

Sound-Meaning Relation in English and E-C Radical Translation

CHEN Yu-xi

University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai, China

Radical translation, opposite to current translation, reflects the purer communication between two languages. In the context of radical translation, the translator's using tendency of translation method essentially represents his or her communicative mentality, the willingness of both sides to communicate, and historical background. Before translating, translators must examine the semantic correspondence between the source language and the target language, and then choose different translation methods accordingly. The sound-meaning relation of a language reveals the culture and ideas of the source language, and whether the translation reflects such relation of the source language also shows the translator's mentality when the two languages communicate. This paper explores English sound-meaning relation by examining the rootology study, original phonology, root phonological relationships, and morphological changes. By reviewing the historical materials of early E-C communication, this paper collects relevant cases of radical E-C translations and investigates them from the perspective of English sound-meaning relation. This paper also explores the willingness of Chinese and western translators and the roles they played in E-C communication through historical discourse analysis.

Keywords: radical translation, sound-meaning relation, E-C translation

Introduction

Today, some translators tend to rewrite and manipulate the original texts for their purposes of advocating ideology or suiting others. This is called "the variation of translation". These translations convey more of the translator's view than that of purely transmission of information. It is of great necessity to review the history and look into radical translation, which makes it possible for us to experience the initial communicative mentality of treating each other as equals and complementing each other. Through the analysis of radical translation from the perspective of sound-meaning relation in English, combined with the discourse-historical approach, the reasons we find out can help solve realistic contradictions and provide meaningful solutions to language problems involved in building a human community with a shared future.

Definition of Radical Translation

Radical translation refers to how the translation between two languages is performed when they first meet each other, that is, the translation of a language that has never been touched by the translator before, without any preexisting translation pamphlets to refer to. American philosopher W. V. O Quine (1960) designed an experiment called "radical translation" in his book *Word and Object*. He supposed that a linguist arrives at an

CHEN Yu-xi, undergraduate, College of Foreign Languages, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai, China.

isolated tribe and everyone in the world knows nothing about its language. Now, the linguist is trying to figure out the rules of the tribe's language.

However, as time changes, the relationships in our society have become more complex, and the translation currently has also undergone a great transformation. Translation studies in China now hardly keep eyes on the original text and author. They focus more on the factors other than the source text, such as the translation process, the social environment of the translator, the translator's cultural identity and political stance, and the translator's religion, etc. Nevertheless, in this case, the translator's interference or even destruction of the original work is inevitable, making the translation regarded as some kind of "intention". Therefore, studying pure translation forms of radical translation is conducive to reviewing the purely beautiful history of human communication. As history is a lesson to reflect on, we can investigate the current contradictions between different civilizations and prompt deep thinking towards the significance of radical translation and today's translation.

The first step of radical translation is to find out what the pronunciation of the original text represents, that is, the sound-meaning relation in the original language. When the source language and the target language have meanings in common, namely concepts in common, the radical translation is very simple. We can just replace the words, which is also the case when there are equivalents. But when there are no corresponding concepts or just part of the concept is equivalent in the context of the target language, the problem of choosing a proper way to translate emerges. According to current translation studies, there are various ways of translation like interpretation, free translation, literal translation, transcription, and even zero translation.

This paper intends to explore the radical E-C translation from the perspective of sound-meaning relation in English. It aims at examining how western translators recognized, understood, and converted English when they were first exposed to Chinese, and the translation method native Chinese speakers chose when they were first exposed to English. This way of recognizing, understanding, and converting language is exactly E-C radical translation. Translation materials can be achieved from the history of English education in China, early E-C dictionaries, related E-C translation journals, and other materials, combined with the analysis of historical discourse; the results we find out can help solve realistic problems in current translation.

Sound-Meaning Relation in English

To explore sound-meaning relation in English, it is necessary to look at the relationship between syllable composition and English words meaning. In this regard, there are related studies, such as rootology and word formation methods generated from rootology. In addition, inflexion which expresses grammatical relations, namely the reflection of morphological changes in phonetics, is also included.

The Original Pronunciation of English

There is little research in the field of the original English phonetics. At present, useful and available reference is *A Brief Introduction to English Vocabulary System* (Ma, 2004). The following contents are based on this book in preparation for the analysis of E-C radical translation.

The original pronunciation of English is related to the original language root of English. Language root is a combination of sound and meaning, and is a concept related to human's life and body. Based on the development history of human society, Ma (2004) claimed that rootology uses deductive methods to study how human language grew from scratch, from low levels to high levels, and slowly evolves into what it is now.

Language root is shared by all human languages, and original language root should be the source of the commonness of languages. When a nation is formed, language root has national characteristics, which promotes the appearance of national language. At the same time, language roots can produce huge language families. The development of language root can be concluded with five short rules: sounds arise naturally; meaning develops with sound; sound shifts the developed meaning; similar sounds have similar meanings; antonyms come from the same root.

According to Ma's view (2004), human language evolved from animal language. The initial stage of human language must be very primitive, and the initial pronunciation must be very simple. Therefore, we can infer that human language evolves along with the development of humans and the society.

The development of humans includes the continuous improvement of pronunciation organs and ability. Consonants and vowels all develop from simple ones to complex ones, from a small quantity to huge amounts. So, we can infer the development order of the original consonants: from a small quantity to huge amounts; from easy ones to difficult ones; from voiceless consonant to voiced consonants. Ma (2004) suggested that the development order of the vowels may be low vowels first, then high vowels; front vowel first, then back vowels; monophthongs first, then diphthongs.

Sound-Meaning Relation in English Word Roots

Different language families have different phonetic systems, and the phonetic composition of the word roots of Indo-European languages is "consonant + vowel + consonant" (consonant includes consonant group). In fact, each sound has its own meaning. The initial consonant represents the word's semantic category, the vowel represents the further division of its semantic, and the last consonant represents the grammatical meaning. Based on the research of Ma (2004), the following will briefly explain the sound-meaning relation of the initial consonant, vowels, and last consonant of English words.

The sound-meaning relation of the first consonant. The sound-meaning relation of the initial consonant mainly refers to that of onomatopoeia (animal onomatopoeia, natural onomatopoeia, percussion). By analyzing the sound-meaning relation of onomatopoeia, we can find out that: Stop consonants indicate blasting, fricatives indicate rubbing, voiced consonants indicate violently banging, and unvoiced consonants indicate slightly crisping. Also, the initial consonants can be divided into [c] [g] [h] series, [b] [p] [f] series, and [d] [t] [th] series. As we mentioned above, the initial consonant represents the semantic category, so we can infer the basic meaning of this word root by exploring the meaning of the first consonant.

Brief example: [p] means tapping: (1) pat (with hand): touch gently; (2) peep: a short high sound made by a bird or a mouse; and (3) Ping-Pong (ball) (Ma, 2004, p. 44).

The sound-meaning relation of the vowel. Short vowels ([i]): small; negative meaning connected with "small"; inward or inside; quick, rapid, or short action. Long vowels ([ɑ:], [i:], [u:], [ei], [ɑ:], [əu]): slow and leisurely movements; high, huge, long, far (Ma, 2004, p. 45).

The sound-meaning relation of the last consonant. "Initial consonant + vowel" represents action, and the consonant after the vowel represents the subject, object, manner, repetition, and continuation of the action. The formed words can be either verbs or nouns. The radical language roots all end with vowels, mainly [a], [i], [u]. For example, "ba" (hit), if we add consonants to make it a word root, it becomes "beat" (a verb), or it may be "bat" (a noun) (Ma, 2004, p. 46).

The Morphological Changes in English Words

According to Ma (2004), the initial consonant of an English word represents its category meaning, the vowel represents its specific meaning, and the last consonant represents the grammatical meaning. Therefore, there is a rule about the morphological changes of English words: The first consonant does not change, and only the vowel or the last consonant changes to represent the grammatical meaning of the word.

Brief example: the tense of the verb (the original form → past tense → past participle) take → took → taken.

The Rule of English Word-building

The rootology study assumes that word roots evolve from language roots, and then word roots evolve into affixes. The recombination of word roots and affixes produces countless words.

The effect of affixes in English word-building is equivalent to that of adposition, used before or after a word. Adpositions are mainly used for grammatical aims, and affixes are mainly used for lexical purposes. Adpositions contain prepositions and postpositions, and affixes contain prefixes and suffixes. Prefixes are mainly used to change the meaning of a word. When we put a prefix before a verb or an adjective, its function is equivalent to an adverb; when we put it before a noun, its function is equivalent to an adjective. A suffix is mainly used to change the part of speech of a word but can also be used to change the meaning of a word (Ma, 2004).

Ma (2004) claimed that English prefixes, with many categories, evolve from the humans' understanding of the world. As we mentioned above, prefixes are derived from word roots, and word roots evolve from the language roots. So, the differentiation of the language roots equals that of the original meanings, which refers to the differentiation of the subject, object, time, place, method, etc. The variants of word roots and addition of prefixes and suffixes when forming words are both evident expression of such differentiation.

English prefixes can be divided into [b, p, f] prefixes, [c, g, h] prefixes, [d, t] prefixes, vowel prefixes, and number prefixes. In addition to obvious prefixes, some prefixes are hard to be recognized, because they are bounded to the word root. For example, devil OE (with prefix "dia-") means demon (the original meaning: dia + ball, throw about).

English suffixes can be divided into noun suffixes, adjective suffixes, verb suffixes, and adverb suffixes. Like prefixes, some underlying English suffixes come from the original word roots, while other suffixes, which are easy for us to distinguish, are derived from the semantic meanings of the words. The difference between suffixes and prefixes lies in that fewer word meanings are retained in suffixes.

Sound-Meaning Relation in English and Radical Translation Method

To investigate E-C radical translation, it is necessary to find translation cases that come from the early historical materials about Chinese people interacting with English-speaking countries or western foreigners knowing China, that is, the history of English education in China, western missionaries' missionary experiences in China, Chinese or western translators' translation works. According to related research from Yu (2019), China's English education started in Guangdong in 1620, with the arrival of a British merchant ship. From there, relevant historical materials revealing the characteristics of radical E-C translation include: *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language* (Morrison, 2008); *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon and Its Evolution Toward a National Language: The Period From 1840 to 1898* (Masini, 1997); *On E/C Translation of White House: Baiwu*

or *Baigong* (Wang, Han, & Jiang, 2005); *An Investigation of Yan Fu's Translation Thoughts* (Huang, 2016); *English Lexical System Dictionary* (Ma, 2018); *Individualism: Translation and Reconstruction of a Western Concept in China—A Corpus-Based Study* (Zhu & Qin, 2018); *Faces of Democracy: Chinese Translation of Dewey's Democracy and Education* (Feng, 2019); *From Trading Companies to Schools: The English Language Education in China (1620-1862)* (Yu, 2019).

The following materials except for the descriptions are all from these books and documents.

Translation work starts with the meaning of the two languages. If the two languages share the same concepts, translation work involves replacing the words of the original language with corresponding words in the target language. At the beginning, the original language roots evolve from concepts closely related to human beings, such as water and soil, and can be found in most national languages. With the development of humans' production and lifestyles, concepts vary in different languages, resulting in several different situations in conceptual relations. This paper mainly talks about translations under the following circumstances: semantic equivalence, partial equivalence, conflict, and semantic gap. We are to explore how translations vary under those situations due to sound-meaning relation. Based on previous analysis of the sound-meaning relation in English, we can investigate and analyze radical E-C translation according to the following steps.

Semantic Equivalence

Root words. Both “gold” and “copper” are root words in the exclamation language family, belonging to [a i u] language root system. This language root system refers to the object of exclamation, that is, the exclamation towards shining metal. Therefore, “gold” and “copper” may be derived from humans' sighs on metal (Ma, 2018).

In the translation of chemical elements in Wells's principle of chemistry (1858), Fryer (1858) named the new chemical terms in Chinese in the list of 64 elements. Among them, 10 elements that already have Chinese names exist with their original names, such as “金” (gold) and “铜” (copper) (Masini, 1997). Fryer and Morrison's translations of “gold” and “copper” all directly use the original Chinese words to correspond to the English words. There is no need to reflect the sound-meaning relation of “gold” and “copper” in the target language because the translated words are equivalent to the original words. So, translators now only need to convert words. This is a free translation method. Translators are subject to the standard of the target language.

Non-root words. In *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language*, “happiness” is translated into “福” (Morrison, 2008). “Happiness” is a word-building word composed of “happy” and “-ness”; “happy” is composed of “hap” and “-y”. “Hap” is a sticky root of Old English and belongs to [b, p, f] language root system. The initial consonant [h] evolves from consonant [c] and belongs to the cad word family. “Cad” is also a sticky root meaning “landing”. The meaning of “hap” is “luck”, extended from the meaning of “cad”. “-y” is also an Old English suffix, usually added after a noun to indicate “more, a bit, similar”. Another Old English suffix “-ness” is added after an adjective to form a noun, indicating “nature, condition” (Ma, 2018). The translated word “福” does not reflect the sound-meaning relation of “happiness” at all. It's a form of free translation. Morrison's translation reflects his willingness of moving closer to Chinese culture.

Partial Semantic Equivalence

Root words. However, some English words and Chinese words just correspond to each other partly, that is, they are partly different. In this case, some translators failed to find the most suitable words in Chinese for free translation. So, they first chose a Chinese word whose meaning was close to that of the English word and then added Chinese words with no specific meanings to represent the pronunciation of this English word.

For example, Fryer translated “lotus” into “莲，陆佗斯” (Masini, 1997). “莲” is a Chinese character, and “陆佗斯” reveals the pronunciation. “Lotus” is a root word from the language family of flowing water sounds, belonging to the [b p f] language root system (Ma, 2018). “Lotus” into “莲” is a free translation method, while “陆佗斯” is a transliterated word. Neither of these two translated words corresponds to the sound-meaning relation of the original word. Indeed, Fryer’s translation not only reveals his willingness of getting nearer to Chinese culture, but also reflects his purpose of promoting the communication between the two cultures by reserving the source language culture.

Non-root words. “Democracy” consists of “demo” and “-cracy”. “Demo” belongs to the language root system of [d, t, th] and is part of the knife language family, meaning “separate”. The origin of “democracy” is “demos” in Greek, which can be traced back to the primitive Indo-European root “da-mo-”, which refers to “people”, with an original meaning of “divide”. In the eyes of the ancient Greeks, people were divided into various levels and distributed in all classes of the society. “-cracy” means “politics, rules” (as a French affix) or “a government or class characterized by...” (as a Greek affix). “Democracy” refers to a government ruled by the people (Ma, 2018).

The word “民主” in ancient Chinese originates from “民之主宰者”, which refers to the emperor. “民主” appeared with a new meaning in the book *Wanguo gongfa*. It is used to translate “republic” in the book. The original author Wheaton explained the difference between the “monarchical” government and the “republican” government in the book. Ding Yunliang translated “republican” as “民主之国” in his translation. Therefore, the idea of “people rule the country” also existed in the Chinese culture at that time. So, there is a partial equivalence between the semantics of the two words (Masini, 1997).

According to the research of Feng (2019) on the evolution of the Chinese translation of Dewey’s *Democracy and Education*, since 1917, Chinese translators have translated the word “democracy” in the title as: “民本主义” (1917), “平民主义” (1919), “德谟克拉西” (1919), “民主主义” (1919), “民治” (1921), etc. (Feng, 2019). The different translated words of “democracy” used by Chinese scholars are actually related to the different translation purposes of the translators. For example, the translator translated “democracy” into “德谟克拉西” for the purpose of promoting Dewey’s thoughts. At that moment, “德谟克拉西” and “赛因斯” represented the main spirits of May Fourth Movement. The translator hoped that Dewey’s thoughts could bring new blood to China’s reformation. “德谟克拉西” is a transliterated word and does not correspond to the sound-meaning relation of the original word. “Democracy” into “民主 (治)” is in fact a literal translation method, corresponding to the sound-meaning components of the English word. “Democracy” into “民本” is a method of free translated and does not reflect the sound-meaning structure of “democracy”. The word “主义” is related to a heat translation method in the academic field at that time, that is, adding the word “主义” after the translation of English words without the suffix “-ism”. It in fact indicates the emphasis translators laid on Dewey’s ideas. It is also related to their thoughts about reforming Chinese society.

Semantic Conflict

Root words. The semantic conflict pointed out here means that the original word and the translated word have reached the level of “textual equivalence” while fail to meet the need of “translation equivalence”. English and Chinese have corresponding vocabularies that seem to share the same meaning on the textual level. However,

affected by the cultural environment, these vocabularies turn out to have extended meanings which contradict each other.

Take the translation of “White House” as an example. “White” is the root word, meaning “the color of white” in Old English. It belongs to [a, i, u] language root system and is in the Alps word family. “White” refers to the object of exclamation, which is part of the exclamation language family (Ma, 2018). “House” is also a root word, meaning “buildings” in Old English, belonging to the language root system of [g, k, h]. It is concluded in the family of knives and chopping voices (Ma, 2018). Here we mainly discuss the translation of “white” and “house” separately.

Because the two root words in English can be replaced by corresponding words in Chinese, “White House” can be literally translated into “白屋” (referring to a house that is white). However, the extended concepts represented by these two words under their own language backgrounds are different. In western countries, the color word “white” symbolizes “power, right”. Phrases like “White House”, referring to the Presidential Palace of the United States, and “White Hall”, representing the British government, are both symbols of national power. Also, “white paper” in English refers to official documents issued by western countries; “white knight” refers to political reformers or successful businessman. It is obvious that westerners lay great emphasis on “white” in their culture.

In contrast, Chinese prefer “red, yellow” to “black, white”. “White” represents “unlucky” in traditional Chinese culture. The extended meaning of “white” is also affected by politics: It symbolizes a person with no fame or official positions, which is derived from the ancient clothing system. Except for clothing, civilians’ houses that are not painted are called “白屋”.

In this way, although “White House” and “白屋” correspond at the textual level, they do not meet the need of “translation equivalence”. The translation “白屋” may mislead Chinese readers. Some translators argue that “白屋” also caters to the American politicians’ aim of whitewashing its true political intentions. Therefore, the most popular translation of “White House” is “白宫”. The word “宫” corresponds to the word “palace” in English. To a certain extent, it reflects the status, identity, and knowledge of the host of “White House”. This shows that the conceptual conflicts in E-C translation are attributed to the differences in the cultural background of the two ethnic groups. And under this circumstance, the translation method is also affected by translators’ political stances and opinions.

Non-root words. Word-building words are usually rooted in a language environment and are often given special connotations. When translators try to translate these words in another language, the original meanings of these words may change. In some cases, some words are even reconstructed in the new cultural context through translation.

Take the translation of “individualism” as an example. “Individualism” is composed of “individual” and “-ism”. “Individual” is composed of “in-”, “divide”, and “-ual”. And “divide” can be further divided into “di-”, “vid”, and “-e”. “In-” is a prefix meaning “inward” and “di-” is transformed from the prefix “de-” which represents “denying”. “Vid” belongs to the language root of [g, k, h], in the language family of walking. The original meaning of “v” and “w” is “bending and inflection”, where the meaning of “walking” comes from. “-ual” is a variant of the suffix “-al” and is used after a verb to form an adjective. “-ism” is used after a noun to form another noun, referring to a kind of theory or doctrine (Ma, 2018).

According to relevant researches and summaries made by Zhu and Qin (2018), the connotation of “individualism” in the English culture is mainly reflected in the following three aspects: (a) In terms of basic concepts, it emphasizes freedom and self-reliance, the initial place of individual interests; (b) at the behavioral level, it emphasizes that individuals are not restricted by social; and (c) at the political and economic level, “individualism” underlines independence and opposes the control from government and society (Zhu & Qin, 2018). Although “individualism” advocates that the interests of individuals precede that of the country and society, it focuses mainly on self-reliance and independent thinking. However, this concept tends to be misunderstood and turns out being criticized. On the behavioral level, “individualism” is restricted by basic beliefs, which is regulated by social systems, religions, and philosophical views. Without restrictions, the concept of “individualism” can be easily interpreted. “Individualism” is fundamentally an idea born with the rise of the bourgeoisie. While pursuing equality and freedom from feudal privileges and religious authorities, “individualism” is placed in an environment that values material-commodity exchange, thus leading to “Money Worship”. Since the 1960s, some western philosophers have begun to reflect on these problems. So “individualism” has its special meaning in the western culture, and even in the west, people’s understandings toward this word vary.

According to the relevant data about the translation of “individualism” collected by Zhu and Qin (2018), the most popular translation of “individualism” is “个人主义”. In ancient Chinese, the meanings of “个人” and “主义” are “that person” and “fundamental proposition” respectively. In modern Chinese, “个人” and “主义” are created by Japanese scholars with Chinese characters. They were originally used to translate “individual” and “principle”. Obviously, “individualism” and “个人主义” are equivalent at the textual level. Also, the sound-meaning relation of the original word is displayed in the translation. This is a literal translation method, and the relevant translators are subject to the source language norms (Zhu & Qin, 2018).

However, due to different cultural backgrounds, in Chinese culture, we prefer to the concept “people” which is the collection of “individuals”. Therefore, “个人主义” can easily be misinterpreted as a synonym for “利己主义” (“egoism” in English). Due to such misunderstanding, “individualism” is resisted by people. The concept of “个人主义” in Chinese culture is more like a kind of behavior opposite to widely accepted social norms like “集体主义” (“collectivism” in English), rather than a kind of belief or trend of thought advocating freedom. Indeed, if we pay more attention to the meaning on its belief level, it is more likely for us to highlight this word from a positive angle.

The understanding of “individualism” has also changed as the domestic situation in China changes. According to the CCL contemporary Chinese sub-database (1949-2009) made by Zhu and Qin (2018), with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China, the public’s understanding of “个人主义” has undergone a turning. The word “个人主义” began to have a negative meaning, namely a bad thought and lifestyle, which is related to the decadent thoughts from the west such as money worship and hedonism. The reason for such changes lies in that the word “个人主义” does not conform to the traditional Chinese thoughts and concepts, nor does it conform to the mainstream values of China at that time. This shows that the translation of “individualism” was influenced by politics and social culture. In the 1970s and 1980s, “人道主义” (“humanitarianism” in English) became the theme of many literary works, aiming at criticizing the restrictions put on individual rights. In the past three decades, China has undergone tremendous social and economic changes, so do people’s views toward

“individuals”. The negative meaning once represented by “个人主义” is gradually replaced by positive meanings like “freedom”. In contemporary China, the meaning of “个人主义” has also undergone subtle changes. In the translation of the report of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the original Chinese text “个人主义” is translated into “self-centered behavior”. This translation not only fully reflects the subtle conflict between “individualism” and “个人主义”, but also explains that the negative aspect of “individualism” that must be resolutely resisted refers to a behavioral and individual-centered one. At the same time, its meaning on the political and economic level is stripped off, which is closely connected with the spirits that we need to advocate and the current international and domestic situations (Zhu & Qin, 2018).

Semantic Gap

Root words. In the early communication between Chinese and foreigners, some foreign language words closely related to people’s lives at that time were translated into Chinese, such as sandwich (“三文治” in Chinese), cheese (“芝士” in Chinese), and bus (“巴士” in Chinese) (Morrison, 1997). “Bus” is the abbreviation of “omnibus”. It belongs to [g k h] language root system, the language family of sounds of knives and chops. “Chop” develops from “cut”, meaning the result of cutting. Then, “cab” and “car” develop from “chop”. “Omni-” is a prefix derived from the Latin bound root, meaning “complete, all”. “Cheese” belongs to the [b p f] language root system and is part of the mother language family, which refers to mother’s milk (Ma, 2018). These translations above do not reflect the sound-meaning relation of the original word. Such western things were unknown to the local Chinese people at that time, so the above transliterated words were not only used as translations of foreign words, but also used by people at that time to refer to new things. Besides, “三文治” was pronounced “sammenji” in Cantonese, “芝士” was pronounced “jixi” in Cantonese, and “巴士” was pronounced “baxi” in Cantonese. It shows that these words are probably first transliterated with Chinese dialects and then used by local people. Later, these words were absorbed into their own dialects, which are still available till now.

Non-root words. In the early E-C translation materials, due to different reasons containing politics, economy, and culture, some English words have no equivalents in Chinese. In this case, some E-C translators in the early times tended to transliterate these words. Some early transliterated words were often the names of places, people, and some western government agencies. For example, in *Si zhou zhi* and some articles translated from Chinese Repository, “parliament” is translated into “巴厘满”; “House of Commons” is translated into “甘文好司” according to Guangzhou dialect (gemmen houxi) (Masini, 1997).

Take the sound-meaning relation of “parliament” as an example. “Parliament” belongs to the [b p f] language root system and is composed of “parl”, “ia”, and “-ment”. “Parl” is from Old French and means “to say”. “-ment” is a Latin suffix used to construct a noun after a verb, referring to an action or the result of an action (Ma, 2018). “巴厘满” does not reflect the sound-meaning structure of the original word. In *Yinghuan zhilüe*, Xu used more words translated by imitating the structure of the English words. In the passages about the United Kingdom, Xu translated “parliament” into “公会” instead of “巴厘满”. In some later translation materials, “parliament” was translated as “议会”, which is borrowed from Japanese (Masini, 1997). Xu used “爵房” to translate “House of Lords” and “乡绅房” to translate “House of Commons”. These are all words made by imitating the structure of the original word. “Parliament” into “公会” is a method of free translation and does not correspond to the sound-meaning relation of the original word. “Parliament” into “议会” is a method of literal translation, correspondent

to the sound-meaning relation of the original word. Of course, while Xu was writing *Yinghuan zhi liu*, he collected lots of materials written in Chinese by Protestant missionaries. Therefore, some of the translated words he used had been used by western missionaries before. When those Protestant missionaries were conducting E-C translation, they hoped to spread their beliefs through the cultural exchanges between English and Chinese. Therefore, they tended to use translated words which can help promote the understanding of Chinese readers.

Conclusions

There are significant differences between English and Chinese. Therefore, how the semantic meaning of the original English language is reflected in radical translation reflects the western translators' mentality when they first encountered and tried to understand Chinese, and the Chinese translators' mentality when they were first exposed to English. This paper investigates some case examples, according to four semantic relationships, of how translators chose more appropriate ways to convey the sound-meaning relation of the source language in the context of radical E-C translation. In cases where English synonyms exist in Chinese, translators tended to adopt free translation words, which is more likely to preserve the original meaning of the source language. When no English synonyms exist in Chinese, phonetic translations are used. In this case, the imitative and word-building translation methods can best reflect the translators' understandings towards the English sound-meaning relation.

Combining the historical context of that time, we can found that: The western translators used free translation method first and then transliteration, indicating their attempts to get closer to Chinese culture through translation, which was related to their missionary purpose; the Chinese translators used translation and analogy translation (pragmatic translation) in order to achieve the purpose of transforming Chinese culture and influencing readers, reflecting their reader-centered attitude. In radical E-C translation, from the materials of the translations of the Pidgin English and from the missionaries, it is evident that the translators leaned toward each other. This communicative mentality changed when the purpose of translation changed for the aim of influencing native readers. So radical translation on the one hand reflects the initial form of equal communication, and on the other hand is inevitably controlled by realistic purposes. Thus, the communicative mentality is related to the purpose of communication, which determines the shape of translation.

References

- Feng, J. Y. (2019). Faces of democracy: Chinese translation of Dewey's *Democracy and education*. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences)*, 37(2), 29-36.
- Gao, L. F. (2018). A study on the application of functional equivalence to business English E-C translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(7), 759-765.
- Huang, Z. L. (2016). *An investigation of Yan Fu's translation thoughts*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Jing, T. (2017). The function of English on the spread of Chinese tea culture under the background of cross-border e-commerce. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 123-126.
- Li, T., & Xu, F. (2018). Re-appraising self and other in the English translation of contemporary Chinese political discourse. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 25, 106-113.
- Li, Y. M., & Wang, C. H. (2019). On functional classification of languages. *Contemporary Linguistics*, 21(1), 1-22.
- Ma, B. Y. (2004). *An introduction to the English vocabulary system*. Beijing: China Meteorological Press.
- Ma, B. Y. (2018). *A dictionary of the English word system*. Zhengzhou: Henan University Press.
- Masini, F. (1997). *The formation of modern Chinese lexicon and its evolution toward a national language: The Period from 1840 to 1898*. (Q. H. Huang, Trans.). Shanghai: The Publishing House of the Chinese Dictionary.
- Morrison, R. (2008). *A dictionary of the Chinese language*. Zhengzhou: Elephant Press. (Original work published 1815-1823)
- Niu, D. S. (2008). *English and China*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

- Quine, W. V. O. (1960). *Word and object*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Shen, J. J. (2020). Data processing and artificial neural network under big data. *Journal of Electronic Research and Application*, 4(2), 10-15.
- Wang, N. N. (2020). A comparative study of folk culture translation from the perspective of cultural presupposition—Taking four English versions of *Biancheng* as an example. *Open Access Library Journal*, 7(5), 1-9.
- Wang, Y., Han, Q., & Jiang, Y. F. (2005). On E/C translation of White House: Baiwu or Baigong. *Journal of Hubei Industrial Polytechnic*, 18(3), 66-69.
- Yu, D. Y. (2019). *From trading companies to schools, the English language education in China (1620-1862)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.
- Zhu, Y. F., & Qin, H. W. (2018). Individualism: The translation and reconstruction of a western concept in China—A corpus-based study. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 39(3), 34-43.