Meta
Journal des traducteurs
Translators' Journal

Interaction Between Language and the Mind Through Translation: A Perspective from Profile/Base Organization

Qing Wu

Volume 47, Number 4, December 2002

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008035ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/008035ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)
1492-1421 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Wu, Q. (2002). Interaction Between Language and the Mind Through Translation: A Perspective from Profile/Base Organization. *Meta*, *47*(4), 532–563. https://doi.org/10.7202/008035ar

Article abstract

Profile/base organization in cognitive linguistics emphasizes a hierarchy of salience imposed on construal by usage events of some concept. Shift in terms of profile/base alignment is highly likely to occur in a cross-linguistic/cultural context. Granted two definitive features of translation, i.e., accountability of a TT to the ST's textually-grounded intention, unless the TT has an otherwise stated intention, and systematicity attained within the TT itself, whether the shift(s) in a translation are explainable and how fall within our concern. This paper has examined the profile/base organization in two Chinese translations of the opening paragraph of William Faulkner's *The Sound and The Fury*, and attempted to locate the factors to account for the textual realization in the TTs as such.

Interaction Between Language and the Mind Through Translation: A Perspective from Profile/Base Organization*

QING WU
City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong

RÉSUMÉ

L'organisation profil/base dans la linguistique cognitive met l'accent sur une hiérarchie d'éminence imposée à la compréhension par l'usage de certains concepts. Dans le contexte d'un mouvement translinguistique/transculturel, une transition de l'alignement profile/base est plus que probable. Étant donné les deux traits définitifs de la traduction, à savoir la dépendence du TT vis-à-vis de l'intention du ST qui est présentée dans le texte, à moins que le TT ait une intention autrement annoncée, et la systématicité acquise à l'intérieur du TT, nous voulons savoir si l'on peut expliquer la/les transition(s) dans la traduction et comment.

Notre étude a examiné l'organisation profil/base dans deux traductions chinoises du paragraphe d'ouverture de *The Sound and The Fury* de William Faulkner et nous avons essayé de localiser les facteurs pour rendre compte de la réalisation textuelle dans les TTs comme tel.

ABSTRACT

Profile/base organization in cognitive linguistics emphasizes a hierarchy of salience imposed on construal by usage events of some concept. Shift in terms of profile/base alignment is highly likely to occur in a cross-linguistic/cultural context. Granted two definitive features of translation, i.e., accountability of a TT to the ST's textually-grounded intention, unless the TT has an otherwise stated intention, and systematicity attained within the TT itself, whether the shift(s) in a translation are explainable and how fall within our concern.

This paper has examined the profile/base organization in two Chinese translations of the opening paragraph of William Faulkner's *The Sound and The Fury*, and attempted to locate the factors to account for the textual realization in the TTs as such.

MOTS-CLÉS/KEYWORDS

profile/base organization, salience hierarchy, shift, mental representation, translation accountability

1 Introduction

A crucial question to start with

Translation Studies is an area where a variety of perspectives and methodologies have convened to approach the phenomenon of translation. The most prominent is probably "the well-established but by no means flawless models derived from linguistics," which "is now sometimes referred to, pejoratively, as the 'scientistic' approach and generally assumed to be still hung up on naive notions of equivalence and limited to the text as the uppermost unit of analysis" (Baker 1996: 9). In fact, linguistics itself

has always been in an incessant process of development, the situation of which is, however, "regrettably overlooked" (Hatim 1999: 203) by many theoreticians and practitioners in the field of translation studies, e.g., the growth of cognitive linguistics and its heuristic view on language as an integral part of human cognition. Indeed as Hatim (1999: 203) attempts to appeal to the scholarly attention, a simple question like "what kind of linguistics are we talking about on a given occasion?" is crucial before one starts to disagree or agree.

Scope and perspective of study

Translating involves, but of course is not confined to, reading, i.e., construing the original text, and writing, i.e., presenting recognized information from the preceding construal in another language, the two processes of which necessarily take place in an act labeled as translating. A complicated scene of interactions among text, language, and mind may be envisioned here then. It is already cliché in the area that translating is a decision-making process. Yet, research on what has motivated (if any motivation at all) a certain choice over other alternatives may lead to discoveries of some general validity regarding the translational phenomenon. This article will draw heavily on cognitive linguistics, and apply its notion of profile/base organization to analysis of an original and its translations, the effort being intended to understand the interactions between language and the mind in decision-making and to characterize the possible factors involved.

Mental representation and textual realization

As early as 1978, Beaugrande argued that "The basis of the act of translation is not the original text, but rather the representation of the text that is eventually generated in the translator's mind" (25).[1] Although he is discussing the role of reading in poetic translating, we believe that the idea applies equally well to most genres, especially other literary forms such as prose, fiction, short story, etc. Beaugrande goes on to explain that "The mental representation of the text that finally is registered in the translator's mind is not identical with the original text" because the translator's reading "may well have led to a redistribution of prominence within the text" (1978: 26).[2] That is, the mental world invoked by the ST varies from reader to reader. Yet, a translator-reader differs from the ordinary reading public, to be precise, in (a) that his/her reading is devoted to much more details, and (b) that s/he has to put down in words what has been generated in that mental world following those reading processes. There arises another concern as to what to choose from the mental representation to be explicitly presented in a prospective TT. A translator's choices in the course of text writing will accordingly map out a distribution of prominence, the process of which must have been constrained by some factors that may, or may not, have been in the clear consciousness of the translator. The consequent distribution of prominence projected onto a reader's mind via the workings of language and mind will most likely depart from that projected by the ST. Our interest advances further to ask whether such shifts are motivated.[3] May a shift have been inevitable within the target language, motivated by the translator's assumption of coherence within text, or driven by the intention(s) accountable from some patterned use of language in the ST?[4] Or may it result from a contingent, even arbitrary, choice? Beaugrande has

raised a challenging issue in observing a redistribution of prominence but he did not (or chose not to) explore it further in his 1978 monograph.

The growing intellectual interest in language and mind has brought about the rise of cognitive linguistics, which we have found revelatory after this preliminary investigation. Linguistic analyses of text based thereupon have helped examine what may be available for a translator to choose from in constructing a mental representation of the ST, and thus made possible an exploration of how and why s/he has elevated some facets in that representation to a prominent presence in the TT. It is believed that such a cognitively-grounded understanding of translation helps track down the possible factors that may have facilitated or suppressed certain textual realizations.

There seems to be an uncontroversial observation that a translator is both free and constrained in a translating task. Following Beaugrande's discussion (1978) and Iser's reading theory (1980), we may quite confidently argue that a translator is free in generating a mental representation of the ST and that s/he is constrained in presenting in the target language what has been generated in his/her mental representation. In this article, we will apply the notions of profile and base proposed in cognitive linguistics to analysis of the original and its translations. It is hoped that we may explicate and explain by inferring from the ST and its TT(s) the possible factors that have been at work before the final draft takes shape.

The Approach Proposed

When we draw on cognitive linguistics, we refer to that approach to linguistic analysis primarily conceptualized and demonstrated in Langacker 1987 and 1991. Its fundamental assumption that "meaning is a cognitive phenomenon" (Langacker 1987: 5), and its central closely-related conceptions that semantic structure is considerably language-specific, based on conventional imagery, and relative to knowledge structures, that grammar/syntax consists in conventional symbolization of semantic structure, and that there is no meaningful distinction between grammar and lexicon (Langacker 1987: 2-3), all signify an insightful perspective on language and linguistic analysis as far as the study of translation, and of literary translation in particular, is concerned. Langacker himself acknowledges (1987: 2) that cognitive linguistics should be viewed as "an evolving conceptual framework" and is "subject to significant modification and will require extension, elaboration, and more explicit formulation." Tabakowska has also made the remarks that "it is difficult to assess the general effectiveness of the model of language that it proposes or to foresee the full scope of its possible applications" at the moment (1993: 1). This paper does not intend to draw on cognitive linguistics as a whole or assess in general its possible implications for translation studies, as Tabakowska 1993 has almost incorporated the entire framework of cognitive linguistics. Instead, we will focus on its core notions of profile and base to demonstrate, with data from Chinese and English, how the idea of profile/base organization may be illuminating to the thinking on translation.

2 The Profile/Base Organization

2.1 The Notions of Profile and Base in Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive linguistics "demands of linguists a radical conceptual reorientation [and] introduces a whole battery of new concepts, terms, and notations, which take some time to get accustomed to" (Langacker 1987: 2). Profile/base distinction and their relation are such new terms that require careful elucidation. In this section, we will present Langacker's account of profile/base, compare it with other related notions in the framework of cognitive grammar,[5] and attempt to reveal the basic underlying ideas entailed in these notions that are heuristic for thinking on translation.

Definitions and exemplifications

Langacker 1987 defines "profile" as a substructure within the base that is designated and achieves a special degree of prominence (186-7; 491) while "base" as the cognitive structure against which the designatum of a semantic structure is profiled (486). Despite the apparent circularity at first sight, these definitions have rightly brought out the interdependent relation between the two.

A simple cited example of the concepts CIRCLE and ARC will serve to illustrate such a relation (Langacker 1987: 183-4). The base for CIRCLE is a basic domain of two-dimensional space and its profile is a configuration (i.e., set of points, each of which is at an equal distance from a fixed point) in this domain;[6] ARC has for its base the two-dimensional configuration that CIRCLE profiles and designates only a segment of this configuration (continuous but unspecified for size and position). Without such a segmenting profiling, the structure is simply that of a circle (not an arc). Without the base, the profiled configuration can only be identified as a curved line segment (not an arc either). The conception of an arc emerges only when the profile and the base are properly construed in relation to one another.

The hierarchical nature in profile/base organization

Langacker 1987 has acknowledged the fundamental status of the profile/base distinction in its cognition-tied perspective on language (187). Proposals have been made (187-9) from four perspectives to understand the nature of the special prominence that distinguishes the profile of a predication from the remainder of its base:

(a) *figure/ground alignment* in such general cognitive events as scene construal;
(b) *attention* understood as hierarchically organized and consisting of numerous local foci of attention in addition to a global one;
(c) intensity or level of *activation*;
(d) *access node* (function of a profile) that participates simultaneously in several relationships pertaining *to different domains*.

None of them seems fully satisfactory. They, however, all reveal the hierarchical aspect in the profile/base organization. Since level of organization is a vital facet to be taken into account in discussions of figure/ground alignment, attention, and domain (e.g., the primary domain(s) versus the secondary domain(s)), profile/base organization evidently entails a hierarchical characterization.

The above understanding includes two aspects. First of all, the basic assumption underlying the notions of profile and base claims that a linguistic expression necessarily makes some entities and/or relations within a conceptualization salient while

treating others as background.[7] Second, salience is a matter of degree, i.e., profile/base organization involves structuring elements or relations in a layering fashion with some registering higher salience than others in a conceptual process. Although linguists' primary concern centers on natural spoken language, their observations and generalizations largely apply to comprehension of written texts that proceeds in a different sensory channel (i.e., more visual than auditory), frequently not without modifications though. When profile/base organization is discussed in the context of written text understanding, a linguistic expression emphasizes its orthographic appearance rather than its phonological realization, which pertains to the concern of the present article. Then we may visualize that a surface text element provides access to a complex network of conceptualization subsuming concepts at varying cognitive distances (i.e., a vertical dimension), in the meanwhile that it accords considerable salience to some selected portion at a certain level of organization (i.e., a horizontal dimension but still a salience hierarchy within), which thereby stands out in prominence. With particular reference to the afore-proposed understanding of profile as access node, a surface text element may channel the computing of its meaning along the profile/base organizations in both dimensions.

In summary, the information in the background, though having not become the focus of consciousness via a coded appearance in the linguistic product, is still active (but to a variable degree depending on its cognitive distance from and its componential relations to a profiled concept or portion of it) and may well come into play in decision-making processes. The hierarchical nature of profile/base organization lays a cognitively grounded theoretical foundation for an attempt to explicitly describe and systematically characterize the implicit in the underlying conceptualization, i.e., the base.[8] It does not only bear on the comprehension of a linguistic expression but also the presentation of it in another language (or even just by another individual within the same language).

Overlap and distinction: in relation to other notions of high relevance

A number of different but related terms have been used in elucidating the notion of profile, such as "salience," "prominence," "explicitness," "specificity," and the like. In fact, these terms do characterize an important facet of what has been conceptualized as a profile in cognitive linguistics. Langacker has even proposed that "profile/base organization should be related to figure/ground alignment" (1987: 187), the latter being a valid and fundamental feature of cognitive functioning in terms of construal of a scene (1987: 120). It is also his belief that "The profile/base, subject/object, head/modifier distinctions are […] to be analyzed wholly or partially in these [i.e., figure/ground] terms" (1987: 120). We quote his account in the following:

> Impressionistically, the **figure** within a scene is a substructure perceived as "standing out" from the remainder (the **ground**) and accorded special prominence as the pivotal entity around which the scene is organized and for which it provides a setting. Figure/ground organization is not in general automatically determined for a given scene; it is normally possible to structure the same scene with alternate choices of figure. However, various factors do contribute to the naturalness and likelihood of a particular choice. (Langacker 1987: 120; original bolds)

Yet Langacker shows his full awareness in the later part of the book that "it is not sufficient to characterize the profile as figure" since level of organization should be

taken into account and that he would have to leave the matter open whether one may relate profile/base to such general cognitive phenomena as scene construal. (1987: 187; cf. the figure/ground distinction functioning aesthetically in the visual arts as reported in Peer 1986: 21.)

Even if we narrow profile/base organization down to linguistically relevant discussions, a further division of roles or functions is manifest within a profile, i.e., trajector and landmark (see §5.3.3, ch. 6 & 7 in Langacker 1987). That is, there exists a whole set of choices regarding the specifications of trajector, landmark, and their interrelationship respectively. This has in turn elaborated (1) that profile/base organization is hierarchical and profile-base relation is relative in terms of directness and domain, (2) that profiling is a matter of degree and a profile is characterized of a state situated somewhere along a continuum.

Traces of struggle in the attempt to explicate the notion of profile are quite obvious in the literature. It is then natural that Deane has warned readers to guard against the ambiguities involved in explaining the concepts of profile/base and figure/ground and urged more careful elucidation and modification (1992: 303; n.7). To add to this complicated situation, Tabakowska has traced the origin of the figure/ground distinction to Gestalt psychology and reported discussions that relate it to the pragmatic opposition of assertion and presupposition and the perceptually different treatment of the known and the new (1993: 47).

However intricate and equivocal the relation between profile/base and those other related proposals, it is not our purpose to address the terminological issue. Rather, we have identified an insight in the profile/base distinction, i.e., linguistic choices in the course of textualization map out a mental picture comprising numerous distances that build up its own "depth," which will, presumably, manipulate and structure the mental organization of concepts during the discourse interpreting process. The inspiration is of course based on our assumption that design of linguistic presentation contributes significantly to the interpretation of a piece of verbal message.

In the following part, we intend to demonstrate how the profile/base distinction proposed in cognitive linguistics has come to facilitate our thinking on translation issues.

2.2 Mental Representation and Textual Presentation: Understanding Profile/Base Organization in Translating and Translation

As we have summarized, a perspective has been definitely subsumed in a concept and imposed on a linguistic expression (i.e., a usage event of a concept)[9] when it comes out. Some features of a situation are elevated, as a profile, while the remainder suppressed as background, i.e., the base, in the verbalized description of that situation, which stimulates us to ask here: what factors contribute to finalizing a profile/base organization within a text? The suppressed information in the background is just locally and temporarily blocked through linguistic management from emerging in the highest level of consciousness. Presumably, it will readily surface to prominence from obscurity while activated or accessed textually. What would be the case if we place these questions in a context of cross-linguistic communication? For a situation presented in the ST, different translators are likely to come up with different mental representations and may well assume disparate perspectives from which the situation

will be presented in a TT. A mental representation is prompted into being by the source text in a reading mind with various types of knowledge, for instance, textual knowledge of conventional text types and intertextuality, linguistic knowledge of grammar and collocations, the reading individual's real-world experiences, etc. It undergoes constant reconsideration and revision as reading proceeds and reaches a relatively stable status when a through reading comes to an end. It is natural that the richness in a mental representation should reduce sharply after textual realization. We wish to observe whether the profile and/or the base has shifted somehow or the profile/base organization has been preserved in the textual presentation in a different language, and to track the factors contributive to the production of a given TT in this regard.

Thinking on translation along this line was first motivated by a TV series, which exemplifies the profile/base organization in a bilingual context. Imagine a situation in which two interlocutors were arguing over some issue. One of them was reluctant to give in and would produce a last piece of evidence that was claimed to be able to persuade his opponent. The other was willing to hear what it might be, and said

(1E) "I'm listening!"

In the Chinese subtitles it was rendered into

(1Ca) "你 说 吧！"
Nǐ *shuō* *ba*.
2sg speak SFP

The rendition set me wondering how the translator had come up with it. We will see how much room the mental representation of (1E) has left for choice in Chinese textual realizations below.

The two utterances (1E) and (1Ca) choose different actors and their corresponding actions to describe the same situation. There are certainly other renditions available such as (1Cb) and (1Cc) in the following:

(1Cb) "我 听着 呢！"
Wǒ *tīng-zhe* *ne*.
1sg listen-DUR SFP

(1Cc) "说 来 听听！"
shuō *lái* *tīng-tīng*.
speak come listen-listen

Cf. "你 说 来 听听！"
nǐ *shuō* *lái* *tīng-tīng*.
2sg speakcome listen-listen

and "说 来 我 听听！"
shuō *lái* *wǒ* *tīng-tīng*.
speak come 1sg listen-listen

(1Cb) selects a perspective similar to (1E) while (1Cc) suppresses both actors in the situation. Examining more closely the linguistic structures of the original and its three possible Chinese translations, and putting them in that communicative situation where the first speaker has just expressed his desire to present another piece of evidence to convince the second speaker, we have found that:

(i) (1E) and (1Cb), starting with a first person pronoun, actually have switched to the second speaker's own angle of view and described something that is obvious without saying it. Normally, such 'low-information' presentation would convey a sense of sarcasm and impatience;

(ii) (1Ca), however, has followed the line of thinking of the first speaker by maintaining his perspective as is shown in the second person pronoun, by which a sense of respect, open-mindedness, or willingness to listen, though not very strong, could be indirectly established;

(iii) (1Cc) is somewhat different from the above three in that it is a bi-verbal clause. Perspectives have been constructed through the two verbs *shuō* and *tīng*[10] instead of pronouns as is the case in (1E), (1Cb), and (1Ca). The fact that the interlocutors have been kept from emerging in the utterance may be interpreted as an attempt to orient the reader's attention towards the event processes. The verb *lái* following *shuō* is an indicator of weak suggestion (or encouragement), which is in turn re-enforced by a sense of tentativeness conveyed through the subsequent reduplicative use of verb *tīng*.[11] That is, the second speaker invites the first speaker to produce the evidence (to try it out on him and see if it will possibly change his mind) and expresses his willingness at the moment to lend an ear to that. Therefore, this rendition is suggestive, in a more positive manner, of a willingness to listen and perhaps a readiness to sympathize.[12]

The three renderings of (1E) are thus likely to result in different readings.

If we look at the above example in terms of profile/base organization, (1E) and the preceding context evoke a base of a communicative interaction scene in a translator-reader's mind. What vantage point s/he intends to assume in rendering (1E) intelligible to another language community determines the final profile that will be explicitly and linguistically encoded. As we have seen, (1Ca), (1Cb), and (1Cc) have profiled different elements and relations from the base/domain of conversation for explicit linguistic presentation. Assessed independently of the context and the co-texts, all of them may be regarded as adequate. However, a translation does not exist in such vacuum and all these profilings must be well accountable in terms of the context or the co-texts, or even cross-textually. Leaving aside the context under which a translation has been produced (since its information is hardly known enough for serious studies and falls beyond our focus of concern too), we have chosen to seek within texts for TTs' accountability instead. Crude and brief analysis of the aforecited example[13] has stimulated us to wonder whether further detailed analysis of text profilings may reveal what factors have been possibly involved in a translator's decision-making processes. An in-depth case study is hence thought necessary in order to verify or to falsify our intuitive understanding of translation inspired by the example.

Awareness grows along this line that what elements or relations have been assigned more salience in the profile/base organization through textualization may have signaled a redistribution of prominence in the translator's mental representation. Since the redistribution within mental representation stays unreachable, and the redistribution as realized in a TT as such is not important either, it is the *accountability* of the redistribution to the distribution in the ST as well as the *systematicity* of the redistribution as suggestive of some intention of the TT in its own right that calls for substantial consideration in the practice of a translator and the assessment of a translation.

To recapitulate the heuristics that profile/base organization may have for translation studies, the profile-base notion does not only stimulate us to tap the underlying

base for a wider view than the mere explicit profile in understanding a text, by which our mind may be set freer to access more richness entailed in the ST, but also directs our attention to the linkage between what to be profiled and what to be left in obscurity of consciousness. It will thereby enable us to seek the possible constraints involved in the writing of a TT, in the course of which the principles of accountability and systematicity as depicted in the preceding paragraph, that is TT's accountability to ST and its systematicity within itself, will turn out to be the most essential defining features that make a translation a translation. Last but not least, such analysis of a translation will help provide more convincing and reliable evidence for quality assessment or translation criticism and thereby avoid arbitrary or ad hoc claims.

3 A Case Study of The Profile/Base Organization in Translations: Shift? And Motivation?

3.1 Introduction of the Case

Granted that the idea of profile/base distinction, i.e., some foregrounded elements or relations as against a background, largely accounts for how different levels of salience may have been imposed on real world experiences and structured via the workings of a given language (see §2.1 above), the reading of a text will presumably project out a topography in the mind with some information registered higher, i.e., perceptually more prominent, than other though the text always appears in a linear sequence. (See note 2.) What bears significantly on the translational phenomenon is the background that signals a vast source of information absent from the highest level of consciousness but available upon activation. If a translator translates from the mental representation of the ST generated in his/her mind (see Introduction for arguments in Beaugrande 1978), which may be regarded as a provisional aggregate of information at one point along the reading process and comprises different levels of "depth" in consciousness, s/he does not only enjoy a considerable degree of freedom in tapping into the base that underlies concepts and relations between concepts in generating a mental representation, but also in setting the levels of focus in the generated mental representation. When s/he has to realize the mental representation as a TT, some factors will definitely come into play since it is implausible for everything to surface to levels allowed in textual presentation. That is, a translator will be constrained in organizing profile/base distinction in the goal language, given that accountability of a TT to the ST and systematicity in a TT itself have been assumed as defining features of translation. Profilings imposed on a given state of affairs by people within the same speech community may well diverge, let alone those in the ST and a TT, where displacement to varying degrees is foreseeable. What concerns us then does not stop over the description and categorization of differences. Rather, it is the motivations behind these differences that we seek to understand. More than one translation of the same ST will be closely examined to see whether shifts occur in terms of profile/base organization,[14] and to find out how the translating mind might have conformed to and stretched the language conventions while striving for a translation, and why.

Two Chinese translations of the opening paragraph of William Faulkner's *The Sound and The Fury* will be closely examined in this section along the line of thinking

of profile/base distinction, whereby an awareness of language management through profile/base organization is demonstrated to be heuristic for translators. This case study is also intended to help pin down some possible factors that may have been at work in a translator's profiling. Of course, as Hatim puts it, such work "is not to suggest a definitive course of action (none exists), but rather to suggest general criteria which can make our decision-making less haphazard." (1999: 211)

The original excerpt and its two Chinese translations are as follows whereas a word-for-word English gloss of the Chinese translations can be found in the Appendix:

ORIGINAL:

> Through the fence, between the curling flower spaces, I could see them hitting. They were coming toward where the flag was and I went along the fence. Luster was hunting in the grass by the flower tree. They took the flag out, and they were hitting. Then they put the flag back and they went to the table, and he hit and the other hit. Then they went on, and I went along the fence. Luster came away from the flower tree and we went along the fence and they stopped and we stopped and I looked through the fence while Luster was hunting in the grass. (Excerpt from *The Sound and The Fury*, William Faulkner, 1931/1978, London: Chatto & Windus)

LW:

透过栅栏，穿过攀绕的花枝的空档，我看见他们在打球。他们朝插着小旗的地方走过来，我顺着栅栏朝前走。勒斯特在那棵开花的树旁草地里找东西。他们把小旗拔出来，打球了。接着他们又把小旗插回去，来到高地上，这人打了一下，另外那人也打了一下。他们接着朝前走，我也顺着栅栏朝前走。勒斯特离开了那棵开花的树，我们沿着栅栏一起走，这时候他们站住了，我们也站住了。我透过栅栏张望，勒斯特在草丛里找东西。(摘自李文俊译《喧哗与骚动》，1984 年，上海：上海译文出版社)

LD:

透过篱笆，从苦苓花的空隙，我看得见他们正在打着。他们朝旗帜处走来，我便沿着篱笆走去。鲁斯特正在花树边的草地上追寻。他们拿出了旗帜，接着打起来。他们随后把旗子放回，走到桌边，先是他敲，接着另一个也敲。他们接着继续下去，我仍沿着篱笆走去。鲁斯特离开了那棵花树，我们沿着篱笆走，他们停下来，我们也停下来。鲁斯特在草地里追寻时，我便透过篱笆看过去。(摘自黎登鑫译《声音与愤怒》，1987 年第 6 版，台北：远景出版社)

Before we go into a close examination of the language management in these texts, it seems necessary to give a brief account of the main characters involved: The narrator "I" is Benjy Compson, a severely retarded man aged 33, whereas "Luster" is a 17-or-18-year-old black boy whose job is to take care of Benjy. Evidence for Benjy's retardedness in the literature primarily falls into two groups. While literary criticism claims support from: (i) Benjy's being directly addressed as 'idiot,'[15] and (ii) the author's own explicit statement,[16] critical linguistics enlists linguistic analysis. For instance, Fowler believes that

> Faulkner has designed the language to suggest the limitations of Benjy's grasp of the world around him. The style is not […] disintegrated in a haphazard fashion, but is systematically patterned in certain areas of structure. (1986/1996: 169)

He has identified four areas of structure (i.e., transitivity, lexical classification, reference and deixis) that characterize the limitedness and innocence of Benjy's world-view. Such a methodology, i.e., exploring literary influence by way of linguistic analysis, makes the verification, or falsification, of his conclusion operable and thereby enhances its validity, albeit with reservations about some specifics within Fowler's analysis (see below).

3.2 Detailed analysis of the profile/base organization in the texts

3.2.1 Simulation of a reading process: progressive mental representations of [HIT]

If a translator has gained a comprehensive knowledge of the original (e.g., characters, scenes, events, plots) before the final draft takes shape, s/he is not entitled to "read" for his/her readers. If a translator allows him/herself to be overwhelmed by and immersed in the work during the reading and first-draft-writing processes to maximize his/her sensitivity to the original work, s/he will need to stay aloof somewhat to work on the language management in the revision stage because forms of linguistic presentation either re-enforce or undermine literary functions.[17] The objectives of the analysis below are to find out if the shifts in profile/base organization are inevitable due to the conventions of the goal language,[18] or if they are manipulations of the translator, and if so if they are intended for some textual purposes or merely arbitrary decisions.

Let us imagine a situation where readers start reading the novel from its very beginning. The comprehension resembles a hypothesis-setting-verifying/falsifying-revising process while the reading proceeds. When readers encounter a linguistic expression (from morpheme to any larger unit of meaning), they are not sure of its exact sense until later texts and their real world knowledge help them pin down the domain of conceptualization. The first encounter of a linguistic expression therefore leaves a relatively schematic understanding in readers' mental representation that awaits further specifications in a number of facets. Take the concept [HIT] as an example, which has made four appearances in this opening paragraph but each may be said to differ from the previous one in terms of specificity.[19]

[HIT] designates a process in which a trajector moves through space, makes forceful contact with the landmark, and then probably departs from it (see Langacker 1987: 317-20 for discussions of one type of use of *hit*; cf. Brown 1994 for a comprehensive discussion of *hit*, not unproblematic though). There are, of course,

other parts than trajector and landmark within a profile, for instance, the locative configuration between the trajector and the landmark, the construal of the internal structure of [HIT] exclusive of its starting and ending points, the force value at the point when the trajector makes contact with the landmark (which may serve to distinguish 敲 from 打 since the two share the same base for conception, see Table 1. below), etc. We concentrate, however, in the present article on the trajector and the landmark only by way of demonstrating how profile/base organization builds up a perspective to affect the reading mind and a translating act in turn, and all the conception of [HIT] is extremely schematic knowledge stored in long-term memory.

When activated into use, such elements as trajector, landmark, and their relations are subject to various specifications while domains for construal vary. The first use of [HIT] comes about at the end of the first sentence, up to where a reader has tied to the conceptualization of [HIT] some details. Compared with the schematic conceptualization of [HIT], the profile/base organization achieves a higher degree of salience:[20]

1) [HIT] takes place outdoors (due to the cognitive frame evoked by *fence*): base
2) The trajector of [HIT] is elaborated by *them*,[21] a construal of more than one as an undifferentiated whole:[22] profile

Up to the second use of [HIT], schematicity lowers further and more indeterminacies come to a resolution, albeit not a full one. The profile/base organization continues to be brought into sharper focus:

3) *They*, the elaborated trajector, moves around when not hitting: profile
4) [FLAG] is evoked as part of the scene where hitting happens: base

Up to the third use of [HIT], the profile/base organization becomes finer-grained:

5) [TABLE] is evoked as part of the scene where hitting happens: base
6) Hitting is done individually (due to the suggestion by the singular subject): profile

Up to the fourth use of [HIT], the profile/base organization now specifies:

7) *They* are two individuals (due to the implication by *he* and *the other*): profile
8) Hitting involves turn-taking (due to the recognition of the hitting act as individually done in contrast to the first and second uses of [HIT] collectively perceived): base

The base for construal of [HIT] continues to contract to its intersection with domains evoked by upcoming concepts (as is shown by 1), 4), 5), 8)). However, the profile of [HIT] varies only in that the trajector has become individually differentiated. The trajector is elaborated by a plural pronoun that is a very schematic [THING] (i.e., nothing is known other than that it is a replicate mass) and the degree of salience achieved so is moderate, while the other most salient part within the profile,[23] i.e., the landmark, is left unelaborated by any surface text elements and thereby remains highly schematic.[24] To put it in other words, we are not informed of what has been hit or who exactly has done the hitting. 1) induces a reader to set up a hypothesis that the hitting might be outdoors, and some jesting fights, or some game; 5) does not have anything in conflict with the initial hypothesis which thereby continues to hold; 7) does not oppose that hypothesis either; 11) makes it more likely to be a game since there seem to be some rules (e.g., turn-taking) to observe. Yet still, the picture on the whole looks mentally like a blur. Or switching to the perspective of the narrator, Benjy, we can see his presentation of the scene seems to reflect an inad-

equate intelligence, or at least may render a normal adult reading mind unsatisfactory or make it feel unusual up to this part of the narration even if readers may identify a provisional domain for their construal of [HIT], since the description is imprecise and fuzzy as if the observation were made from behind a piece of lightly-frosted glass. The weird feeling has come about under the influence of the linguistic presentation of the scene.

Fowler (1986/1996: 169) reaches a similar conclusion though his linguistic analysis from which the conclusion has been drawn is not unproblematic, especially when the processual computation of meaning along reading is taken into account as we have strived to simulate above. According to Fowler, the transitive verb *hit* has been "used repeatedly without an object, ungrammatically," which is supposed to take one by the traditional English grammar (1986/1996: 169). First of all, as Brown 1994 has argued, verb classification following the traditional transitive/intransitive distinction is not fine-grained enough (61; see Hopper & Thompson 1980 for a discussion of transitivity parameters from the perspective of prototype theory). The traditional prescriptive view (i.e., if a verb is classified as transitive it will not appear in an intransitive pattern and if it does appear it will be labeled as "ungrammatical") seems to fall at a time when grammar comes to lose its purely autonomous status and is increasingly recognized as part of the general cognitive capacity. In a study of natural texts, it seems somewhat self-defeating to apply a prescriptive label such as 'ungrammatical' to a patterned use and to explain on that basis the purpose(s) of deviation. Any appearances in a natural text (except typographical mistakes) are actual usage events. We may describe (but not describe in a prescriptive spirit) the textual phenomena and account for how the patterned use (if any) serves to structure the reading mind.

Another relevant point is that "well-formedness," or "grammaticality" in standard terminology,[25] is a matter of understanding. Whether an expression is well-formed critically depends on what conventional units are selected for its primary categorization (see Langacker 1987: 431). Therefore, if the transitive pattern is chosen to sanction an instance of "hit" taking no object, it is of course readily interpreted as ill-formed; but if readers are open in this regard, i.e., whatever they encounter will be taken as well-formed until it is textually contradicted, the four uses of [HIT] (that all underspecify the most salient parts, i.e., the trajector and the landmark, within its profile) accumulate to build up a perspective that imposes on a reading mind an observation that falls short of its expectation. People are generally not accustomed to seeing blurred pictures. Underspecifications may thus lead readers to project an unusual mentality onto the narrator Benjy. The intention to map out an innocent mind (as is claimed by the author, see note 16) has thus been realized via systematic language planning to manipulate the working of the reading mind.

In summary, although Fowler has also managed to explain how a literary function has been reinforced through language design, some specifics in his linguistic analysis contain loopholes and fail to reveal how language uses work on the mind in the course of reading.

3.2.2 *Profile/base organizations of [HIT] in the ST and its TTs: factors identified for shift*

We have spent some space describing how the conceptualization of [HIT] develops along reading from the perspective of profile/base organization and comparing it with Fowler's analysis to show the latter's weakness in explaining how a text exerts impact on a reading mind via language management. However, this is not our ultimate purpose. All the above analysis is intended to demonstrate how the profile/base organization is formulated in this paragraph to blur the scene under description and as a result affects a reader's feeling and judgment about the narrator, and to explore how such awareness of language management may bear on studies of translation. We will in the following turn to examine two Chinese translations of this opening paragraph and compare the profile/base organizations in these three texts to identify the motivations for displacement in the two translations (if any).

The clauses where instances of [HIT] appear are listed below along with the two corresponding translations:

LISTING 1

ST	LW	LD
(1) I could see them hitting.	我看见他们在打球	我看得见他们正在打着 **Φ**[26]
(6) and they were hitting.	打球了	接着打起 **Φ** 来
(9) and he hit	这人打了一下 **Φ**	先是他敲 **Φ**
(10) and the other hit	另外那人也打了一下 **Φ**	接着另一个也敲 **Φ**

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the position of the segments in the Appendix.

The schematic base in conception of [打] and [敲] in Chinese resembles that of [HIT] in English. Such similarity in base can be seen in the following Table 1, which, however, will not reflect their difference in profile for its focus concentrates only on trajectors and landmarks within the profile. (See §3.2.1 above.)

TABLE 1

Profile/base organization in construal of [HIT]/*hit*

hit	TEXT CODE	PROFILE		BASE
		overt trajector elaboration/ salience degree	overt landmark elaboration/ saliencedegree	
$[\text{HIT}]_1$	ST	*them* / M^-	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game
$[\text{打}]_1$	LW	他们 / M^+	球 / H	outdoor ball game
$[\text{打}]_1$	LD	他们 / M^+	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game
$[\text{HIT}]_6$	ST	*they* / M^-	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game with a flag/$[\text{FLAG}]^H$
$[\text{打}]_6$	LW	elliptic Φ/ L^+	球 / H	outdoor ball game with a flag/$[\text{FLAG}]^{H+}$ [27]
$[\text{打}]_6$	LD	elliptic Φ/ L^+	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game with a flag/$[\text{FLAG}]^{H+}$

[HIT]$_9$	ST	*he* / M	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game with a flag/[FLAG]^H and a table/[TABLE]^H
[打]$_9$	LW	这人 / H^+	Φ / L	outdoor ball game in a terrace/ [TERRACE]^H with a flag/[FLAG]$^{H+}$
[敲]$_9$	LD	他 / M^+	Φ / L	outdoor jesting fights or game with a flag/[FLAG]$^{H+}$ and a table/[TABLE]^H
[HIT]$_{10}$	ST	*the other* / M	Φ / L	turn-taking outdoor game with a flag/[FLAG]^H and a table/[TABLE]^H
[打]$_{10}$	LW	另外那人 / H^+	Φ / L	turn-taking outdoor ball game in a terrace/[TERRACE]^H with a flag/[FLAG]$^{H+}$
[敲]$_{10}$	LD	另一个 / M^+	Φ / L	turn-taking outdoor game with a flag/ [FLAG]$^{H+}$ and a table/[TABLE]^H

Note: H(high), M(medium), L(low) hereinafter indicate the relative degree of salience, and each further distinguishes finer differences of salience degree, using symbol plus, bare symbol, and symbol minus for these sub-rankings in a degrading order, i.e., H+, H, H-, M+, M, M-, L+, L, and L-, nine levels of salience degree in all. Yet the notations in the tables should not be understood as absolute rankings but just rankings based on comparison among the three texts in question. The numbers in subscript correspond to those in the Listings and the Appendix.

The fact that the base progresses to gain salience is easy to understand, but the departures from the ST observed in the translations are worth questioning. LW departs more than LD in this sense.

The former, from the very beginning and throughout the four uses of [HIT], ascertains the reading mind that it is a ball game and indicates via 小旗 and 高拔 that it might be a golf game, which turns out to be confirmed by such special terms as *caddie* and *pasture* in the later part of the novel. That is, the knowledge that the *they* Benjy has been watching is in a golf game comes from the mental representation generated out of the translator's reading of the whole work. The translator has hastened to make the picture clear at the very beginning, and may thus deprive prospective readers of the right to enjoy a processual reading and to interpret themselves, as s/he enjoys in his/her own reading of the ST.

LD, by contrast, follows very closely the ST in "base" delineation except that 旗帜 is more specific than the concept of 旗 in [FLAG]. Although 旗 alone is not impossible in modern Chinese, there does exist an inclination to bisyllabicize a monosyllabic morpheme. This may have motivated the translator's choice of 旗帜. Even if so, there are other alternatives than 旗帜 to bisyllabicize 旗, for example, 旗子. How could the translation be accounted for then?

Corresponding to base organizations, profilings manifest even greater displacement. The most obvious one is the overt elaborations of the landmark within a [HIT] profile in LW, which naturally springs from a ball-game base. Similarly, three out of the four translations accord higher degree of salience to trajector elaborations. The only one exception may be ascribed to the linguistic convention in modern Chinese discourses that zero anaphora is more frequent than overt pronouns when descriptions center around the same referent(s). One case worth noting is the translation of *them*. *Them* in English (as we have characterized before) does not specify any features like [ANIMATE], [HUMAN], [SEX], etc. It is construed as a replicate mass. However, modern written Chinese distinguishes [ANIMATE] and [SEX] orthographically in third

person plurals, i.e., 他们([MALE]∩[HUMAN]; "∩" for overlap of intersected sets), 她们 ([FEMALE]∩[HUMAN]), and 它们 ([NONHUMAN]). Selection of definitely increases the degree of salience of the trajector but this is inevitable since the linguistic conventions offer no other alternative that would make the choice less salient. In short, displacement in profile/base organization sometimes is imposed on textualization by the language conventions.

To sum up, we have so far identified the factors that may have led to motivated displacement of profile/base organization in the translators' textualization:

The first type is comprehensive information obtained of the *entire* work:

(**F1**) **overall mental representation;**[28]

The second type is linguistic convention, which further divides into two sub-factors:

(**F2**) **optional but preferred linguistic conventions;**
(**F3**) **obligatory linguistic conventions.**[29]

The displacements we have observed in the two translations would allow a reading mind to gain a more precise and clearer perception of the scene under the narrator's description. The narration in the TTs will in turn be naturally interpreted as more usual and normal than that in the ST in which narration has been systematically building up an unusual perspective through imprecise and fuzzy descriptions in this opening paragraph of *The Sound and the Fury*.

Unless the translator explicitly states otherwise, we assume s/he has strived for as much accountability to the intention(s) in the ST as possible in designing TT's profile/base organization. If this holds, how the TTs have been as such may be attributed to that the translators failure to recognize the original's designed pattern of language use in delineating the character's abnormal mental capacity. It thus in a way confirms that awareness of language management is critical in translating activities.

It has been illustrated how the translators must have been translating from the mental world generated in their mind instead of the ST as such. The description of the profile/base organizations in the translations as exemplified in their treatment of "hit" has, on the one hand, revealed a concern for linguistic well-formedness, as they enlisted extra entities or features from the mental representation to make up for the lack of well-formedness in the ST, as it were; it, on the other hand, has also indicated relatedness perceived and constructed between the concepts[30] out of an overview of the entire work. Awareness of the role that language plays in facilitating a deviated reading and effort in adjusting a translator's perspective to the narrator's (here Benjy's) are hardly noticeable in the two translations' language management.

3.2.3 Other textual manifestations of shift in profile/base organization

Other examples of displacement in profile/base organization found in the sample texts will be enumerated in the following to illustrate further how focus zooms in or out to project onto the mental representation distinct or blurred images. They include instances from the English categories of verbs, prepositions, nominals and connectives, analysis of which will be presented in the form of tables. First, let us look at Listing 2 below to examine the italicized and the underlined expressions.

LISTING 2

ST	LW	LD
(2) … where the flag *was*	… 插着小旗的地方 …	… 旗帜处 …
(3) … went *along* the fence.	… 顺着栅栏朝前走。	… 沿着篱笆走去。
(4) … *the flower* tree.	… 那棵开花的树 …	… 花树 …
(5) … *took* the flag out,	… 把小旗拔出来，	… 拿出了旗帜，
(7) … *put* the flag back	… 把小旗插回去，	… 把旗子放回，
(12) … went *along* the fence.	… 也顺着栅栏朝前走。	… 仍沿着篱笆走去。
(14) … *we* went *along* the fence	… 我们沿着栅栏一起走，	… 我们沿着篱笆走，

TABLE 2

Profile / base organization in construal of [BE] / *was* [31] in (2)

– verbs: *be*, *take*, *put*

	usage event / linguistic pattern	concept	profile of concept (PC) / salience degree	base of concept (BC) / salience degree	profile in usage event (PUE) / salience degree	base in usage event (BUE)/ salience degree
ST	was / $[BE]_{PAST}$	[BE]	continuation through time of a stable spatial configuration between trajector and landmark / L	[SPACE] (invoked by *where*) / L	PC (with trajector elaborated by $[FLAG]^{H}$ and landmark unelaborated) located in the past on the time axis / M	outdoor setting with [FENCE], [FLOWER], $[FLAG]^{H}$ / M
LW	插着 / [STICK]+*zhe*	[STICK]	evolution through time of a changing spatial configuration between trajector and landmark / L^{+}	[SPACE] / L	final state of PC (with trajector elaborated by $[FLAG]^{H+}$ and landmark unelaborated) / H	PC in outdoor setting with [FENCE], [FLOWER], [BALL], $[FLAG]^{H+}$ / H
LD	…处 / [SPATIAL OCCUPATION OF …]	[LOCATION]	stative spatial configuration between trajector and landmark / L^{-}	[SPACE] / L	PC (with trajector elaborated by $[FLAG]^{H+}$ and landmark unelaborated) / M^{-}	outdoor setting with [FENCE], [FLOWER], $[FLAG]^{H+}$ / M

[STICK] designates a process in which a trajector moves through space toward a landmark, reaches the physical boundary of the landmark, and proceeds against friction until part (or the whole) of the trajector is included within the landmark.

[LOCATION] designates a state in which a trajector takes up part (or the whole) of the physical boundary of a landmark. (See Langacker 1987: 216-7 for related discussions of [PART] and [OF].)

LW deviates from the ST due to the choice of a more salient concept [STICK]. The decision is highly likely to have been induced by the knowledge of a golf game in the translator's overall mental representation, i.e., (F1). PUE_{LW} abruptly increases in salience compared with PUE_{ST} because it does not only elaborate on trajector but also

singles out one component state (i.e., selecting the final state of PC against the entire PC as its immediate scope of conception). Yet, it is noteworthy that the former does not specify its location in the temporal dimension, which is what modern Chinese sanctions, i.e., construal of a temporal relation (i.e., a process) does not require linguistically overt specification of time, as opposed to modern English. That is, displacement in profile/base organization in this respect is attributable to (F3).

Displacement takes place in LD too, only in an opposite direction, i.e., salience degree has degenerated as against ST. Leaving aside whether LD has room for improvement (especially when taking into account the fact that? in the discussed sense usually belongs to discourse in formal register), we may conclude regarding the construal of [BE] that the description presented in LD is more vague than that in LW, as is shown in Table 2 by PC_{LW}>PC_{LD}, PUE_{LW}>PUE_{LD}, BUE_{LW}>BUE_{LD} (">" for higher than).

In fact, a vertical search and some horizontal comparisons will find us more evidence in favor of this conclusion. For instance, in (5) and (7), treatments in LW (see italicized and underlined parts in Listing 2.) accord more salience to the construal of the more schematic processes evoked by ST within a mental representation than those in LD. See Table 3 below for comparison between the profile/base organizations in the prototypical concepts, which suffices to reveal the profile/base organization in usage event because conceptual schema will be inherited in construal.

TABLE 3

Profile/base organization in [TAKE] and [PUT], [?] and [?], [?] and [?]

TEXT CODE	CONCEPT	PROFILE				BASE
		$trajector_1$	$trajector_2$	trajectory after contact point	force applied at contact point	
ST	[TAKE]	—	—	away from landmark	—	$trajector_1$ moves through space, makes contact with $trajector_2$ located with landmark; two trajectors move away from landmark
LW	[拔]	—	shape: thin & long	linear away from landmark along physical length dimension of $trajector_2$	with force	ditto
LD	[拿]	—	—	away from landmark	—	ditto
ST	[PUT]	—	—	towards landmark	—	$trajector_1$ moves with $trajector_2$ through space until $trajector_2$ contacts landmark; $trajector_1$ parts with $trajector_2$ which remains with landmark
LW	[插]	—	shape: thin & long	linear towards inside of landmark along physical length dimension of $trajector_2$	with force	ditto
LD	[放]	—	—	towards landmark	—	ditto

Notation: — for no or unknown specifications

TABLE 4

Profile/base organization in construal of [ALONG]/*along* in (3) [32]

– prepositions: *along*

	usage event	concept	profile of concept (PC) / salience degree	base of concept (BC) / salience degree	profile in usage event (PUE) / salience degree	base in usage event (BUE) / salience degree
ST	along	[ALONG]	trajectory parallel to landmark / L	[SPACE] (invoked by physical extension of *fence*) / L	PC (with trajector elaborated by [I] and landmark by [FENCE]^{H}) / M	outdoor setting with [FENCE]^{H} / M
LW	顺着… 朝前	[ALONG]∩ [FORWARD]	trajectory parallel to landmark and in the direction of trajector's face / L^{+}	[SPACE] / L	PC (with trajector elaborated by [I] and landmark by [FENCE]^{H}) / M	outdoor setting with [FENCE]^{H} / M
LD	沿着… 去	[ALONG]∩ [GO]	trajectory parallel to landmark and away from trajector's point of origin / L^{+}	[SPACE] / L	PC (with trajector elaborated by [I] and landmark by [FENCE]^{H}) / M	outdoor setting with [FENCE]^{H} / M

Both LW and LD have assigned higher salience to construal of *along* as is shown in Table 4. (12) will project a similarly well-oriented image on a reading mind (despite that the base would have become more specific). By contrast, both translations of (14) have not added any directional or deictic implication in construal of *along*.[33] We find it hard to account for such inconsistencies in construal reflected in textualization and therefore consider the profile/base organization in both translations' conception of *along* ad hoc, i.e., no motivation can be identified for these profilings in translation. This case stands in complement to those cases where there are presumably motivations for a final decision, and for which we have sought to locate the factors at work in decision-making.

TABLE 5

Profile/base organization in construal of [TREE]/*the flower tree* in (4)[35]

- nominals: *the flower tree*

	usage event / linguistic pattern	concept	profile of concept (PC) / salience degree	base of concept (BC) / salience degree	profile in usage event (PUE) / salience degree	base in usage event (BUE) / salience degree
ST	the flower tree / [DET]+[N]$_{SG}$+[N]$_{SG}$	[TREE]	 / L	[PLANT] network / L	an instance of PC as identifiable[34] (e.g., number) / M	outdoor [PLANT] with [FLOWER]^{L}, [GRASS] / M
LW	那棵开花的树 / [DET]+[CL]+[CLAUSE]+*de*+[N]	[TREE]	 / L	[PLANT] network / L	an instance of PC as identifiable (e.g., distance, number, shape, growth stage) / M^{+}	outdoor [PLANT] with [FLOWER]^{H}, [BRANCH], [GRASS] / M^{+}
LD	花树 / [N]+[N]	[TREE]	 / L	[PLANT] network / L	an instance of PC as identifiable / M^{-}	outdoor [PLANT] with [FLOWER]^{H}, [GRASS] / M^{+}

Discrepancy between the translations' PUE and the ST's reflect different textualized construals of *the flower tree* within the current discourse space, i.e., the BUEs, which will in turn serve as linguistic clues in structuring a reader's mental representation in subsequent text reading. Specifically, the determiner, or the definite article *the* precisely, plus the singular form of *tree* constitutes the source of discrepancy. *The* profiles an instance of [TREE] type and confers a considerable degree of identifiability on the instance; the singular morpheme on [TREE] (zero in form in modern English) is further recognized as specifying the number of the instance in particular. Such construals may also tolerate specifications regarding spatial bounding, shape, and location incorporated within the construal of the superschema [THING], of which [TREE] is an instance lying at some distance along the line of hierarchy (see Langacker 1987: ch.5). This last point puts us in a position to explain why the construed identifiability in PUE$_{LW}$ is likely to exceed the ST's overt specification domain (i.e., number) and informs a reader of distance and shape (as suggested by the distal demonstrative 那 and the classifier 棵 in modern Chinese). In contrast, PUE$_{LD}$ leaves open the number specification (though a singular reading may be preferred), which is perfectly fine with a bare NP in modern Chinese.

That PUE$_{LW}$ ranks higher in terms of salience than PUE$_{ST}$ is also due to the construal of *flower* in such environment as __N. Modern English grammar would take N as the profile determinant in the valence relation between *flower* and N. In view of figure/ground alignment, the profile determinant (i.e., the head noun *tree*) functions as the figure while the modifier *flower* constitutes the ground, a highly schematic one (see Langacker 1987: 235 and 1991: §2.1). Yet, [FLOWER] in BUE$_{LW}$ con-

stitutes a less obscure ground[36] because it serves to elaborate the trajector of an imperfectively construed process 开; and the process of [开] will reversely enhances the salience degree of the flower considerably for it describes the growth stage of the tree, as is hence marked by [FLOWER]^{H} in BUE_{LW}. In contrast, [FLOWER] in BUE_{LD} would have inherited high specificity from 苦苓花, a specific term naming a type of flower whose profile contains a number of concrete specifications, and thereby obtained even more salience than in BUE_{LW} in construal. Although the absence of 苦苓花 from the current clause restores a somewhat schematic flower, the flower in BUE_{LD} stands more salient than that in ST still and is hence marked by [FLOWER]^{H} too.

Textual shifts reflected by profile/base organization in construal of *the flower tree*, as analyzed in the above to show their potential impact on a reading mind, can be summarized as follows: no motivation, from the perspective of overall mental representation or linguistic convention, may be found for LW's shift in profile/base organization, while (F3) contributes in part to LD's underspecifying shift in profiling. It is not that shift is to be strictly prohibited (let alone its implausibility). Yet awareness regarding whether profile/base organization in the ST consistently orients a reader's mental representation towards something particular, e.g., an imprecise description purported to generate a blurred mental representation in Faulkner's writing, certainly will make translators' choices less haphazard. Shift in such a case would be supposed to be motivated, and in case of a failure to pin down some motivation a translation would be considered ad hoc.

– connectives: *and*

A last conspicuous profiling shift is locatable in the uses of *and* in the ST where it performs a conjunctive function to link two events expressed in short clauses. Langacker argues from the perspective of profiling that

> A 'pure' conjunction can be characterized as one that retains no vestige of any objective connecting relationship and at best a minimal subjective relationship. Stripped to the bare minimum, an *and*-type conjunction merely indicates the mental juxtaposition of two co-equal conceptions (their co-equality reflecting an absence of any conceived relationship that would impose an asymmetry). (1991: 429; original italics)[37]

According to him, a conceived interrelationship, i.e., an objective connecting relationship, fades entirely from the profile of [AND], and each of its connected components stands as separate-but-equal profiles out of the whole coordinate structure (Langacker 1991: 428-9; 472-3). Such a profile/base-grounded theory of [AND] fully explains why a sequence of verbal projections with an overuse of *and*, e.g., the 17-clause-long sample ST threaded by 10 *and*s, would seem like a slide show of pictures.[38] It is because [AND] profiles in a single gestalt separate profiles of each component but not their interrelationships. Therefore, the ST presentation would strike a reader as more fragmented than related as if s/he were conceiving objects with discrete boundaries rather than consecutive processes.

However, it has also been acknowledged that "in actual usage even the 'purest' of conjunctions tends to pick up pragmatically induced interpretations involving temporal sequence, causation, etc." (Langacker 1991: 429). That is, room is always left with a translator-reader for computation of the connecting relationship suppressed from the profile of [AND]. It is natural enough for a reader to sort things out in his/

her mental representation. A question would arise in front of a translator-reader as to whether the conceived interrelationship is to be elevated to surface via textualization, denying a reader of the translation a true experience of reading, laborious and unsatisfatory may it be. Let us now look at a table that summarizes the possibilities and the actualities of construing *and*-relation in our sample texts.

TABLE 6

Profile/base organization in construal of *and*-relation[40]

and in current clause /salience of interrelation in profile	trigger ST elements in preceding/current clauses	conception of interrelationship induced by trigger ST elements	textualization in LW / salience of interrelation in profile	textualization in LD /salience of interrelation in profile
and_3 / –	coming / went	contrast (between deictic motions)[39]	Φ / –	便 / +
and_6 / –	they / they	continuation (in referencing)	Φ / –	接着 / +
and_8 / –	they / they	continuation (in referencing)	Φ / –	Φ / –
and_9 / –	they / he (…the other)	derivation (of referent)	Φ / –	Φ / –
and_{10} /–	he / the other; hit / hit	contrast (between referents): repetition (of process)	这人…另外那人也… / +	先是他…接着另一个也… / +
and_{12} / –	went / went	repetition (of process)	也 / +	仍 / +
and_{14} / –	Luster came / we went	inclusion (of referent): contrast (between deictic motions)	一起 / +	Φ / –
and_{15} / –	Φ	–	这时候 / +	Φ / –
and_{16} / –	stopped / stopped	repetition (of process)	也 / +	也 / +
and_{17} / –	we / I (…Luster)	derivation (of referent)	Φ / +	Φ / –

Notations: "–" is for absence from profile; "+" is for presence within profile; "Φ" is for absence from surface text.

Applied to our sample analysis, the question posed above translates into: which mind is to be put to paper, a translator's organized mind zooming into sharper focus or the narrator's fragmented mind remaining out of focus? Obviously, both translations examined here have outranked the ST in salience by calling in from the overall mental representation a conceived connecting relationship that could have been left in obscurity. That is, (F1) might have been at work. The adjusted profile/base organizations would invoke a more precise and clearer mental representation generated in TT-reading, which, however, departs from what the ST has aroused in the mind of ST-readers via language management.

3.2.4 Summary of text analysis

Close study of the profile/base organizations in the sample texts may be summarized as follows:

- Shift occurs absolutely but differs in degree in translations from the perspective of profile/base organization;
- When shift occurs, it is either motivated or unmotivated;
- Unmotivated translations result from ad hoc decision-making, or unawareness of language management;
- Motivated translations may be driven by factors (a) the overall mental representation of the entire work in question; and (b) linguistic convention: (b1) optional but preferred linguistic conventions, and (b2) obligatory linguistic conventions;
- When shift is not observed, other factors within one language should also be taken into account, e.g., markedness (see note 40), which falls beyond the focus of the present article.

These descriptions based on a case study, not without general validity, would lead to in-depth understandings of the reading and writing processes subsumed within a translating act.

4 Concluding without conclusion

Our investigation into the profile/base organization in a text, i.e., the ST and its TTs, has not been targeted at seeking some set of guiding principles or technical solutions for translating practitioners. It intends to incorporate cognitive facets in linguistic-analysis-based studies of translation and to explore what factors from language and the mind may have interacted in the course of textualization. The theory of profile/base distinction has not only become the tool in analyzing texts but also served to understand translation in general and to explain what information has become at a translator's disposal and how, and why a TT has come out of a translator's mental representation as such. The ultimate goal is to emphasize that a sensitivity to language management in reading a source text and an awareness of the management of language in writing out a target text are important to a translation task. This preliminary study will be concluded from the following three aspects.

First of all, as we have seen through a descriptive analysis with respect to textualized profile/base organization in construal of concept (e.g., as manifested in English categories of nouns, verbs, nominals, pronouns, prepositions, and connectives), the opening paragraph of *The Sound and the Fury* consistently builds up a "pretended" perspective via imprecise descriptions that work a reading mind toward an unclear perception of the ST-invoked world. A translation is produced on the basis more of the translator's mental representation than of the ST directly. Shifts have been observed and translators' presence is found registered in TTs when the translations are put to analysis in terms of their profile/base organizations. A seeking for motivation to account for the translations culminates in the discovery of two main types of factors, i.e., overall mental representation of the entire work and linguistic convention (further divided into two sub-factors, i.e., a disposition to conform to the principle of well-formedness and an inevitable decision even though with awareness of language management). Identification of the two factors has

rightly demonstrated the interactions between language and the mind in translating. It is strongly believed that a systematic description of translations considering both the cognitive and the linguistic aspects constitutes a basis for any further explanation or exploration of the translational phenomenon.

Secondly, the notion of profile/base distinction proposed in cognitive linguistics has provided a theoretical framework within which a text may be analyzed to be something where language and the mind meet to interact for textualization. A translation is nothing but a translator's mental representation verbalized in a target language. What to present explicitly and what not are critical issues if we acknowledge that the TT should stand accountable to the ST regarding its textually-grounded intention unless otherwise stated while attaining systematicity in its own right. The insight offered by the profile/base distinction into the understanding of translation is obvious but more work is yet to be done to have stronger validity and wider accountability.

Last but not least, translations, in return, have turned out to be a better source of evidence to support the proposal of profile/base distinction in general than mono-linguistic texts. Since different translations of one and the same ST in another language or other languages can be regarded as attempts to approach the states of affairs delineated by the ST, investigation of the profile/base organization among translations is believed to fill up a gap left unattended by that conducted mono-linguistically.

NOTES

* The writer has benefited substantially from the research staff in the Department of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics, City University of Hong Kong. She wishes to acknowledge in particular Dr. ZHU Chunshen for detailed discussions of relevant ideas in translation and discourse studies, Dr. Randy LAPOLLA for comments on the investigated case, and Dr. PAN Haihua for suggestion of a solid analysis of profiling. The responsibility for any possible errors in the paper, however, rests entirely with the writer.

1. Cf. the notion of "virtual translation" proposed some fifteen years later in Neubert & Shreve 1992. "Virtual translation" there is a mental model of the elements and relations which exist in the mental space between real source and not-yet-realized target text (14). N & S, however, have not sought to expound on it in the rest of their volume. Although the notion has pointed towards an awareness of some cognitive structure that may lie between the actual texts, the growth of research in cognitive sciences has unfortunately not come into their view. See also Lefevere's critique (1993: 231) that N & S's consideration of "external" influences shaping the "virtual translation" is inadequate.
2. Experiments reported in Van den Broek et al. 1996 have been attempted to construct a memory representation out of the empirical reading results analyzed computationally on the basis of a five-point activation scale. The construction turns out to be a landscape schema representing the fluctuating patterns of activation of a set of concepts from the sample text over time index (173). It thus proves to a considerable extent the psychological validity of Beaugrande's postulation (1978: 32) some two decades ago that the mental representation accomplished in the reader's mind of a linear sequence of text is a topography comprising various levels of prominence.
3. Non-shift is by no means less worthy to examine. It, nevertheless, falls beyond the focus of the present article. See the summary of text analysis below at the end of §3.
4. "Intention" has been frequently discussed in the literature, especially that of skopos theory. Vermeer (1996: 8), while acknowledging different perspectives implied by the synonymous terms "intention," "skopos," and "function," has emphasized the "skopos" tailored to the target-cultural situation and agreed upon by commissioner and translator. Yet his "skopos" seems to remain detached from the textual realities as a set of goals to be attained (Vermeer 1996: 7). The concern of this article lies more with actual texts than with the intended skopos, the latter not being explicitly stated in most cases (let alone providing operable conditions). Texts have been examined for language uses with/without patterns, which may be recognized as pointing towards some intention, and in this case by the researcher through systematic analysis of the texts. (See also N & S 1992: 71 for a distinction

between an author's *productive intentions* and the indications of intentionality realized in the patterned sequence of linguistic signs at the textual surface.)

5. We by no means have any intention to clarify the relation between these notions in cognitive grammar. Comparison is being done to show the relatedness between them, which suggests a common concern regarding the issue of grounding calibration within cognitive processes and is also significant for the study of translation (see Chafe 1972 for one of the earliest documented discussions of grounding). It seems to us that each pair of notions found in the literature has characterized one facet of grounding and thus gained a partial explanatory power. That is why we do not feel it necessary, not at least for our purpose, to distinguish them.
6. It should be noted that the terms "domain" and "base" have sometimes been used interchangeably in Langacker 1987. Cf. "scope of predication" in his terminology.
7. It should be noted that profile/base organization is by definition more characteristic of conceptualization. The result of a conceptualization may be coded in a linguistic expression as a usage event as contrasted with that as resources in language conventions (i.e., the established well-entrenched linguistic codifications of conceptualizations). Since cognitive linguistics insists a view that examines language phenomena in the overall context of human knowledge, judgment, and problem-solving ability (Langacker 1987: 73; and *passim*), a linguistic expression manifests a particular structuring imposed on real world experiences in conceptualization, i.e., profile/base organization, which may be said to constitute a profile resulting from selections from among, usually, more than one alternative. Yet, in studies of natural language data, a linguistic expression is always a particular usage event, i.e., a resulting profile after textualization, and may in turn serve to structure its meaning computation.
8. For discussions of implicit information in literary translation, see Gutt 1996 whose perspective is from the relevance theory established in Sperber & Wilson 1995.
9. See concrete analyses of the profile/base organizations in a concept and its usage events in the tables in §3 below.
10. The respective actors of these verbs are easily inferable from that particular extra-linguistic situation. Cf. Li & Thompson 1981: 327 for their strong claim that zero-anaphora is the norm in Chinese discourse, Tao 1996: 487 for a more descriptive statement that Mandarin Chinese permits abundant use of zero-anaphora in its written and oral discourse.
11. "Delimitativeness" is sometimes used in place of "tentativeness." See Li & Thompson 1981: 29-31 for a discussion of the semantic function of reduplicating the volitional verb in a Chinese sentence.
12. It should be argued that the shade of meaning imposed on an utterance might well vary with intonation in the spoken language. Although we are examining a conversation, our focus here has been placed on what may be implied in the syntactic-semantic properties of an utterance. To be precise, all that may be put to paper is within our concern, for instance, intonation or stress realized typographically.
13. It is "crude" in the sense that profile/base organization entailed in a prototypical concept (as codified in linguistic signs) involves a much more complicated three-dimensional network than the selections or suppressions of actors demonstrated in this example.
14. Cf. Catford's (1965: ch. 12) translation shifts whose concern lies with the two linguistic systems in question.
15. It is one of the two times that "idiot" has been used throughout the novel. Benjy has been so addressed by Mrs. Patterson who is angry and frustrated at him for getting caught with Uncle Maury's assignation letter. (See Ross & Polk 1996: 8.)
16. Faulkner himself has identified Benjy with "the idea of the blind, self-centeredness of innocence, typified by children, if one of those children had been truly innocent, that is, an idiot." (See Matthews 1988: 79.)
17. How the linguistic options selected by the writer relate to the total meaning of a (literary) work has long since been stressed in Halliday 1973 (*passim*) as a concern of functional linguistic theories and demonstrated via an inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*. Halliday 1973 has equated "foregrounded features" with "selections in transitivity [structure]" (134), which has served its purpose very well. However, the notional framework of profile/base distinction has alerted us to connections between possible mental workings and textual products and allows us to establish explicitly the relation between foregrounded information in the surface text and information left unstated in the vast background.
18. We do not imply by any means that a usage even is necessarily fettered by and must observe the language conventions. On the contrary, language is regarded as symbolic of conceptualization and

related to cognitive abilities. Every usage event is a perfect mix of conventions and creations (which may be extensions from or violations against the former). Yet, both convention and creation are a matter of degree. Some of the language conventions are easily stretched or even broken but not others. For specific illustrations, see the following analyses.

19. Throughout the analysis part of this paper, small capitals or characters bracketed represent concepts (or prototypes), words in italics indicate a particular use of the corresponding concepts, and words in single quotes indicate lexical items in the lexicon if they are not meant for emphasis in argumentation.
20. In the following characterization of the profile/base organization manifested in each use of [HIT], the numbering conforms to the sequential appearance of the information concerned in the source text and the colons introduce what the current numbered description is about. Also, see §2.1 above for definitions of profile and base.
21. The trajector within the profile of [HIT] involves some complexities since the actual thing in motion may be the trajector itself as a whole, a part of the trajector, or something conceived as part of the trajector.
22. The individuals within *them* are identified only schematically, and taken individually they can be considered unprofiled for their profiling is collective and no single one has any particular salience vis-à-vis the others. See Langacker 1987: 302 for a discussion of the semantic pole of plurals and Langacker 1991: 376 for discussions of plural personal pronouns.
23. See Langacker 1987: 451 for a discussion of salience hierarchically organized within a profile.
24. The trajectors and landmarks of relational predications (i.e., the semantic pole of a linguistic expression) are usually elaborated by subjects and objects (Langacker 1987:233; but see LaPolla 1993 for arguments from a typological perspective against "subject" and "direct object" as viable concepts in Chinese). However, the trajector/landmark distinction is far more general and broadly applicable than the subject/object distinction normally reserved for overt nominals with specifiable roles in clause-level syntax. The former pertains closer to a predication's internal structure than to its combinatorial properties despite their mutual influence (Langacker 1987: 232). In case of absence of overt nominals, the trajector and landmark are still included in the profile, only with a schematic characterization, which implies less salience.
25. Langacker prefers to use the term "well-formedness" to refer to an expression's degree of "conventionality," i.e., how closely it conforms to linguistic convention, instead of the standard term "grammaticality" which he thinks is both narrow and problematic (1987: 66). The difference does not, however, lie in a choice of terminology. Rather, it involves a cognitively-tied perspective on language and language use.
26. The Φ sign marks the possible position of a post-verbal noun, i.e., 球 in this case, in Chinese.
27. 小旗 in LW and 旗帜 in LD are more salient than 旗 since they have pinned down the specifications of some facets in the latter.
28. This overall mental representation should be distinguished from the progressive mental representations in §3.2.1. It is a relatively stable aggregate of information before the final draft of translation goes to press. See relevant discussions in §1 and §3.1.
29. Optionality and obligatoriness regarding linguistic conventions should not be understood as a clear-cut division. In fact, the so-called obligatory conventions are also subject to change and may become established as optional after novelties are introduced, tolerated long enough and used frequently enough. Linguistic obligatoriness means that linguistic convention does not have an optimal alternative at a synchronic point so that a user in need has to make do with the readily available one(s). For example, modern Chinese does not have a plural pronoun (orthograph) that does not distinguish [HUMAN] and [SEX] as the English "they." The make-do choice **inevitably** underspecifies or overspecifies an ST-invoked concept. We believe that such an evolutional and cognitive view on language and language use is healthier especially in studies of natural texts. More traditional grammatical/ungrammatical distinction is locatable in recent literature on translation studies. For example, a tendency to replace ungrammatical source sentences with grammatical renderings has been reportedly found in English translations of Dutch novels and oral courtroom interpretations from Hebrew into English (Laviosa-Braithwaite 1998: 289-90), and Toury believes that a law of growing standardization (based on crude and unsystematic observation of texts) governs the translational behavior (1995: 267-8).
30. We integrate the views in Beaugrande & Dressler 1972/1981 (4; 6; 84) and Brown & Yule 1983 (24; 224) and believe that coherence is a reader's assumptions in interpreting a text, i.e., there should be mutual access and relevance between the components within the textual world. See Sperber & Wil-

son 1995 (289; n.19) for the understanding that coherence is a subcategory ultimately derivable from relevance.

31. It should be noted that only the salience degree of those concepts highly relevant to the concept under discussion is marked. For example, [FLAG] in Table 2 is the only concept notated regarding its salience degree while [FENCE], [FLOWER], [BALL] have been left unmarked in this regard.
32. See Lindstromberg 1998 for cognitively-grounded explanations of the English prepositions in question here and Langacker 1987: §3.3.2.3 for discussion of deixis.
33. (14LW), however, has shown displacement of profile/base organization in other aspects, which will be dealt with in the following analysis of reasoning trace.
34. See LaPolla 1995: 302-3 for discussions of various cognitive states of referential NPs in discourse and Langacker 1991: §3.1.1 for discussion of English definite articles.
35. It is hoped that the icons used in the table will not cause any confusion. Icons are merely symbolic of highly schematic knowledge about trees in a culture that has experiences with trees, which does not, however, by any means deny the culture-specific nature of that knowledge. A tree schema, neutralizing all the culture-specific and individual-specific experiential differences and positioned in the network of [PLANT], can presumably be shared across tree-cultures. Besides, icons are used for the sake of convenience since verbal characterization of a tree schema would be very difficult.
36. It is noteworthy that in this particular case modification relation is overtly indicated by a morpheme *de* in Chinese as in LW or by word order as in LD whereas it is indicated by word order in English.
37. Cf. a discussion of *and*-relation in Halliday & Hasan 1976: §5.2, §5.3.
38. See Peterson & McCabe 1991: 47-9 for a general conclusion that three-quarters of clauses dedicated to events on the timeline in narratives are linked by connectives (mostly by *and*) and for its summary, on the basis of a corpus of narratives told by children, that *and* is likely to occur between successive events that lie on the timeline. See also Berman & Slobin 1994: §IIIA for a comparative study of use of connectives in narration between English-speaking children of different age groups and adults, and for its conclusion that *and* tends to be typically chosen to mark each ensuing utterance among the youngest children.
39. In the above summary, we have identified [contrasted deictic motion verbs] as the feature characterizing (2) and (3). The contrast actually exists in the deictic implication rather than in the motion facet of "come" and "go." That is, the two verbs still have a semantic overlap in at least one aspect.
40. See Chen 1998 for a summary of over a score of technical solutions to translating *and* into Chinese, one of which suggests that *and*-relation does not appear through lexical explication in a translation on many occasions especially when it performs a coordinating function (104). It prompts us along the line to assume that presence of *and* in English performs a similar function, i.e., keeping the interconnection between connected items unprofiled, to absence of coordinating connectors in Chinese. Reverse thinking may induce us to believe that presence of connectors in Chinese may establish excess markedness in a reader's mental representation.

REFERENCES

BAKER, M. (1996): "Linguistics and Cultural Studies: Complementary or Competing Paradigms in Translation Studies?," Angelika LAUER et al. (Eds.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch: Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 9-19.

BAKER, M. (Ed.) (1998): *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York, Routledge.

BEAUGRANDE, R. de (1978): *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating*, The Netherlands, Van Gorcum, Assen.

BEAUGRANDE, R. de and W. U. DRESSLER (1981): *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London and New York, Longman. (German original in 1972)

BERMAN, R. A. and D. I. SLOBIN (1994): *Relating Events in Narrative: A Crosslinguistic Developmental study*, Hillsdale, New Jersey-Hove, UK, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

BROWN, G. and G. YULE (1983): *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BROWN, K. (1994): "Syntactic Clues to Understanding," Gillian Brown et al. (Eds.), *Language and Understanding*, Shanghai, Foreign Language Education Press, pp. 59-80.

CATFORD, J.C. (1965): *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An essay in applied linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

CHAFE, W. L. (1972): "Discourse Structure and Human Knowledge," John B. CARROLL and Roy O. FREEDLE (Eds.), *Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge*, Washington, V. H. Winston & Sons, pp. 41-70.

CHEN, D. (1998): *English-Chinese Comparison and Translation (revised edition)*, Beijing, China International Translation Publishing Co.

DEANE, P. D. (1992): *Grammar in Mind and Brain: Explorations in Cognitive Syntax*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

FOWLER, R. (1986/1996): *Linguistic Criticism* (2nd Edition), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

GUTT, E.-A. (1996): "Implicit Information in Literary Translation: A Relevance-Theoretic Perspective," *Target*, 8-2, pp. 239-256.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1973): "Linguistic Function and Literary Style: an inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*," *Explorations in the Functions of Language*, London, Edward Arnold, pp. 103-143.

HATIM, B. (1999): "Implications of Research into Translator Invisibility," *Target*, 11-2, pp. 201-222.

HOPPER, P. J. and S. A. THOMPSON (1980): "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse," *Language*, 56-2, pp. 251-299.

ISER, W. (1980): "Interaction between Text and Reader," Andrew Bennett (Ed.), *Readers and Reading*, London & New York, Longman (1995), pp. 20-31.

LANGACKER, R. W. (1987): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol.I: Theoretical Prerequisites*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

LANGACKER, R. W. (1991): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol.II: Descriptive Application*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

LAPOLLA, R. J. (1993): "Arguments Against 'Subject' and 'Direct Object' as Viable Concepts in Chinese," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology*, 63-4, pp. 759-813.

LAPOLLA, R. J. (1995): "Pragmatic Relations and Word Order in Chinese," Pamela DOWNING and Michael NOONAN (Eds.), *Word Order in Discourse*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 297-329.

LAVIOSA-BRAITHWAITE, S. (1998): "Universals of Translation," in Mona Baker (Ed.), pp. 288-291.

LEFEVERE, A. (1993): "Discourses on Translation: Recent, Less Recent and to Come," *Target*, 5-2, pp. 229-241.

LI, C. N. and S. A. THOMPSON (1981): *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*, Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press.

LINDSTROMBERG, S. (1998): *English Prepositions Explained*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

MATTHEWS, J. T. (1988): "The Discovery of Loss in *The Sound and The Fury*," Harold Bloom (Ed.), *William Faulkner's The Sound and The Fury*, New York & Philadelphia, Chelsea House Publishers, pp. 79-102.

NEUBERT, A. and G. M. SHREVE (1992): *Translation as Text*, Kent, The Kent State University Press.

PEER, W. van (1986): *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*, London-Sydney-Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, Croom Helm.

PETERSON, C. and A. MCCABE (1991): "Linking Children's Connective Use and Narrative Macrostructure," Allyssa McCabe and Carole Peterson (Eds.), *Developing Narrative Structure*, Hillsdale, New Jersey-Hove and London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, pp. 29-53.

ROSS, S. M. and N. POLK (1996): *Reading Faulkner: The Sound and The Fury*, Jackson, the University Press of Mississippi.

SPERBER, D. and D. WILSON (1995): *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd Edition), Oxford and Cambridge, Blackwell.

TABAKOWSKA, E. (1993): *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.

TAO, L. (1996): "Topic Discontinuity and Zero Anaphora in Chinese Discourse: Cognitive Strategies in Discourse Processing," Barbara Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 487-513.

TOURY, G. (1995): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

VAN DEN BROEK, P. et al. (1996): "A 'Landscape' View of Reading: Fluctuating Patterns of Activation and the Construction of a Stable Memory Representation," Bruce K. Britton and Arthur C. Graessar (Eds.), *Models of Understanding Text*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 165-188.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE PRESENT PAPER

1sg	1st person singular pronoun
2sg	2nd person singular pronoun
3sg	3rd person singular pronoun
ASSOC	associative (*-de*) that connects two phrases
BA	a pre-NP morpheme marking the NP's being at disposal (*bǎ*)
BC	base of concept
BUE	base in usage event
CL	classifier
DEM	suffix marking a diminutive nature (*-zi*)
DUR	durative aspect marker (*-zhe, zài, zhèng*)
NOM	nominalizer (*de*) that follows a modifying clause
PC	profile of concept
PFV	perfective aspect marker (*le*)
PL	plural suffix (*-men*)
PUE	profile in usage event
SFP	sentence-final particle
ST	source text
TCM	temporal clause marker (*-shí*) that follows a temporal clause
TT	target text

APPENDIX

The original text and its two translations will be presented in the following format for the convenience of analysis and comparison. The original is in bold type and numbered. The italics transcribe the translations into *pinyin* forms based on Mandarin Chinese pronunciation. The back-translations into English are actually a word-for-word gloss.

(1) Through the fence, between the curling flower spaces, I could see them hitting.

LW: 透过 栅栏， 穿过 攀绕 的 花枝 的 空当，
tòuguò zhàlan, chuānguò pānrào de huā-zhī de kòngdāng,
through fence through climb-wind ASSOC flower-stem ASSOC empty-space
我 看见 他们 在 打 球。
wǒ kànjiàn tāmen zài dǎ qiú.
1sg see 3sg-PL DUR hit ball

LD: 透过 篱笆，从 苦苓花 的 空隙， 我 看得见 他们 正在 打着。
tòuguò líba, cóng kǔlíng-huā de kòngxì, wǒ kàn-de-jiàn tā-men zhèngzài dǎ-zhe.
through fence from Kuling-flower ASSOC empty-space 1sg look-can-see 3sg-PL DUR hit-DUR

(2) They were coming toward where the flag was

LW: 他们 朝 插着 小旗 的 地方 走 过 来，
tā-men cháo chā-zhe xiǎo-qí de dìfāng zǒu – guò – lái,
3sg-PL towards plant-DUR small-flag NOM place walk – over – come

LD: 他们 朝 旗帜 处 走 来，
tā-men cháo qízhì – chù zǒu – lái,
3sg-PL towards flag – location walk – come

(3) and I went along the fence.

LW: 我 顺着 栅栏 朝前 走。
wǒ shùn-zhe zhàlan cháo-qián zǒu.
1sg follow-DUR fence forward walk

LD: 我 便 沿着 篱笆 走 去。
wǒ biàn yán-zhe lí ba zǒu - qù.
1sg then follow-DUR fence walk - go

(4) Luster was hunting in the grass by the flower tree.

LW: 勒斯特 在 那棵 开花 的 树旁 草地里 找 东西。
Lèsī tè zài nà - kē kāihuā - de shù - páng cǎodì - lǐ zhǎo dōngxi.
Luster at that - CL bloom - NOM tree - beside grassland - inside search thing

LD: 鲁斯特 正 在 花树边 的 草地上 追寻。
Lǔsī tè zhèng zài huā - shù - biān - de cǎodì - shàng zhuī-xún.
Luster DUR at flower - tree - beside - ASSOC grassland - on chase-search

(5) They took the flag out,

LW: 他们 把 小旗 拔 出 来，
tā-men bǎ xiǎo-qí bá - chū - lái,
3sg-PL BA small-flag pull - out - come

LD: 他们 拿 出 了 旗帜，
tā-men ná - chū - le qí zhì,
3sg-PL take-out-PFV flag

(6) and they were hitting.

LW: 打 球 了。
dǎ qiú le.
Hit ball SPF/PFV

LD: 接着 打 起 来。
jiēzhe dǎ - qǐ - lái.
Then hit - up - come

(7) Then they put the flag back

LW: 接着 他们 又 把 小旗 插 回 去，
jiēzhe tā-men yòu bǎ xiǎo-qí chā - huí - qù,
then 3sg-PL again BA small-flag plant - back - go,

LD: 他们 随后 把 旗子 放 回，
tā-men suíhòu bǎ qí-zi fàng - huí,
3sg-PL then BA flag-DEM put - back,

(8) and they went to the table,

LW: 来 到 高地 上，
lái dào gāodì - shàng,
come to high-land - on

LD: 走 到 桌 边，
zǒu dào zhuō - biān,
walk to table - side

(9) and he hit

LW: 这 人 打了 一 下，
zhè rén dǎ-le yí - xià,
This person hit-PFV one - CL,

LD: 先是 他 敲，
xiānshì tā qiāo,
first 3sg knock,

(10) and the other hit.

LW: 另外 那 人 也 打了 一 下。
lì ngwài nà rén yě dǎ-le yí – xià.
another that person also hit-PFV one – CL

LD: 接着 另 一 个 也 敲。
jiēzhe lìng – yí – gè yě qiāo.
then another – one – CL also knock

(11) Then they went on,

LW: 他们 接着 朝前 走，
tā-men jiēzhe cháo-qián zǒu,
3sg-PL then forward walk

LD: 他们 接着 继续 下 去，
tā-men jiēzhe jì xù – xià – qù,
3sg-PL then continue – down – go

(12) and I went along the fence.

LW: 我 也 顺着 栅栏 朝前 走。
wǒ yě shùn-zhe zhàlan cháo-qián zǒu.
1sg also follow-DUR fence forward walk

LD: 我 仍 沿着 篱笆 走 去。
wǒ réng yán-zhe líba zǒu – qù.
1sg still follow-DUR fence walk – go

(13) Luster came away from the flower tree

LW: 勒斯特 离开 了 那 棵 开花 的 树，
Lèsītè lí kāi - le nà – kē kāihuā de shù,
Luster leave-PFV that – CL bloom NOM tree

LD: 鲁斯特 离开 了 那 棵 花 树，
Lǔsītè lí kāi - le nà – kē huā – shù,
Luster leave-PFV that – CL flower – tree

(14) and we went along the fence

LW: 我们 沿着 栅栏 一起 走，
wǒ-men yán-zhe zhàlan yìqǐ zǒu,
1sg-PL follow-DUR fence together walk

LD: 我们 沿着 篱笆 走，
wǒ-men yán-zhe lí ba zǒu,
1sg-PL follow-DUR fence walk

(15) and they stopped

LW: 这 时候 他们 站 住 了，
zhè shí hòu tā-men zhàn – zhù - le,
this moment 3sg-PL stand – stop - PFV/SFP

LD: 他们 停 下 来，
tā-men tí ng – xià – lái,
3sg-PL stop – down – come

(16) and we stopped

LW: 我们 也 站 住 了。
wǒ-men yě zhàn – zhù - le.
1sg-PL also stand – stop - PFV/SFP

LD: 我们 也 停 下 来。
wǒ-men yě tí ng – xià – lái.
1sg-PL also stop – down – come

(17) and I looked through the fence while Luster was hunting in the grass.

LW: 我 透过 栅栏 张望， 勒斯特 在 草丛 里 找 东西。

wǒ tòuguò zhàlan zhāngwàng, Lèsītè zài cǎocóng - lǐ zhǎo dōngxi.

1sg through fence strain-look, Luster at grass-bush - inside search thing

LD: 鲁斯特 在 草地 里 追寻 时， 我 便 透过 篱笆

Lǔsītè zài cǎodì - lǐ zhuīxún -shí, wǒ biàn tòuguò lí ba

Luster at grass-land - inside chase-search TCM, 1sg then through fence

看 过 去。

kàn - guò - qù.

look - over - go

SOURCES OF THE CASE

FAULKNER, William. 1931/1978. *The Sound and The Fury*. London: Chatto & Windus.

LI, Dengxin. tr. 1979/1987. *Shengyin yu Fennu (6th edition)*. Taibei: Yuanjing Chubanshe. (黎登鑫译《声音与愤怒》，1987 年第 6 版，台北：远景出版社)

LI, Wenjun. tr. 1984. *Xuanhua yu Saodong*. Shanghai: Shanghai Yiwen Chubanshe. (李文俊 译《喧哗与骚动》，1984 年，上海：上海译文出版社)