and its two English translations quantitatively. Statistical significances are found regarding the differences in the distribution, block density and prosody of various attitudinal units between the ST and two TTs; by contrast such significances are not reported in the same differences of those attitudinal units between the two TTs. In addition to these quantitative results, we also find that the linguistic distance between Chinese and English as well as the professed cultural diversity and ideological gap between communist China and capitalist countries in the West are likely to be the contextual explanations for some attitudinal shifts in *The Newcomer* and its two English translations under the translators' manipulations.

In the end, it is worth stressing that what the present study has offered is more than mere quantitative results of some attitudinal shifts between a Chinese

short story and its two English translations. It also shows the roles certain contextual factors (e.g. linguistic, cultural and ideological) might play in affecting a translator's translating decision, triggering possible attitudinal shifts between a ST and its TT(s). However, it is also necessary to point out that the "Graduation" of attitude, although could have been usefully developed, is not explored in this research. This is because our pilot study shows that the attitudinal shifts between each of the three texts in terms of graduation are petty, with most attitudinal units levelled-off across the three texts. But for further research along this line, "Graduation" can be incorporated to build stronger theoretical ties between the Appraisal Theory and quantitative-oriented descriptive translation studies. Furthermore, the potential effects of attitudinal shifts between a ST and its TT(s) on target readers' receptions could be explored to build stronger ties between attitudinal shifts and readers in translation.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his sincere thanks to Dr. Dechao Li of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions in the writing of this article.

References

- Al-Shunnag, M. A. (2014). *Stance in political discourse: Arabic translations of American newspaper opinion articles on the 'Arab Spring.'* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Salford, UK.
- Australian National University (2018). *Professor Geremie Barme*. Retrieved April 08, 2019, from <https://researchers.anu.edu.au/researchers/barme-gr>.
- Barmé, G. (1983). The Newcomer (by Wang Meng). In Liu, B. (ed.), *Fragrant Weeds: Chinese Short Stories Once Labelled as "Poisonous Weeds"*. Hong Kong: Cheng & Tsui Company.
- Barmé, G. (2005). On new sinology. *Chinese Studies Association of Australia Newsletter*, 31.
- Benito, L. (2009). *Object and complement fronting in the English clause* (Dissertation), Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

- Bjorge, G. (1980). The Young Man Who Has Just Arrived at the Organization Department (by Wang Meng). In. Hsu, Kao-yu (ed.), *Literature of the People's Republic of China*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Chen, M. & Wen, J. (2013). A Research on the English Translations of Bai Juyi's Poems from the Perspective of Attitude in Appraisal Theory. *Foreign Language Education*, 34(4), 99-104.
- Chen, M. (2007). Attitudinal Resources in Journalism and Their Chinese Translations. *Shanghai Journal of Translators*, (1), 23-27.
- Cormack, A., & Smith, N. (2000). *Fronting: The Syntax and Pragmatics of "Focus" and "Topic"*. Technical report, UCL Working Papers in Linguistics.
- He, L. (2003). *Literary Critics on Wang Meng's Work*. Qingdao: China Ocean University Press.
- Huber, T. M. et al. (2002). *Compound warfare: That fatal knot*. Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Press.
- Li, J. (2009). Unraveled Mysteries of Wang Meng's *Zuzhibu Xinlaide Qinnianren*. *The Great Wall*. (3):162-173.
- Liu, S. (2012). A Model of Translation Process Within Appraisal Theory. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 33(4), 24-28.
- Martin, J. R. and White, P. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*, London: Palgrave.
- Mouka, E., Saridakis, I. E., & Fotopoulou, A. (2015). Racism goes to the movies: A corpus-driven study of cross-linguistic racist discourse annotation and translation analysis. In C. Fantinuoli & F. Zanettin (Eds.), *New directions in corpus-based translation studies* (pp. 35-70). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Munday, J. (2009). The concept of the interpersonal in translation. *SYNAPS*, 23, 15-27.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation*. New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2015). Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning. *Target*, 27(3), 406-421. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.94.05mun>
- Pan, L. (2015). Ideological positioning in news translation: A case study of evaluative resources in reports on China. *Target*, 2(27), 215-237. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.27.2.03pan>

- Pérez-González, L. (2007). Appraising dubbed conversation: Systemic functional insights into the construal of naturalness in translated film dialogue. *The Translator*, 13(1), 1-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799227>
- Qian, H. (2017). Investigating “unfaithful” translations via the appraisal theory: A case study of public notices. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 1(1), 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol1no1.13>
- Rodrigues-Júnior, A. S., & Barbara, L. (2013). Linguistic constructions of appraisal in the novel the picture of Dorian Gray and its Brazilian translation and adaptations: An exploratory analysis. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 13(1), 259-285. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1984-63982013000100013>
- Romagnuolo, A. (2014). (Re)interpreting human rights: The case of the “torture memos” and their translation into Italian. *Humanities*, 3, 313-339. <https://doi.org/10.3390/h3030313>
- Rosa, A. A. (2013). The power of voice in translated fiction: Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies. In C. Way, S. Vandepitte, R. Meylaerts, & M. Bartłomiejczyk (Eds.), *Tracks and treks in translation studies* (pp. 223-245). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.108.12ros>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism–collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21 (2): 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022190212001>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. New York: Routledge.
- Vandepitte, S., Vandenbusschea, L., & Algoeta, B. (2011). Travelling certainties: Darwin’s doubts and their Dutch translations. *The Translator*, 17(2), 275-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2011.10799490>
- Wang, M. (2003). *Zuzhibu Xinlaide Qinnianren*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House.
- Wen, F. & Zhang, B. (2016). *One Story and One Era: The Newcomer*. Qingdao: China Ocean University Press.
- White, P. R. R. (2016). Constructing the “stranger” in Camus’ L’Etranger: Registerial and attitudinal variability under translation. *The Journal of Translation Studies*, 17(4), 75-106. <https://doi.org/10.15749/jts.2016.17.4.004>
- WorldCat Identities. (2019). *Bjorge, Gary J. Overview*. Retrieved April 08, 2019, from <https://worldcat.org/identities/lccn-n88200093/>
- Xie, G. (2009). Comparative Study of Two Versions of *Zuzhibu Xinlaide Qinnianren*. *Journal of Hubei Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 29 (1):148-149.

- Yang, B., Sun, J. & Cao, C. (2017). Translation of Travel Guides from the Perspective of Appraisal Theory: A Case Study of Lonely Planet: Jamaica. *Journal of Fuzhou University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 31(1), 80-85.
- Yu, J. & Qi L. (2007). Realization of Appraisal Meanings in the Eight English Translations of Hao Liao Ge. *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*, 15(2), 45-48.
- Zhang, M. (2002). Appraisal and the Translator's Attitude. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, (7), 15-18.
- Zhang, M. (2013). Stance and Mediation in Transediting News Headlines as Paratexts. *Perspectives*, 21(3), 396-411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2012.691101>
- Zhao, H. (2014). On the Subjectivity of Interpreter with the Appraisal Theory. *Yumenxuekan*, (4), 64-65.
- Zhi-hong, S. H. A. O. (2001). A Contrastive Study of English and Chinese "Weight" Tendencies in the Syntactic Structure [J]. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 3.

Appendix

Affect	Judgement	Appreciation
(AQ[D]) Quality/Description	(JSE[N]) Social Esteem/Normality	(AR[I]) Reaction/Impact
(AQ[A]) Quality/Attribution	(JSE[C]) Social Esteem/Capacity	(AR[Q]) Reaction/Quality
(AQ[M]) Quality/Manner of Process	(JSE[T]) Social Esteem/Tenacity	(AC[B]) Composition/Balance
(AP[M]) Process/Affective Mental	(JSS[V]) Social Sanction/Veracity	(AC[C]) Composition/ Complexity
(AP[B]) Process/Affective Behavioral	(JSS[P]) Social Sanction/Propriety	(AV) Valuation
(AC) Comment	(JSS[N]) Social Sanction/Normality	

Table A. Tags for Attitudinal Annotation

Block	ST	T [*] T1 by Bjorge	T [*] T2 by Barmé
1	22	20	28
2	15	22	28
3	31	16	28
4	14	17	26
5	21	20	27
6	15	11	23
7	28	19	31
8	23	23	23
9	35	35	28
10	25	25	34

Table B. Raw Frequencies of Attitudinal Units in ST and TTs

Block	ST		TT1 by Bjorge		TT2 by Barmé	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
1	15	7	11	9	15	13
2	8	7	14	8	16	12
3	13	18	6	10	12	16
4	3	11	8	9	11	15
5	6	15	10	10	10	17
6	5	10	7	3	12	11
7	17	12	10	9	16	15
8	13	12	6	17	11	12
9	15	17	18	18	21	7
10	16	9	10	15	19	15

Table C. Raw Frequencies of Attitudinal Prosody in ST and TTs