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Abstract

Translation, rather than a process of equivalency, requires linguistic and cultural mediation on behalf of the translator. Thought of in this way, the translation process becomes a process of rewriting to fit the sociolinguistic context, and the translator becomes the most important factor in determining how well a translation can fill in gaps present in the knowledge of the target audience. To provide a better understanding of how those with no training in translation seek to fit a translation to the linguistic audience they are provided, I conducted a study of two native bilingual Chinese students on the Wadsworth version of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* that includes an intake fluency questionnaire, a translation session, and an exit interview. While I sought to provide answers to both the Christian and translation community on how best to train future young professionals, I instead discovered the influence of identity of translation.
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Introduction

Since Shakespeare's introduction into Chinese culture in 1856, many have attempted an adequate translation of his works. Such attempts require the possession of cultural, linguistic, and historical knowledge because, as Chen-Hsien Chang says, "[a] translation is primarily for those readers who have no knowledge at all of the foreign language upon which the text is based" (115). Inga-Stina Ewbank furthers Chang's definition and defines translation as "[not] purely a philological activity but a collusive re-creation in which cultural differences cling to grammar and syntax and history mediates even single words…translation, then, is only one form of re-writing, and needs to be thought about and studied as such" (6-7). Naturally, if translating can be thought of as rewriting, the act of translation ensures that differences will arise through changes in language, ideology, or poetics (Lefevere 124). Such changes depend on the translator, which suggests that the translator heavily influences how a piece is interpreted and understood in another culture. While the translator is the most important factor in interpretation, there are also times in which outside influences, such as the impact of patronage or governmental control, may also change how a translation is construed. This is known as the double control factor theory, which is an idea that features prominently in the study of translation poetics. Translation poetics brings in the study of a translator's literary and translation training to facilitate an understanding of why certain choices were made for the translation's target audience.

While much is known about the effect of the double control factor theory on the translation poetics of those trained in translation theory, little is known about the effect of the theory on the translation poetics of native speakers of Chinese who are untrained. I argue that because most Chinese bilingual students have no practical training in translation theory yet have
much experience "translating" between Chinese and English, they will be unable to produce an adequate translation of Shakespeare that shows sensitivity to both the linguistic and cultural systems in place. I also argue that each participant will approach the act of translating differently due to their unique preconceived notions about literature that have been established through their schooling, which shows that the double factor theory still applies. To test this, I intend on conducting a qualitative study of several native Chinese bilingual students that will be chosen through a questionnaire and having them translate a passage of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to further understand if participants will be able to identify their audience’s values and use this to inform their translations. Once an understanding of this has been reached, future research can be done on how to best train future young translators.

**Significance as a Christian Scholar**

The issue of how translation poetics affects translations should be important to Christians because both Christians and translators share the same task of being conveyors of truth: while Christians are called to share the truth of Christ, translators must communicate as clearly as possible the heart of what another party is saying. Without careful translation of Shakespeare into Chinese, relationships between Christians and those who are unsaved in China can be broken or even destroyed permanently due to bad translations that lead to cultural misprision or in some cases the erasure of culture. Both problems are important to guard against in light of globalization and the influence of the Internet, which can make it appear as if everyone is the same culturally; however, this is far from the truth. Very often cultural differences are more vast than we may realize, but great beauty exists in the variety of cultural practices throughout the world, and to not recognize the differences between various cultures is to not honor God because all cultures were created individually by Him. In this sense, translators also play the same role
that Christians do in peacemaking, as translators can promote cultural understanding. Specifically in the context of Shakespeare in China, inaccurate translations can lead to misunderstandings of Christianity as Shakespeare’s texts often deal with Christian themes. Such misunderstandings can make sharing the gospel more difficult with Chinese people, while more culturally representative translations can provide an avenue with which to teach those truths most central to the Christian life.

As a Christian scholar in literature studies, I believe that no greater goal exists than the promotion of relationships that are formed through the cross-cultural translation of literature, and I am particularly interested in how translation between cultures affects cultural understanding and, conversely, misunderstanding. In my study of translation and how it is conducted, I hope to provide some answers that will be of use to the Christian community in learning how to create translations that are not just accurate or aesthetically pleasing, but conducive to creating and to maintaining and improving cross-cultural relationships. In doing so, I hope to incorporate several of the seven principles from the Religious Tract Society which was established in Britain and was primarily concerned with translating, publishing, and distributing Christian works in nineteenth-century China. The principles that I hope to utilize in my thesis are principle three, which mentions that translations should be plain in order to be understood; principle four, which says that translations should be striking, lively representations of truth; principle five, which states that translations should be entertaining and delivered in the medium of narrative; principle six, which suggests that translations should be full of ideas because the value will rise with the amount of truth that exists within the text; and principle seven, which states that translations should be adapted to various situations and conditions (Lai).
Chapter Descriptions

Chapter 1 – Introduction

This section will provide a brief history of Shakespeare and his exposure to Chinese culture. Shakespeare was introduced to China by a translator named Lin Qinnan who used Shakespeare’s works to argue that the Chinese culture had value during a moment when the culture was under attack by reformers from the inside who believed that foreign culture was more civilized than their own (“Shakespeare in China” 4). Reformers felt that citizens needed to be modernized, and they believed the way to do that was not only to embrace Western technology and weaponry, but also to adopt foreign literary works. While many were unsure how Shakespeare would align with the current culture, Shakespeare was sold as someone who wrote 神怪小说 (shén guài xiǎo shuō) or stories of gods and spirits, which was a genre of literature familiar to Chinese readers and thus able to be more easily accepted than other writers of that particular era in Chinese history. Therefore, the introduction of Shakespeare accomplished two goals: to the reformers, the adoption of Shakespeare brought more value to the Chinese culture; but to those who were unwilling to adopt foreign culture, the adoption of Shakespeare was meant to prop up value hidden in their own culture.

Perhaps if Lin hadn’t assigned the Chinese 神怪小说 tag to Shakespeare’s work, Shakespeare would not exist in China today, as prior to 1922 his works had never been translated into Chinese and he was not studied in schools (15). The years between 1920 and 1949 saw a significant surge in Chinese translation of Shakespeare’s works, most notably by Zhu Shenghao, whose complete works of Shakespeare was published in 1978 well after his death. What has followed since then has been criticism of the plays, better translations and productions, and even classes on the playwright (Berry 212). As Shakespeare has become more popular in China,
scholarly debate in the field of translation has mostly been on the translation poetics of several well-known translators; however, little to no work has been conducted on the impact of translation poetics on those who have no training in translation theory, and this is the gap in the research I hope to fill.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

This section will begin with a short history of the field of translation studies and examine how Lefevre’s double control factor theory revolutionized the way that translation was viewed as it began to be seen as a means of cultural mediation rather than a purely linguistic phenomenon. The literature review will then move to consider the general problems that arise when translating between Chinese and English, such as non-equivalency, which causes either intension or overextension; multiple words that must represent a single concept between languages; and also derivation, or the way in which certain images cause specific emotional reactions. Finally, the literature review will discuss the challenges in translating Shakespeare cross-culturally, such as the loss of some words between Shakespeare’s time and the present, the difficulty in translating puns, and the possible confusion raised by differences in politics, religion, science, and mythology.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

The study will survey twelve to fifteen native Chinese bilingual students’ translations of a passage found in Wadsworth’s version of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* to determine how well participants with no previous training in translation can adhere to the sociolinguistic context provided to them and to determine if participants with no classical training in translation are bound by the double control factor theory. I chose ten to twelve because the study is quite in depth and some variety is needed to truly answer the research question at hand without
introducing too many variables that would make it difficult to draw a significant conclusion from the data. *Hamlet* was chosen as the play to be translated because most Chinese students have some familiarity with this work and because adequate translation of this work will require some cultural mediation on behalf of the translator. After some research on the ease of readability of various Shakespeare versions, I settled on the Wadsworth text because it is known for its simple language, and while there will be differences in fluency levels among participants, I would like to reduce the amount of influence that differences in language can have on understanding to control the variables that can influence my study. In terms of themes I would like to look at, I would like to specifically explore Christian themes of human mortality as *Hamlet* provokes much discussion about what happens after death, and this theme will require participants to shift their language to put terms specific to Christianity into words that others can understand simply.

Before the chosen participants will translate, a preliminary questionnaire will be given to determine how bilingual the participant is, as there are different degrees of linguistic competency. Rather than creating my own questionnaire, I plan to use Blumenfeld and Kaushanskaya’s Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q) because it is commonly used by researchers in the field to gain a comprehensive understanding of adult subjects’ bilingualism from the view of the participants themselves. While such self-reporting measures may seem unreliable, the questionnaire has been validated by multiple studies since the questionnaire’s introduction in 2007 (Krizman, Skoe, Marian & Kraus, 2014; Ansaldo, Ghazi-Saidi & Adrover-Roig, 2015; Blumenfeld, Schroeder, Bobb, Freeman & Marian, 2016; Schroeder & Marian, 2012). The questionnaire collects information such as ages of acquisition and attained fluency; length of immersion in various contexts; estimates of proficiency in speaking, reading, and understanding; ratings of how different contexts have contributed to the
acquisition of the language; extent of exposure in different contexts, and degree of accent (“LEAP-Q: Ten Years Later” 1). While The LEAP-Q has proven to be sufficient, I also plan to add one question to the LEAP-Q about Shakespeare so I can get an understanding of the extent to which the participants have had prior exposure to Shakespeare. Understanding the participants’ background will help to determine if a participant is eligible to cooperate in the study and provide evidence of factors that may cause the data to change.

I will then on a given date, time, and location determined between myself and the participants schedule the translation to take place, which will be about one hour in length. I do not plan to tell them what audience they are translating for as I believe the participants should inherently deduce from the translation process itself that their audience is Chinese readers, and I am simply curious as to what assumptions they will make in terms of what their audience knows. To make the playing field as level as I can, assuming I will have participants from a wide variety of backgrounds, I will allow them to use dictionaries if they must, but I will not allow them to look at other translations, as I do not want other translator’s ideas of what a “perfect” translation is to inhibit the results by unduly influencing any participant. After the translation process is complete, the translations that the participants provided will be analyzed for differences between the original and the translation the participants composed. Finally, an exit interview will be scheduled for each student based on the differences in translation between participants. These sessions will be audio recorded with consent from the participants to ensure an accurate portrayal of their statements, and I will also take notes to reference later.

Chapter 4 – Results

This section will begin with the results of the questionnaire to gain a better understanding of how the participants compare to their peers. I will then provide a side by side comparison of
both the original Shakespeare translation and the participants’ Chinese translations of the original. Finally, I will provide a narrative of what was discussed during the final interview. Based on the research I have already conducted, what I am currently expecting is that most of the participants will naturally directly translate without considering the audience of the translation and the prior knowledge such an audience would have of Shakespeare and Western culture.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

Based on my anticipations of the results, I believe that the first reason that many of the students will provide direct translations is because the participants will have no official training in translation but will have significant experience in superficially “translating” language (listening to comprehend and respond) as many of them have been using the language for quite some time in college and perhaps even for some time before that. While this kind of translation may differ slightly from translating written work, I imagine that the students may slip unconsciously into the habits they have already formed when “translating” language while listening. I also do not believe that the students will consider their audience to be Chinese students at Liberty University rather than Chinese students in China, which is an important distinction to make as Chinese students at Liberty will generally have more biblical knowledge than Chinese college students who live in China. In terms of Lefevere’s theory, this would show that even those who are not classically trained in translation theory are bound by the double control factor, as the students would be exhibiting knowledge of concepts that are familiar to them rather than those that are unfamiliar, and perhaps would consider me as a patron in this scenario; they might also assume I would like translations that are tailored to fit the needs of students at Liberty rather than students who live abroad.
Chapter 1: The History of Shakespeare in China

Since Shakespeare's rise to fame in Britain, he has become one of the most studied poets across the globe. Because of China's particular adoption and adaptation strategies, Shakespeare's popularity went through periods of growth and decline. His works were studied to understand the foreign other and were used to prop up Chinese culture, but were also shunned because of their foreignness during the Cultural Revolution of the 1960’s and 70’s. As China opened its borders once more after the Cultural Revolution came to an end, Shakespeare became studied once again, and this chapter will seek to provide a brief history of Shakespeare’s importance throughout Chinese history.

First Mentions of Shakespeare

First mentions of Shakespeare in China began as early as 1836 after the British Opium War. As the loss forced China to open its doors once more to the West, national hero Lin Zexu organized people to translate books and newspapers to acquire a better understanding of foreign peoples in case of another invasion. After the 1850s, Shakespeare was introduced through missionaries. He was often mentioned as a great poet and a dramatist in various books that taught Chinese people about British culture, geography, and history ("Shakespeare Translation in China"). During this time, Shakespeare appeared in Hugh Murray's *Cyclopedia of Geography*, published in 1839 under the title *Annals of the Four Continents*. However, the first author to mention Shakespeare in a novel was British missionary William Muirhead, who mentioned the "Bard of Avon" in a British history book in 1856.

Yet another way Shakespeare was introduced to Chinese culture was through the Chinese themselves. As a result of the war, the Qing government took measures to strengthen their military personnel, which they believed also meant educating them well, so the government sent
many of their best men to the West to study. When the men returned, many continued their work in China as translators. Yan Fu was one of them, and he translated many prominent philosophical, political, and economic classics, such as Thomas Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics and Other Essays*. In his rendition of Huxley's words, he decided to focus on Shakespeare as a communicator of Western ideas:

> Shakespeare wrote a play recounting the murder of Caesar. When Antony delivers a speech to the citizens while showing the body of Caesar to the public, he uses logic to stir up the citizens cleverly because Brutus warned him that he would not be allowed to redress a grievance for Caesar and blame the murderers. The citizens are greatly agitated by the speech, and their resentment against Brutus and his comrades is running high. We should attribute Antony's success to the function of logic! (qtd. in Sun 1932)

From this quote, it is evident that Yan Fu believed that the reason that Antony is successful in Shakespeare’s play is because of his usage of logic, and Yan Fu indicated that Chinese people should seek to learn from the Westerners in this manner. This example is one of many that shows that Chinese people interacted with Shakespeare's text looking to learn about the success of foreigners, and this would become the standard that Chinese people used to interact with Shakespeare's texts.

When Shakespeare was initially introduced into Chinese society by western missionaries, he was depicted as a poet and a playwright who was seen as a "cultural agent of Western imperialism" (*Shakespeare East and West*). While many Chinese people did not want to interact with his work for fear of being taken over through the spread of literature, which carries culture, the government believed that reading Shakespeare would greatly help sharpen the minds of the men that went to war for their country. However, later, Shakespeare would come to represent
Chinese culture through the adaptation of his works and be given great respect within Chinese circles.

Shakespeare's Importance in Chinese Society

After the British Opium War, China became a fractured country, as some came to believe that their culture was not modern enough, which caused them to lose the war, while others did not seek to denounce their culture. Those that felt the need for modernization believed the way to do that was not only to embrace Western technology and weaponry but also to adopt foreign literary works, including Shakespeare. While the government had made it mandatory for the military to become familiar with his works, it was not compulsory for the common people, and the dislike of foreign works was still prevalent in Chinese circles as it was seen as a threat to their own culture. One such reformist, Lu Xun, a Chinese writer, essayist, and literary critic, believed that China needed a "fighter in the spiritual realm" who could revitalize the country, and he believed that person was Shakespeare ("The Early Years").

However, Shakespeare also came to be embraced as a symbol for progressives, first by an unknown translator in 1903 who translated Charles and Mary Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* into classical Chinese. Titling it *Hai Wai Qi Tan (Strange Tales from Overseas)*, the translator arranged the plays into ten chapters of a novel, changing the titles of the plays to eight-character poetic lines that provided the reader with the gist of the plays. The following year in 1904, Lin Shu, another Chinese translator, would use Shakespeare's works to argue that the Chinese culture had value during a moment when the culture was under attack by reformers from the inside who believed that foreign culture was more civilized than their own (Chang 4). Lin perceived similarities between Shakespeare and traditional Chinese culture, as in Lin's view, Shakespeare "looked to fairies and monsters for his inspiration, themes, and language," which is precisely
what the authors of the Chinese genre of 神怪小说 had done ("The Early Years"). Drawing on these similarities, Lin later chose to package his translation of Charles and Mary Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare as 神怪小说, and because of this repackaging, Shakespeare's works were received better than those of other foreign writers of that era in Chinese history. By the mid-1920s, Shakespeare had solidified his position in the People's Republic, and as their respect for him grew, the transliteration of his name was no longer deemed acceptable, so they decided to call him "Sha Wang" or "Old Man Sha" to express their respect.

Translation of Shakespeare

The years between 1920 and 1949 saw a significant surge in the Chinese translation of Shakespeare's works due to the New Cultural Movement, which gave birth to the modern Chinese language. During the next ten years, twelve translators would publish their versions of eight plays, and by 1949, 31 plays had been translated into Chinese (He 151). Interestingly enough, the plays that had not been touched by the translators were the historical plays, and the ones that had been translated most often were the tragedies, such as Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, Julius Caesar, and Macbeth; while one comedy, The Merchant of Venice, had been translated five times (151).

One of the first modern Chinese Shakespeare translations was Tian Han's 1922 translation. Tian Han, the chairman of the Chinese Dramatists' Association and a noted playwright, began with a translation of Hamlet and a goal to translate nine other plays. Only one of them, however, Romeo and Juliet, actually made it to print. Besides Han, Liang Shiqiu was another translator who was one of the first to render Shakespeare's work in Chinese. He began his translations in 1931 and worked on eight of them during that decade but did not finish the rest until 1967 (Sun).
Another notable translator, Zhu Shenghao, had his complete works of Shakespeare published in 1978, well after his death. Starting in 1936, Zhu began translating *The Tempest* at the age of 23. The following year, however, the second Sino-Japanese War broke out. Despite this, Zhu's ambition was not interrupted: although his manuscripts were destroyed twice in his escape from the Japanese occupation of Shanghai, and he suffered from sickness and poverty, Zhu Shenghao retranslated all the lost manuscripts, including *The Tempest* and eight others. In 1944, Zhu passed away from tuberculosis at the age of 32. At his death, he had translated 31 of Shakespeare's plays. What is most notable about his contributions to the field of Chinese Shakespeare translation is not the volume of what he produced but rather the quality of his translations, as they closely resemble Shakespeare's in style and form. Due to the quality of Zhu’s translations, his work became the starting point for later revised translations, such as Liang Shiqiu's Chinese translation in Taiwan in 1967 or the later People's Literature Publishing House translation that was published in 1978.

**Flowering of Scholarship**

While prior to 1949 the bitter feelings towards Western society that were caused by the Opium war contributed to indifference toward Shakespeare’s plays, after 1949 the study of Shakespeare grew because of Chinese-Russian relations. Post WWII, Russian literature was translated into Chinese, and Russian literature and practice, including literary criticism, was incorporated into Chinese schools; among the translations that were performed were several essays on Shakespeare written by Russian critics. Like their Russian counterparts, Chinese scholars also enjoyed focusing on the history of the plays, but their form of literary criticism also applied Marxist-Leninist thought. But one frequently researched question was who Shakespeare’s audiences were, and many Chinese scholars concluded that he wrote for the
people, as they knew Shakespeare opposed the feudal system (154). This period of scholarly growth did not last long in China; in the 1960s, China would break relations with Russia and condemn once again the study of foreign literature.

Although word spread quickly through China about Shakespeare prior to 1966, Shakespeare was banned during the Cultural Revolution. In 1966, Mao Zedong, the leader of China, launched the Cultural Revolution to reassert his dominance over the government and the people, as he believed that the government was leading people to abandon their culture. He called on the nation's youth to purge what was impure from society and sought to revive the revolutionary spirit of the Chinese people that had led to victory in the civil war twenty years earlier and had allowed the people to form the People's Republic of China. Schools and museums closed while the publication of Western literature was stopped; libraries and bookstores removed copies of Shakespeare's plays, and productions of Shakespeare were halted. Everything became about "one age, one author, and one piece of literary work,"1 particularly the "Little Red Book" written by Mao.

After the Cultural Revolution, however, Shakespeare studies picked up again in 1976. Foreign plays hit the shelves once more while plays began to be staged by the British Old Vic company, a scholarly journal called Shakespeare Studies (China) was established in 1983, and the inaugural conference of the Shakespeare Society of China was held in the same year (155). Since then, China has enjoyed a wealth of scholarly literature written about Shakespeare, and Chinese scholars have published around one hundred and fifty critical essays, most of which were written about Shakespeare’s plays being written to combat class struggles. However, in 1983, as Chinese scholars were given more freedom to write about various more controversial

---

1 This is a phrase that appeared frequently in critical essays that discussed the Cultural Revolution after 1976. It was inspired by Hao Ran and his novels, particularly The Broad Road in the Golden Sunlight.
subjects, many of them began writing about topics other than the purpose or history of Shakespeare’s plays, although others continued to analyze Shakespeare from a political point of view, which can be attributed to an after-effect of the Cultural Revolution. This is because during the Cultural Revolution, art forms were understood to be designed for specific classes and thus had political overtones; Chinese critics were therefore preoccupied with questions about the class that Shakespeare wrote for, the themes he developed, representations of various classes of his characters, and purpose.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the understanding of Shakespeare's identity in China changed as the country underwent various social and political changes. While Shakespeare started as a poet shunned because of his foreignness, he quickly became a symbol of hope to both non-reformers and reformers before the Cultural Revolution, and his works were adapted to fit the cultural needs of various readers. However, the Cultural Revolution would suspend Shakespeare study in China as the country once again became wary of foreign culture permeating its own, and it would not be until the late 1970's that Shakespeare study would truly flower into what it is today.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Literary translation offers the opportunity for individuals to build relationships with other cultures. In this sense, literary translation is a form of cross-cultural communication; however, it has not always been treated as such. In fact, the field of literary translation has been seen as a sub-discipline of applied linguistics and literary studies by scholars, which is why the translators prior to 1970s and 80s were often consumed with questions of the translatability, faithfulness, accuracy, and equivalence of their own work (Bassnett). Although these are important elements of the translation dynamic to consider, translators should not have disregarded the cultural aspect of translation, and it is for this reason that translation theorists such as Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere created their own framework of systemic and descriptive approaches to the study and practice of translation.

Theories of Translation

Early Theorists

One of the first theories of translation was produced in 1540 by Dolet. Titled *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (How to Translate Well from One Language into Another) he established five principles for the translator: 1) The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities. 2) The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) 3) The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings. 4) The translator should use forms of speech in common use 5) The translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone (Dolet qtd. in Bassnett 63-64). On the basis of his principles, it is clear that Dolet stresses the importance of understanding the original text as a prerequisite to true translation. George Chapman, translator of Homer, would come to echo
Dolet's sentiments later in the preface to his translation of *The Iliad* titled *Epistle to the Reader*. He states that writers must: “1) Avoid word for word renderings 2) Attempt to reach the original intent of the original work 3) Avoid overly loose translations, which can be achieved through basing translation on a sound, scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses” (Chapman qtd. in Bassnett 64). In other words, Chapman was inspired by the Platonic doctrine of poetry at the time. Proponents of this theory believed it was possible for a translator to completely and totally recreate the original tone or spirit of the text.

*The Seventeenth Century*

The belief on the part of earlier translation theorists that translators should attempt to achieve the same spirit as that of the original text later changed during the seventeenth century, as translators began to believe that translation was not just a mere imitation of the source material, but rather a joint effort that sought to fuse the original material with the translated work. Sir John Denham in his preface to his translation of *The Destruction of Troy* discusses the balance that must be struck between the text and spirit when warning translators of the pitfalls of overly literal translation: “For it is not his business alone to translate Language into Language, but Poesie into Poesie; and Poesie is of so subtile a spirit, that in pouring out of one Language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *Caput mortuum*” (Sir John Denham qtd. in Bassnett 68). Essentially, Denham's idea is that without an infusion of the translator's spirit into the source text to reimagine the words on the page, the translation itself becomes useless and can be considered dead. Denham's insistence on the role of a translator's spirit in translation was later used by John Dryden, who defined three types of translations: 1) *Metaphrase*, literal translation; 2) *Paraphrase*, translation where translators can take some liberty; and 3) *Imitation*, the translator
abandons the original text as he sees fit (Dryden qtd. in Bassnett 69). Many translators during his time chose to take the middle road, stressing close reading which emphasized the style and manner of the literature, while also attempting to keep alive the spirit of the poem through style indicative of a translator’s preference.

*The Eighteenth Century*

At the turn of the eighteenth century, translators became more focused on the moral duty of translators to accurately portray the source text to their readers. Many believed that the essential spirit of a text should be clarified, as writers were understood to have written for their nation and time; therefore, clarifying the spirit of the text meant reimagining the text using historical and societal frameworks to guide the translation process (Bassnett 70). While this idea was widespread, it underwent transformations during the eighteenth century. For example, Goethe argued that every piece of literature passes through a system of modes: the first mode "acquaints us with foreign countries on our own terms," the second mode is appropriation through substitution and reproduction, while the third mode aims for the perfect balance between the source language text and the target language text (Goethe qtd. in Bassnett 71). However, as scholars have argued, Goethe's third mode borders on the theory of untranslatability, as there is no fully accurate one-to-one translation between varying languages that exists 100% of the time.

During the Romantic period, translation began to be considered as a category of thought rather than a mechanical linguistic process. This change in approach from the views of early eighteenth-century translator theorists was due to the distinction Coleridge drew between two types of Imagination: that of the Fancy and the Imaginative (Bassnett 73). For Coleridge, the Fancy refers to the operations of a poet who deals with the fixed and the finite, a poet who works within the field of their own memory, while Imagination refers to the creative ability of a poet to
dissolve, diffuse, and scatter in order to recreate something better (Biographia Literaria).

Naturally, as a Romantic poet, Coleridge thought of the Imaginative as being the superior of the poetic qualities to possess, and his ideas consequently influenced translators to think of themselves as part of a bigger influence on the target languages themselves. However, the preeminence of Imagination over Fancy led to the problem of meaning, and translators began to wonder: if language is separate from imagination, how can such poetic works be translated unless the translators are expected to understand both what is said as much as what is unsaid?

In the post romantic period, two conflicting ideas have competed for prominence: the first is the idea of a sub-language for translation, while the other is an idea that a translator should be subservient to the text (Basnnett 75). Both of these theories sought to respond to the difficulties that Shelley raised in A Defence of Poetry, particularly the issue of non-equivalency, as he said that "it [was] as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as to seek to transfuse from one language into another" (2). This is why much of the translations of that time often are written peculiarly with "archaic English with just the right outlandish flavor" that serves to disguise "the inequalities and incompleteness of the original" (Simcox qtd. in William Morris 153). While the translations were odd, translation critics did not have problems with them, and enjoyed them for the air of foreignness they possessed.

The enjoyment of idiosyncratic translations that did not directly mirror the English language carried over into the Victorian era, whose translators were concerned with conveying the remoteness of the original in the time and place that the literature was written. Bassnnett notes that this created an interesting translation theory paradox, in which there was immense respect for the original text, but such respect was based only on the translator's understanding of the
piece. However, the translators with their foreign translations were rejecting the idea of universal literacy through the creation of archaic translations which significantly reduced the number of people able to read the translation. Such actions are in contrast to the primary goal of a translator, which is to give people the ability to enjoy and learn from others cultures they are less familiar with by giving them the words to understand.

To sum up, the history of translation theory can be broken down into five categories: 1) Translation as a scholar's activity, where the pre-eminence of the SL text is assumed over any target language version. 2) Translation as a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the original. 3) Translation as a means of helping the reader become a better reader through deliberately contrived foreignness in the target language text. 4) Translation as a means whereby the individual translator offers his own pragmatic choice to the target language reader. 5) Translation as a means through which the translator seeks to upgrade the status of the source language text because it is perceived as being on a lower cultural level (Bassnett 78-79). From these five categories, we see a strong pendulum swing between the more literal translations and those which allow the translator greater freedom, and these categories make it evident that the translator himself through the use of translation poetics arguably wields the most influence over the outcome of a target language text.

1970's and Onward: Translation and Power

Many translation theorists since the 1970’s have become preoccupied with the ideological dimension of translation. For example, in 1978, Itamar Even-Zohar argued that cultures translate according to need, and he provides three situations in which this need may arise: "(a) when a literature is ‘young,’ in the process of being established; (b) when a literature is either ‘peripheral’… ‘weak’ or both; and (c) when there are turning points, crises, or literary
vacuums in a literature" (47). In all three cases, the literature system requires translations to improve the literary culture, whether that is through propping up what already exists or through creation of what does not exist.

Itamar's work became the basis on which Bassnett and Lefevere based their theories of translations. They asserted that the field of translation was undergoing a turn of its own, one that required answers to questions not of the linguistic features of translation, but rather of context, history, and convention. They argued that translation is never an innocent activity, for in the process of translation, cultures impose their own history and expectations on works of literature, changing the forms and themes of a literary culture. Their idea of a cultural turn was widely accepted, and their theories which will be discussed below serve as the basis for this thesis.

Lefevere's Double Control Factor Theory

As evidenced by the history of the theories of translation mentioned above, systemic and descriptive approaches to translation activity typically ignore the fact that translation is a genuine form of cultural exchange. However, using translations to comprehend an entire culture’s interpretation of another cannot provide a holistic understanding of the comprehension of the literary culture, and therefore examining other types of writings is necessary. This gap was filled by Andrew Lefevere through his usage of the term "rewriting" to define translations.

In Lefevere's view, there are two types of rewriting that occur in any literary system: that expressed by translations, and those made available by reference works. Rewritings can be understood to comprise the factors that influence how an author or the text is depicted in another culture. But perhaps the most important factor is the dominant ideological thought of the target culture. This is because translations can either have a positive influence on the target culture, such as a cultural phenomenon that is unfamiliar to the reader, or they can have a negative
impact, such as tacitly promoting a particular repressive ideology within a given culture. In Lefevere’s words, all translations "whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way" *(Translation, History, and Culture* ix). Such manipulations are dubbed by Lefevere refractions, which he defines as the "rewriting of texts to make them more acceptable for a new audience" in which "virtually every feature of the original may be changed, or else very little may be changed" ("Refraction"). These changes could be anything from modifications of language, ideology, or even a shift in poetics (124). It can be concluded then that Lefevere is interested in the reasons why foreign literatures may change significantly in the rendered translated text due to the constraints of language, and thus he developed the double control factor theory to account for these changes.

Poetics

In Lefevere's theory, the constraints mentioned above emerge from a double control factor system that is comprised of an inside regulated by professionals, and an outside regulated by patrons. Professionals represent critics, reviewers, teachers, and translators, who are defined by their schooling both in literary studies and translation studies and can either suppress works that are blatantly opposed to their views or support those works which align with their views or their poetics (14). A literary translator has two types of poetics at their disposal: the first is translation poetics, while the second type of poetics is a translator's own literary poetics. Literary poetics consists of two components: one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, typical characters and situations, and symbols, while the second is an understanding of what the role of literature is or should be (Lefevere 20). Once a poetics is defined, it may exert great influence over the culture that produced the text. In Earl Miner's words: "A systematic poetics
emerges in a culture after a literary system proper has been generated and when important
critical conceptions are based on a then flourishing or normatively considered genre. The
coinciding of major critics with the considered genre generates the critical system" (350).
Therefore, patrons, and even the translators who work for them, exert a significant influence over
how a culture's literary system is shaped; what exists is a system based on the preference of the
elite.

While literary poetics are created mostly by the patrons themselves, translation poetics
are solely influenced by the translator. Cheung defines translation poetics as a "translator's
discourse on translation" which includes both direct and indirect discourse (Cheung 71-73).
Direct discourse consists of both an "in-ward looking text" (the translation itself) as well as other
factors related to the translation, otherwise known as the "outward-looking text" (15). Indirect
discourse then refers to other factors such as the translator's own views on literature, which may
not be directly reflected in the translation but constitutes the direct discourse on the translation
(15). These ideas concerning the nature of a translator's discourse raise some interesting
questions, particularly about the relationship of a translator's literary poetics to his or her
translation poetics and the extent to which one has effect over the other.

**Patronage**

In addition to a translator's own personal belief systems, there is also the issue of whether
translators have certain ideologies forced upon them, otherwise known as patronage. Lefevere's
definition of patronage refers to "something like the powers that can further or hinder the
reading, writing and rewriting of literature" (Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of
Literary Fame 15). For example, in Shakespeare's case, he had to be particularly careful of the
Queen's reaction to any of his works:
Like any other royal subject he had to satisfy – or at least not displease – the sovereign and her court; the Queen, for good reason, was sensitive to any challenge to the legitimacy of the monarchy, and her word could put an end to Shakespeare's career, if not his life. He had also to avoid the censure of the London authorities, whose Puritanism militated against any dramatic production as decadent, superstitious frivolity, and who sought excuses to close the theatres. As a new kind of ideological entrepreneur still working within traditional patronage relations of literary production, Shakespeare had to keep favour with his court patron – in this case the powerful Lord Chamberlain – who afforded the company political protection, and, literally, licence to work; at the same time, he had to hold the interest of a broad public drawn from London's mercantile, artisanal and working classes. (Kavanagh 151)

Although Shakespeare was not a translator, the challenge of patronage he faced is mirrored by that endured by many translators, who frequently face threats of joblessness or even death. While it appears that the patrons have always had the upper hand, Lefevere mentions that professionals have power as well. This is because professionals feel that translators are providing a service rather than merely a commodity, and the translator's role as a professional provides them with a measure of authority and status (Weber 25). It is important to note, however, that Lefevere's definition of power is based on the Foucauldian understanding of power, which defines power in a more positive light as being something that "induces pleasure, forms knowledge, and produces discourse" and is not always oppressive (Foucault 119).

While patronage is based on the relationship between the patron and the professional, it also functions in three key ways. The first is an ideological component, which constrains both the development of form and of subject matter which may be included or excluded dependent
upon the patron’s wishes. There is also an economic component, as the patron ensures that the translators can make a living by either providing them with pensions or appointing them to some office. Finally, there is the element of status, as acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain group and its lifestyle. In addition to these elements, Lefevere also differentiates between the two types of patronage: differentiated and undifferentiated. Patronage is undifferentiated when the three components of patronage (ideological, economical, and status) are all dispensed by one patron, but it is differentiated when the economic success of the professional is independent of ideological factors and does not necessarily bring status with it. For example, a patron who is only willing to provide pension and status in exchange for the translation to be rendered a specific way would be considered differentiated, but a patron willing to provide pension and perhaps not status, regardless of the way the translation is rendered, would be considered as undifferentiated.

General Issues in Translation: Chinese and English

Because language is culturally charged and narrates one's experiences, there are several issues that a translator will always encounter. One such difficulty is the dilemma of non-equivalency, which is the idea that shifts from one language to another result in disparate meanings that do not totally coincide; often, a term in one language does not have a counterpart in another. For example, in Chinese, there is the term 见外 (jiàn wài), which refers to a close friend treating someone too politely despite the friendship they share. Because this word does not have a 1-to-1 word equivalency, it must be translated conceptually, and is thus considered non-equivalent. The issue of non-equivalency can also cause problems of intension (referring to the denotative meaning of a word) and overextension (referring to the connotative meaning of the word). An example of this is given by Wu in "The Analysis of Cultural Gaps" where she states
that the phrase "to have red eyes" in English means to have red eyes (intension), whereas in Chinese the meaning is extended to not only mean "someone who has red eyes" but can also figuratively mean "someone who is jealous," or in English, someone who is "green with envy" (extension) (124). This example shows that phrases can sometimes have the same meaning cross-culturally but may also have secondary or additional meanings that one culture does not possess; this presents a problem for the translator because the translator must possess enough linguistic knowledge to know the connotative meanings of words and recognize when a writer is using a term in the connotative sense rather than in the denotative sense.

Yet another issue that translators may run into during the translation process is when concepts in one language have only one or two words to represent them; however, in the other language, multiple words can represent a single concept. Such is the case from Chinese to English for familial words: whereas in English there is only one word that applies to both maternal and paternal uncle, Chinese features two separate words to denote the difference (Wu). The final issue faced by a translator is that of derivation, which details how particular objects are interpreted between cultures emotionally. Whereas in North American cultures groundhogs are typically celebrated, as their existence suggests the beginning of Spring, Chinese people have no such emotional attachment to the groundhog, but instead are attached to creatures such as the dragon or the phoenix, which symbolize luck, power, and prosperity.

Challenges in Translating Shakespeare

While the above issues exist when translating between Chinese and English, translating Shakespeare specifically both exacerbates standard issues and creates new ones, both linguistically and culturally. Not only must a translator work with a foreign language, but he or she must also reckon with the fact that the English language has changed a great deal since
Shakespeare's time, which is reflected in the changes in vocabulary between Shakespeare's time and now. To put these changes into perspective, as Shakespeare was writing, it is estimated that his vocabulary at most was drawn from 43,566 possible words, while some sources say that his range of vocabulary could be estimated at around 20,000 words; despite these limits, the consensus is that his vocabulary was vaster than that of the King James Version of the Bible (Lu qtd. in Sun 233). Since many words from Shakespeare's era are no longer written or spoken, translators run a risk of losing meaning as well if they cannot find the words that capture what Shakespeare is saying and instead must settle for mere approximations at best.

While there are many problems involved in translating literature between Chinese and English, one that presents itself particularly in Shakespeare is the issue of translating puns, as Shakespeare frequently employs them throughout his work. Sun defines a pun as a "linguistic game, in a given context, mainly relying on meaning, usage, and pronunciation of words which have the same sound but different meanings," while Hooper further says that "pun[s] serve as ambiguous answers to a direct question, rendering the response devoid of any real information" (Sun, Hooper qtd. in Sun 233). Such definitions mean that a translator must proceed with caution, as translation can easily distort the meaning between two languages that share little in common. This ease with which meaning can be distorted provides the translator with two options: ignore the pun, and seek to create a direct translation, or recreate the original meaning as best as possible. Many choose the former option, but such direct translations can cause confusion for the audience reading the new translation.

Culturally, there are several additional difficulties a translator must contend with, such as the encyclopedic nature of Shakespeare's plays. Shakespeare's plays feature content on a wide range of topics such as astronomy, geography, history, politics, and science, as well as cultural
allusions to the Bible or classical mythology. While attending to such contextual details has become easier, the Bible and mythology still cause problems because the Chinese government has deemed these two sources as likely harmful to society, and as such, the translator must tread carefully. When translating this culturally sensitive material, translators take two routes: they either provide notes explaining the reference or alter the text slightly with words that permit the Chinese audience understanding. In the case of Liang Shiqiu, another prominent Shakespeare Chinese translator, in his translation of *Merchant of Venice*, he transliterates character and place names and provides explanatory notes which enable a better understanding of Shakespeare's plays, while in the case of the Bible, he chooses to change the context to fit the cultural situation (Sun 235). For example, in *Merchant of Venice*, Liang translates Shylock as 夏洛克 (xià luò kè), a transliteration of his name that does not provide the target audience with information about the character. This is important to note as most Chinese translations of Shakespeare’s plays tend to use symbolism in the naming process of the characters to make them easier to understand. As such, Liang reconstructs the character sympathetically, stating that Shylock is "a poor fellow" who represents "oppressed people" (Liang qtd. in Xiu 208). Furthermore, in the translation of the biblical material in Act 1, Scene 3, line 96, which reads "the devil can cite Scripture for his purpose," Liang chooses to downplay the demonic traits conferred upon Shylock through the usage of the word 坏心眼 (huài xīn yǎn), which literally means "bad intentions," to refocus the audience's attention on Shylock's intentions being wrong instead of the assertion that he is inherently evil (Xiu 209-10). Such translations afford the target audience better understanding in light of their lack of experience and limited knowledge of biblical subject matter.
Conclusion

As this chapter illustrated, the field of translation is ever-changing, and in light of the newest development of the double control factory theory, there has been no study conducted which makes use of the theory, yet the theory has been widely accepted among the translation community, thus proving the need for my study to be conducted. With my study, I hope to not only test this theory, but I hope to provide data which may be of use in the translation education community when planning future curricula.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The literature review provided the background for the translation methodologies employed throughout history as well as current issues in translation both between the Chinese and English language as well as difficulties in translating Shakespeare’s plays. In this chapter, I will discuss the study methods used, including the study design, participants, instrumentation, and data analysis methods.

Research Methodology

Case Study

Because I am attempting to understand if Lefevere’s double control factor theory applies to others who are not professionals through translation, which requires understanding of why the participants have translated the passages a certain way, I have chosen to implement a single case study design. According to Schramm, case studies should be used when “tr[y]ing to illuminate a decision or a set of decisions” which includes “why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result” (Schramm qtd. in Yin). In the case of my study, I am attempting to understand why the participants chose the particular words they did during the translation session concerning the biblical material within Hamlet. As mentioned previously, in relation to the double control factor theory, I may be seen by the participants as a theoretical “patron” of sorts, as I am choosing to compensate the participants monetarily, and I am affiliated with Liberty University both as a student and as an employee. This representation of myself in this manner may influence the participants to translate the biblical material in the passages I have chosen differently than if a native speaker not affiliated with the research site had asked them to complete the same tasks. However, the additional factors of other languages studied and the participants’ personal views on literature and translation also play a key part in the rendering of
the translations they will provide. Therefore, to account for these factors, I have also implemented a questionnaire and an interview in addition to the translation data I will need to gather to gain a further understanding of the participants’ backgrounds and their experiences during the study.

Context

This study took place during the Fall semester at Liberty University in Virginia in 2022 over the course of two months. The number of Chinese students that attended in 2018 is estimated at 86 students, while the total amount of international students that attend Liberty each year is around 700; therefore, the Chinese population at the research site is quite small but can make up anywhere from 0.1% to almost 12.0% of the international student body (“Liberty University International Student Report”).

Research Design

IRB Approval

Due to my identity as a student and a teacher assistant at the university where the research was conducted, as well as my wish to conduct the study of the school I attend, I applied for IRB approval at said institution. My chair, Dr. Stephen Bell, is listed as the Principal Investigator (PI) for the study while I am listed as an investigator. Because Dr. Bell is the PI, student participants were notified that they could elect to contact him in the event they had questions or concerns during the course of the study but felt uncomfortable contacting me. Once my IRB application was approved and I received an exemption from further IRB review, I began recruiting students for participation.
Participant Recruitment

Upon IRB approval of the study, I began the recruitment process. To recruit students, I contacted the International Student Center at the university and asked them to send out the recruitment letter along with a consent form on behalf of myself to Chinese students. In the email, students were provided with a synopsis of the study and were asked to return the attached consent form if interested. The participants were encouraged to apply if they met the following criteria: 1) 18 years or older, 2) previous exposure to Shakespeare, and 3) a native Chinese speaker with proficiency in English. These criteria were decided on as being most significant to the study because without previous exposure to Shakespeare or proficiency in English, participants could skew the results through faulty translations due to a lack of understanding of either Shakespeare or English. In addition to detailing participation criteria, the consent form also asked for consent to record during the interview process and informed them that upon completion of the study, the students would be given $15, but that failure to finish the study or dropping out of the study would make them ineligible to receive the compensation for their time.

Although I had hoped to have 12 participants for my study, I ran into some issues during recruitment. The first issue is that the first time I emailed the International Student Center, I gave them directions to tell the students to have the consent form signed and returned to me within a week; however, I did not take into account how long it would take the International Student Center to get the original email sent out, which left the students with only three days to complete the form. Because I did not receive as many participants as I had hoped, I asked the International Student Center once again to forward the information on my behalf; however, as the International Student Center was very busy preparing for an event, they could not send my email out. Although I was not able to reach the number of participants I had hoped to have to conduct
the experiment, given the time frame I had (a semester), I decided to continue with the two students who had provided me with their consent forms, which I kept stored electronically on my OneDrive account.

**Participants**

Due to the issues I had with recruiting, no applicants were excluded from participation. Participants took part in the research because the International Student Center at the university advertised it and also because they received monetary compensation at the end of the study.

Two female Chinese students in their mid-twenties that attend Liberty University, a private Christian university in Virginia, volunteered to participate in the research project. Because these two students attend an evangelical university, they will be more familiar with biblical principles and may not be able to represent the entire Chinese population as they will ultimately have more knowledge of biblical material than a standard Chinese individual may possess. Below is a compiled table of the participants’ self-identified information from the LEAP-Q:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Languages (Dominance)</th>
<th>Order of Acquisition</th>
<th>Language Exposure</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English, Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Chinese (20),</td>
<td>50, 50</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16 yrs, some MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20),</td>
<td>(7),</td>
<td>program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yingyu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Chinese (30),</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>18 yrs, college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English (70)</td>
<td>(90),</td>
<td>(90),</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rachel is the first participant. She is 23 and has completed some of her master’s program. She identifies herself as slightly more American, which she rated as an 8, while she rated Chinese as a 7. This is interesting, given that her native language is Chinese, yet she feels
English is her more dominant language. However, her stronger tie to English could be due to the fact that she is exposed to English 90% of the time and Chinese only 20% (these are the participant's own percentages). Finally, although she reported on the LEAP-Q that she would choose to speak English more than Chinese (English being 80% and Chinese being 20%), she reported she would be willing to read in either language.

The second participant is Yingyu. Yingyu is 23 and has completed some of her bachelor’s degree. She only identifies as ethnically Chinese and still possesses Chinese as her dominant language despite her time in the U.S., but this could be due to her daily exposure in Chinese being 10% higher than Rachel’s. Yingyu noted for both speaking and reading she would rather use Chinese than English, rating her wish to use Chinese 90% of the time and English only 10% of the time.

**Data Collection**

*Survey*

For the survey portion, Blumenfeld and Kaushanskaya's Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q) was utilized because it is commonly used by researchers in the field to gain a comprehensive understanding of adult subjects' bilingualism from the view of the participants themselves. While such self-reporting measures may seem unreliable, the questionnaire has been validated by multiple studies since the questionnaire's introduction in 2007 (Krizman et al.; Ansaldo et al.; Blumenfeld et al.; Schroeder and Marian). The questionnaire collects information such as ages of acquisition and attained fluency; length of immersion in various contexts; estimates of proficiency in speaking, reading, and understanding; ratings of how different contexts have contributed to the acquisition of the language; extent of exposure in different contexts, and degree of accent ("LEAP-Q: Ten Years Later" 1; see
Appendix A). Because the LEAP-Q has proven to be sufficient, no additional questions were added to the survey instrument.

Translations

For the translation portion of the study, three passages from the Wadsworth version of <i>Hamlet</i> were chosen for the participants to translate. <i>Hamlet</i> was chosen as the play to be translated because most Chinese students have some familiarity with this work and because adequate translation of this work will require some cultural mediation on behalf of the translator. After some research on the ease of readability of various Shakespeare versions, I settled on the Wadsworth text because it is known for its simple language, and while there will be differences in fluency levels among participants, I would like to reduce the amount of influence that differences in language can have on understanding to control the variables that can influence my study. After picking the play and the version, I also decided that I would focus on Christian themes throughout <i>Hamlet</i> that provoke discussion about what happens after death. This theme will require participants to shift their language to put terms specific to Christianity into words that others can understand simply. After doing a quick skim of the text, I decided on three passages found in <i>Hamlet</i>, one from the beginning, one from the middle, and one from the end. In addition to picking the passages from various parts of the play, I also attempted to choose passages that would range in translation difficulty; easy difficulty being clear use of Christian language throughout the passage, hard difficulty meaning suggestion of Christian themes (see Appendix D for original passages).

While I had originally planned on doing the translation session in person to have more control over the environment the participants were in, due to the sickness going around on campus as well as the fact that my participants had limited availability as both of them are also
graduate students with jobs, I decided it would be best for each person to conduct her own translation session. Although I could not control their environment when they chose to complete this part of the study, I provided a few guidelines both in the email and in the file with the translation passages on them. Those guidelines were that I preferred the participants complete the translation session in an area they would be willing to study in, that translating the passages should not take more than thirty minutes, and that the participants were not to use other translations to guide their own translations, but that they could utilize dictionaries to their advantages should they stumble on a word they did not know. In choosing these guidelines, I wanted the participants to be comfortable, which is why I suggested they find an area they would typically study in to set the mood as well as to help guide their focus; I also wanted the participants to not overthink the translations, which is why I told them to not take longer than thirty minutes to complete the task. As for my decision to allow the usage of Internet dictionaries but no other translations, this is because I wanted the participants not to be influenced by other people’s literary and translation poetics.

*Interviews*

Finally, for the interview portion of the study, I generated some basic questions before the translation session occurred related to the nature of the study, and they are as follows:

1) Were there any parts of the passages you can remember having troubles with?

2) Why do you think you had issues in attempting to translate these passages?

3) Did you consider your audience and your audience’s values when translating the passages? Why/why not?

4) What knowledge do you think the target audience of the translation would need to be able to understand your translations, if any?
In addition to these preliminary questions, I came up with others related to the translations themselves, which were an attempt at gaining an understanding of specific word choices that the participants used in their rendering. As Rachel’s interpretations of the translations were more straightforward, I did not have as many questions I did for her as I had for Yingyu. The questions for Rachel were as follows:

1) Is 小人 a more literary or polite term, or is it a phrase you would use in everyday life?

2) Could you explain this line “直到人性驱使我犯罪” to me in English?

The questions for Yingyu were as follows:

1) I noticed you used two different words in the same translation passage; is there a reason you chose to vary your language throughout your translation? ("邪恶的人" (evil person) and the second is “凶手” (murderer))

2) You describe the spirit as “保佑” (blessed), while you describe the “goblin” as “受诅咒” (cursed). Do you think you added extra detail to the passage, and if so, why did you?

3) Can you describe to me what the term “灵气” means, and why you chose to add it in your translation?

4) Can you explain to me this phrase in English? (为了不在为生火为难)

The interviews were conducted two weeks after the translation session had been completed and were done in person. As the interviews began, I reminded the participants I would be audio recording our meeting, which they had both previously consented to on the consent form. The recordings were saved onto my phone but were transferred to my password-protected OneDrive account, and I used the service to transcribe the audio to ensure the accuracy of the claims being made by the participants.
Data Analysis

Survey

The second phase of my study consisted of the LEAP-Q survey, which I sent out to the participants and asked them to return to me in a week. Once I received each completed survey, I downloaded and stored them on my OneDrive account. For analyzing the data that I received from the LEAP-Q, I imported the information individually from the questionnaires into Excel following the instructions that the authors of the LEAP-Q posted on their website. From there, I put the data from each participant into a master Excel sheet containing the students’ information. In analyzing the information, I paid particular attention to the number of languages that the participants know, their self-perceived fluency levels in each language, and their reported identity.

Translation

As for the translations themselves, after receiving the files from each participant, I downloaded them to my OneDrive account. To analyze the data, I focused on the aspects of accuracy and acceptability that most translators agree must be met for a translation to be of valued quality. In this case, accuracy refers to whether the source text and the target text are equivalent, while acceptability “confirms whether the form of the translated text is natural and equivalent” (Sakulpimolrat 166). To check for these two aspects, I performed back translations using my own knowledge of Chinese and the Internet, including dictionaries and Chinese forums that explain the meaning of phrases. After completing the back translations, I compared the original text to the translations and checked to see if any biblical content was still present in the passages, as naturally acceptability will require cultural mediation. After checking for this, I focused heavily on diction and grammar to check for accuracy; however, I also analyzed those
two aspects of accuracy because I was concerned with the participants' stylistic choices and what that articulated about who they believed their audience was. Because I am not a native speaker of Chinese, to check my understanding of the diction of the translations, I researched any words whose meaning I did not understand and used the participants to check my understanding of these words during the interview process.

**Interviews**

As the interviews are being used to check the validity of my assumptions about the translations and are being used to narrate the participant’s thoughts on her translation processes, I will be adopting a discourse analysis method to examine the interview data. According to Jankowicz, discourse analysis is of relevance when listening to others’ own narratives of a situation:

> Discourse analysis…[focuses] on the way in which your respondents draw on differing repertoires depending on their interpretation of the context in which your interview takes place. The technique focuses on the way in which language is used in given settings, and in a discourse analysis, your task is to identify the context; the various interpretive repertoires; and attempt a matching of one to the other, to arrive at an understanding of the function, from the point of view of your respondent, of the different stories being told. (229)

Discourse analysis is important when considering interviews because interviews as a form of data collection have drawbacks, particularly regarding inconsistencies in answers from various participants. However, as Sanna Talja points out, discourse analysis allows for variability to be present in the data because, in the discourse analysis approach, “the researcher abandons the assumption that there is only one truly accurate version of participants’ action and belief;” as
“[interview talk] is reflexive, theoretical, contextual, and textual, because the objects of talk are not abstract, ideal entities everyone sees in the same way” (“Analyzing Qualitative Interviews”). As translation is based on methods of thinking and is highly influenced by a participant’s upbringing, I do not believe that there is any one correct way to translate and am only interested in producing a narrative that will assist in understanding the participants’ choices during the translation process, so during the interviews, I will be analyzing based on three interpretive repertoires: “1) analysis of inconsistencies and internal contradictions 2) identification of regular patterns of variability of accounts and 3) identifying basic assumptions and starting points that underlie a particular way of talking about a phenomenon” (Talja).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the methodology of the study, which includes using a mixed methods case study approach that includes a questionnaire, a translation session, and an interview. In the following chapter, I will discuss the results of the study.
Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, I will provide the results of the LEAP-Q and the translation sessions and offer some commentary on the choices that the participants made during the translation sessions using the interviews as a way for the participants to speak for themselves.

Rachel

What is particularly interesting about Rachel’s LEAP-Q information is that she noted that she feels slightly more American than Chinese, ranking Chinese as a 7 (10 being the highest) and 8 for American as her identity. In addition, it seems she is more comfortable using spoken English, as the LEAP-Q information noted that she would choose to use English 80% of the time and Chinese only 20% of the time. However, this is not the case for reading, as her LEAP-Q results indicate she is comfortable reading in either Chinese or English and would choose to use either equally. While it seems that Rachel’s identity may be a factor related to the way she did her translations, it is also important to note that during the interview she mentioned that she chose to translate more simply because she wanted a wider variety of people to be able to read her translations, as she believes others may need knowledge of literature in general as well as Shakespeare to be able to fully understand her rendition of the play.

Looking at her translations of the passages of Hamlet I provided to the participants, her translations closely follow the English version of the play:

现在我应该做什么，现在应该祈祷，现在我要做，要去天堂。我已经复仇了。那应该被扫描了，一个小人杀了我的父亲，应为这一点，我，他唯一的儿子，要对那个杀了我父亲的小人 做同样的事，送他去天堂。
Now I should do what, now should pray, now I must do, must go to Heaven. I already
revenge. [I] should have been scanned, a villain has killed my father, and because of this,
I, his only son, must to that person killed my father do the same thing, send him to
Heaven.

In this first passage, there are several key differences worth noting between the Chinese
rendering and the original. The first is that Rachel seems to misunderstand parts of this passage,
for example, she misunderstands “And so I am [reveng’d]” to mean that the revenge has already
been completed, hence the Chinese translation “我已经复仇了” (wǒ yǐjīng fùhuóle).
Additionally, there is the interesting usage of the word “扫描” (sǎomiáo) for “scann’d,” which in
the Chinese language typically refers to the type of scanning done by electronic devices rather
than the examining that Hamlet is referring to in his soliloquy. Finally, another keyword of
difference in her translation of this passage is the usage of the word “小人” (xiǎo rén), which I
asked Rachel about in the interview given that the word is a combination of the words “small”
and “person,” so it made me think perhaps she was choosing to use this word to be more polite.
However, she mentioned in the interview that it is “not a very polite term, it is speaking poorly
about someone, they are not generous, they are not… I guess… humble or honest or whatever.”

The next two renderings are also fairly straightforward and keep the biblical material in
place:

做健康的精神，或者该死的精灵/从天堂里带来的空气，或者从地狱里来的爆炸。

Be healthy spirit, or damned goblin, from Heaven brought wind, or from hell blast.
这个名词注定是黑夜的行走，在这日子的尽头是无尽的火焰，直到人性驱使我犯罪/烧毁了所有的悲伤。

This name doomed is dark night walk, at the day end is inexhaustible flames, until human nature urges my sin, burned all my sin.

In these last two passages I had Rachel translate, the only area I found difficult to understand was the last two lines due to her emphasis in the translation on human nature “驱使” (qūshǐ) or “urging” or “driving” the crime, which is typically not a word choice English speakers would make in this case, so it is interesting to see the differences in thought between Chinese and English speakers in this passage.

In terms of accuracy and acceptability of Rachel’s translations, Rachel’s translations are very accurate but perhaps would not be deemed acceptable by other translators. This is because her translations closely follow the original and are quite literal, but because of this, they would not be deemed acceptable as her audience would inevitably need more information in order to understand her translations. Further, because her translations are literal, the translations do not flow as well as they could in Chinese.

**Yingyu**

Unlike Rachel, Yingyu identifies strongly as Chinese, which is abundantly clear throughout her LEAP-Q data. On the question in the LEAP-Q on what language she would choose to use for reading and speaking, she indicated she would choose Chinese 90% of the time and English only 10% of the time. Despite her time in the U.S., her acquisition of English as a second language, and her frequent usage of the language, Yingyu did not note any identity other than Chinese. This perhaps could be because her exposure to Chinese daily is 10% higher than
Rachel’s and could also be because Yingyu does not have an English name, which would make it more difficult for her to conceive of herself as an American. Similar to Rachel, however, Yingyu mentioned that she translated for a general audience and that she believed her audience would need biblical and literary background knowledge to be able to understand her translations.

Due to these factors, her translations have a distinct Chinese flavor:

现在（轻拍）我有可能会, 现在我祈祷, 现在我决定杀了他然后送他天堂, 之后我也会遭到报复, 之后再测试: 一个邪恶的人杀了我的父亲，因为如此, 我, 他唯一的儿子, 杀了这个凶手把他送上天堂。

Now I might, now I pray, now I have decided to kill him and send him to Heaven, after I will (meet with) revenge, and will be tested: a wicked man has killed my father, and because of this, I, his only son, killed his murderer and sent him to Heaven.

In this first translation, the passage flows well with the addition of more Chinese grammar throughout. What is interesting, however, is the usage of the phrase “遭到报复” (zāo dào bàofù) which means “retaliation against” and suggests the idea that Hamlet’s revenge on the man who killed his father is well deserved. After this, Yingyu translated the idea of “scann’d” correctly, as she rendered it in Chinese as “测试” (cèshì) meaning “to test” which is closer to the Shakespearean meaning of the phrase. Another interesting feature of this passage worth noting is that she uses two different words to refer to the killer of Hamlet’s father, the first being “邪恶的人” (xiē’è de rén) “evil person” and the second is “凶手” (xiōngshǒu) or “murderer”. When I asked Yingyu about why she chose these two different words in the passage, she did not have a reason for using both words, but she did indicate that the two words are interchangeable. This is
interesting as the original English version uses the word “villain” the first time the character is mentioned, whereas, in the second sentence, the noun is understood to be the villain, so he is not named.

In the second passage, Yingyu adds more description to the text:

你是保佑安康的神或者受诅咒的精灵。你或从天堂带来灵气带或从地狱带来爆裂。

You are a protective spirit of health or a curse. You either bring with you spiritual influence or blasts from Hell.

In the second passage, she describes the spirit as “保佑” (bǎoyòu) “blessed”, while she describes the “goblin” as “受诅咒” (shòu zǔzhòu) or “cursed”. Both of these words seem to add more to the original text, as the original text says that the spirit was only “a spirit of health” while the goblin is not “cursed” but is actually “damn’d”. This is an important distinction given the content of the play in that cursed and damned are two different words; while cursed means “having some sort of divine harm, malady, or other curse” damned refers to being “god-forsaken.” Although I believe that Yingyu added some description to the text and mistranslated as the distinction between cursed and damned is wide, I asked Yingyu if she thought she was adding any description to the text and she told me she was not. In addition, she used the word “灵气” (língqì) to describe the air from Heaven. While I researched this word and several sources indicated that it meant “smart, all-knowing,” I asked Yingyu about the meaning of the word and she told me that it referred to a “spiritual air” of sorts, which could be “smart” or “all-knowing” like I had suggested.
Finally, in the last passage, it appears that Yingyu understood the Catholic metaphor of purgatory in the last passage:

注定某刻要在夜间行走, 为了不在为生火为难, 直到在一天我犯了恶劣的罪行被焚烧和净化。

Doomed some time to at night walk, because I was not in the fire that made things difficult for me, until that day I will commit sin and be purified by fire.

While she seemed to understand the latter half of the sentence, she chose to translate the phrase “confin’d to fast in fires” as “为生火为难” (wéi shēnghuǒ wéinán), which, after consulting several online Chinese dictionaries and forums as well as Yingyu herself, means “to make it difficult to light a fire;” and this translation suggests a possible misunderstanding. However, the latter half is translated perfectly, but with religious undertones, especially with the usage of the word “净化” (jìnghuà) or “purified” to mean “purg’d” in this instance.

In terms of accuracy and acceptability of Yingyu’s translations, Yingyu’s translations are less accurate than Rachel’s and would also not be deemed acceptable by other translators. While her translations flow well in Chinese, she adds some extra description to the text that I have mentioned above, and while this aids in the producing of better understanding perhaps for Chinese audiences, this makes her translations less accurate. Her translations would also not be acceptable for the same reasons that Rachel’s are, which is that her audience would need extra knowledge to understand her translations.
Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the results of the study. While I had anticipated that the participants would not consider the audience’s knowledge during the translation process, I did not anticipate the factor of identity in my study, and now believe that perhaps because religion is so integral to the self, particularly in the research context, the factor of identity could have had more of an influence in the renderings of the translations. Therefore, in the following chapter, I will discuss the implications of the effects of language on identity and will provide some suggestions for language and translation programs to consider.
Chapter 5: Discussion

After looking at the data, what became abundantly clear to me is that Lefevere is missing a key idea in his theory, which is the factor of identity. Below, I will further discuss the importance of identity in a second language as well as provide some suggestions as to how translation programs can work on fostering identity among speakers of a second language. Afterward, I will discuss the limitations of my study, as well as propose ideas for future studies on the topic of improving human translation.

Implications

Identity Struggles in L2 Learners

While it is well known that many speakers of a second language struggle with their identity in the acquisition process, it is perhaps less known that identity is a multifaceted complex structure to understand. Identity for second language learners is not an addition of a new part of oneself to the old, nor is it a problem of becoming half-and-half, but rather “a third place…a negotiation of difference” during which the past and the present “encounters and transforms each other in the presence of fissures, gaps, and contradictions” (Block). Further, Pavlenko found that some bilinguals experience what they describe as “a self in between, a self in need of translation” (5). The reasons for this feeling, however, vary and can range from linguistic and cultural differences, distinct learning contexts, levels of language emotionality, and levels of language proficiency (Pavlenko). Therefore, students undergo a process of learning to negotiate their identity as both a speaker of their native tongue and of a foreign tongue, but the degree to which they struggle with their identity depends on a variety of factors.
Translanguaging

The way that students chose to deal with this negotiation of identity is typically done through the process of translanguaging. Translanguaging is a pedagogical practice employed in some foreign language classrooms which enables the usage of two or more languages to help bilinguals understand the world around them. Translanguaging is essential to understanding why some of the participants may have translated passages in particular ways because translanguaging does not view the two language systems present in the learner as two separate entities; rather they are enmeshed together, and features are selected specifically for their various purposes (“Translanguaging and Writing”). While translanguaging is somewhat similar to code-switching (alternating between two languages during conversation), it is important to note that translanguaging is different from code-switching in that while code-switching refers to the usage of two separate linguistic systems for the purposes of communication, the translanguaging of speakers of multiple languages serves a functional point (“Translanguaging and Writing”).

Importance of Embracing the L2 Culture: Motivation

Finally, another important concept in addressing the role of identity in language is the importance of motivation linked to acceptance of the second language culture. There are two types of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic. From an intrinsic perspective, possessing an ideal self is important to realize the goal of proficiency in a second language (Dorynei 27). However, extrinsic motivation is just as important, which can be influenced by how one feels about the speakers of that language: the more positively someone feels about native speakers of the target language, the more someone will want to become like the target language speakers; however, the reverse is also true; the more despised the target language speakers are, the more difficult it is to imagine an ideal second-language self, and acquisition of that language will become more
difficult to attain (Gardner). Without either form of motivation, proficiency becomes an impossible goal and translations suffer due to translators being unable to conceive of themselves as “the other” because of non-comprehension of the values and understanding a translator’s target audience may have.

*Suggestions for the Translation Classroom*

While pedagogy within translation classrooms needs to change, it would also probably be beneficial to return to the original meaning of the world “translation.” Cayley, a researcher in the field of cyberpoetics, defines translation as a piece of digital language art that exemplifies “iterative, procedural ‘movement’ from one language to another” (Cayley qtd. in Baynham and Lee). Essentially, as Baynham and Lee say in *Translation and Translanguaging*, translation is not meant to be a coherent piece of discourse; rather it is meant to be a sequence of images that form something of meaning in the language being translated into (138). With this definition of translation in mind, I’d like to suggest that translation and second language classrooms should provide students with an experience that allows for the continued formation of the second language self to arise without making students lose sight of their identity in their first language. Such an experience can be accomplished by allowing translanguaging to disturb the neatness of translation.

While some may balk at the idea of allowing those who work with foreign languages to use their first language more freely, the benefits of allowing students to do so outweigh the negatives of not allowing them to do so. First and foremost, regardless of what teachers would like to believe about their students, especially in a written exercise like translation, students will gravitate toward using their first language as it is difficult to divorce oneself from the language of birth. Often, in translation, how students use the first language actually helps to produce better
translations anyway, as students have been found to commonly use the first language when structuring composition in their second language, finding appropriate vocabulary, searching for information, and reducing cognitive load (Rana, “L1 Use in L2 Writing”). Although my study asked the participants to translate into their native tongue, my point here is that more translation programs should allow for students to develop both identities in order to produce translators who feel comfortable assuming either identity to successfully complete the task of translation.

Furthermore, identity-affirming pedagogy used within the translation classroom would help to produce stronger student-teacher relationships, and consequently, better understanding of the material. This is important to note as often students within second language programs feel that they are “less than,” and this thinking can cause students to resist learning the language because of a resistance to the instruction given (Liu and Tannacito; Tahriri, Mansour, and Siavash; Sumaryono and Ortiz). While this study was not focused solely on the benefits of identity formation in polylingual speakers, the link can be found through classroom safeness which leads to engagement within the class which would further lead to better individual translations within the future.

Limitations/Suggestions for Future Study

As with any study, there are numerous limitations. The first limitation is that my study only consists of two participants, so while I may have suggestions on what could be done in light of the results, the results are not comprehensive. Therefore, it would be favorable for future studies to possibly have a wider pool of participant backgrounds whether that is using people of varying ethnicities rather than one to complete the study, or using a multi-case study method, so that the results would be more thorough and concrete conclusions would be better able to be formed.
Another limitation I found after conducting the study is that due to the difficulty of Shakespeare, many participants felt they did not understand the lines that I gave them to translate. Because of this, I think the participants did not think of their audience and how the values of the audience perhaps change the translation perhaps in some way, especially in terms of the biblical material that was present throughout the passage. For this reason, other studies should use less difficult material to translate that does not require the participants to sort through multiple identities and rich encyclopedic information to arrive at an interpretation of literature in another language.

In addition to increasing the applicant pool, I think it would be interesting to conduct studies on those who have disabilities and observe how those identities shape translation processes. While I am sure there are studies out there that may already do this, I was very intrigued by the one student who had joined my study originally but was unable to complete it because he had both diagnosed and undiagnosed disabilities. As he dropped from my study, I was unable to include his data in my thesis, but the research I did on the disabilities he had sparked my curiosity. Generally speaking, disabilities may affect identity and could also affect a participant’s ability to understand the material, but as a Christian researcher, I believe that observing this people group would provide invaluable knowledge of how best to create a translation curriculum to help those with disabilities to be able to become translators.

Conclusion

While I did not accomplish what I originally set out to do, which was to provide some guidelines for those who hope to translate biblical material in the future, I believe that I have uncovered another facet of the double control factor theory that should be considered not only in translation curricula and pedagogy, but especially when determining why past translators have
made the decisions they have in the rendering of their own works. Although the limitations are many and concrete solutions are not able to be given, I am satisfied with the work I have done here, and I hope to be able to continue working on the intersections between identity and translation in the future.
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Appendix C: LEAP-Q

Northwestern Bilingualism & Psycholinguistics Research Laboratory

Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Today's Date</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Age

Male ☐ Female ☐

(1) Please list all the languages you know in order of dominance:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(2) Please list all the languages you know in order of acquisition (your native language first):

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(3) Please list what percentage of the time you are currently and on average exposed to each language.

*Your percentages should add up to 100%*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List language here</th>
<th>List percentage here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(4) When choosing to read a text available in all year languages, in what percentage of cases would you choose to read it in each of your languages? Assume that the original was written in another language, which is unknown to you.

*Your percentages should add up to 100%*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List language here</th>
<th>List percentage here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(5) When choosing a language to speak with a person who is equally fluent in all your languages, what percentage of time would you choose to speak each language? Please report percent of time.

*Your percentages should add up to 100%*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List language here</th>
<th>List percentage here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(6) Please name the cultures with which you identify. On a scale from zero to ten, please rate the extent to which you identify with each culture. (Examples of possible cultures include US-American, Chinese, Jewish-Orthodox, etc):

| List cultures here | [click here for scale] | [click here for scale] | [click here for scale] | [click here for scale] | [click here for scale] |

(7) How many years of formal education do you have?

Please check your highest education level (or the approximate US equivalent to a degree obtained in another country):

- [ ] Less than High School
- [ ] High School
- [ ] Professional Training
- [ ] Some College
- [ ] College
- [ ] Some Graduate School
- [ ] Masters
- [ ] Ph.D./M.D./J.D.
- [ ] Other: ☐

(8) Date of immigration to the USA, if applicable

If you have ever immigrated to another country, please provide name of country and date of immigration here.

(9) Have you ever had a vision problem ☐, hearing impairment ☐, language disability ☐, or learning disability ☐? (Check all applicable). If yes, please explain (including any corrections):  ☐
Language:  

This is my (please select from pull-down menu) language.

All questions below refer to your knowledge of  .

(1) Age when you...:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>began acquiring</th>
<th>became fluent</th>
<th>began reading</th>
<th>became fluent reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Please list the number of years and months you spent in each language environment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A country where is spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family where is spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school and/or working environment where is spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) On a scale from zero to ten, please select your level of proficiency in speaking, understanding, and reading from the scroll-down menus:

- Speaking
- Understanding spoken language
- Reading

(4) On a scale from zero to ten, please select how much the following factors contributed to you learning:

- Interacting with friends
- Interacting with family
- Reading
- Language tapes/self instruction
- Watching TV
- Listening to the radio

(5) Please rate to what extent you are currently exposed to in the following contexts:

- Interacting with friends
- Interacting with family
- Watching TV
- Listening to radio/music
- Language lab/self-instruction
- Reading

(6) In your perception, how much of a foreign accent do you have in ?

(7) Please rate how frequently others identify you as a non-native speaker based on your accent in :
Directions: Please translate the following passage as accurately as you can within the time allotted. You may use dictionaries, but please do not look at other Chinese translations of Hamlet.

“Now might I do it [pat], now ‘a is a-praying; / And now I’ll do’t—and so ‘a goes to heaven, / And so am I [reveng’d]. That would be scann’d: / A villain kills my father, and for that / I, his sole son, do the same villain send / To haven” (III.3.73-78).

“Be thou a spirit of health, or a goblin damn’d / Bring with thee airs from heaven, or blasts from hell” (I.4.41-41).

“Doomed for a certain term to walk the night, / And for the day confin’d to fast in fires, / Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature / Are burnt and purg’d away” (I.5.10-13).
Appendix E: Interview Questions

1) Were there any parts of the passages you can remember having problems translating?

2) Why do you think you had issues in attempting to translate these passages?

3) Did you consider your audience and your audience’s values when translating the passages? Why/why not?

4) What knowledge do you think the target audience of the translation would need to be able to understand your translations, if any?

For Rachel:

1) Is 小人 a more literary or polite term, or is it a phrase you would use in everyday life?

2) Could you explain this line “直到人性驱使我犯罪” to me in English?

For Yingyu:

5) I noticed you used two different words in the same translation passage; is there a reason you chose to vary your language throughout your translation? ("邪恶的人" (evil person) and the second is “凶手” (murderer))

6) You describe the spirit as “保佑” (blessed), while you describe the “goblin” as “受诅咒” (cursed). Do you think you added extra detail to the passage, and if so, why did you?

7) Can you describe to me what the term “灵气” means, and why you chose to add it in your translation?

8) Can you explain to me this phrase in English? (为了不在为生火为难)
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