
The Politics of Translation in Intercultural Discourse Relationships: Translation of 龍 /lung and 夷 /i into English as a Case in Point

◎ Hui Chen, Shilei Zhai

Hunan Normal University, China University of Mining and Technology

Abstract: The translation equivalence between 龍 /lung and *dragon* as well as 夷 /i and *barbarian* embodies the way of discourse power competition between China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain with different discourse pedigrees and discourse systems. The translation equivalence between 龍 /lung and *dragon* was constructed by means of mutation and discourse rewriting, and the political implication and cultural value of 龍 /lung in Chinese context were ablated. The equivalence between 夷 /i and *barbarian* in the English context was established through the translation manipulation of the British, and the meaning of 夷 /i was separated from the Chinese historical context forcibly. The British operated discourse mutation on core Chinese political discourses via translation manipulation to weaken the subjectivity of China and bring China into the modern international discourse system dominated by the West, providing support for the expansion and colonization of British imperial discourse. This research provides reference for dealing with the cultural characteristics and universality, and the relationship between subject and object of discourse in the translation of contemporary Chinese discourse.

Keywords: 龍 /lung, 夷 /i, *dragon*, *barbarian*, translation competition and manipulation

CLC: H059 **Document Code:** A **Article ID:** 2096-4374(2022)02-0143-11

Doi: 10.53397/hunnu.jflc.202202013

In Chinese cultural history, 龍 /lung refers to the supreme power and is a core concept of political discourse and 夷 /i, referring to the region around the central dynasty, is a core concept of diplomatic discourse. 龍 /lung, referring to the supreme power in Chinese context was translated by the British as *dragon*, which is equivalent to the evil monster in the Bible, adulterating the sacred meaning of 龍 /lung in the Chinese context. In this way, 龍 /lung in the Chinese context has realized its meaning reconstruction, resulting in the deconstruction of 龍 /lung, weakening the Chinese national discourse sovereignty and cultural subjectivity. 夷 /i, referring to people living in the East of the Middle Kingdom, was understood from Western discourse as barbaric and uncivilized people, and was thereupon translated as *barbarian*. The meaning of 夷 /i was separated from the Chinese historical context forcibly, and an equivalence between 夷 /i and *barbarian* in the English context was established through the translation manipulation of the British.

The English translation of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* reflects not only the cultural differences between China and the West in history, but also the dominance of national capital in translation. The study of Chinese-English translation of core discourses represented by 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* helps to sort out the similarities and differences in the cognition and interpretation of national core discourses between China and the West in the 19th century, and reveal the different paths to achieve translation competition and manipulation, main factors involved in translation competition manipulation, as well as the different practical effects brought by translation competition and manipulation.

Based on different editions of Robert Morrison's Chinese-English dictionaries published in 1815, 1819, 1820, 1822, 1823 respectively and some English-Chinese dictionaries compiled by other missionaries and sinologists,¹ this paper is to examine the evolution of translation equivalence between 龍/*lung* and *dragon*, 夷/*i* and *barbarian*, and analyze the logic of discourse power competition reflected by the two core concepts belonging to different discourse lineages and discourse systems in English-Chinese translation.

1. Translation of 龍/*lung* as *dragon*

龍/*lung*, in Chinese culture, is a legendary animal with a divine nature, representing bravery, wisdom, good luck, and it is a symbol of supremacy. For thousands of years, the Chinese people have labeled themselves as “descendants of 龍/*lung*” (Doolittle 264). In China, 龍/*lung* symbolizes the power of the emperors or refers to a god capable of causing rainfall (120). The dragon is perceived as an evil monster in the West, from Greek and Babylonian mythology to Christianity, and even in Nordic myths, Celtic culture, and Anglo-Saxon legends. The dragon is considered to be the keeper of treasure in many legends and also a symbol of greed.² However, *dragon* was taken as the legal equivalence to 龍/*lung*. What is the historical origin of such a “mistranslation”?

The history of translating 龍/*lung* can be traced back to Matteo Ricci and Michele Ruggieri, who came to China with the religious missions. The image of 龍/*lung* was totally different from that of dragons, so they were troubled as to how to introduce 龍/*lung* to Europeans (Lee 220). *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matteo Ricci (1583-1601)*—one of the earliest books about China written by Matteo Ricci—revealed that the author knew very well about the position of 龍/*lung* in Chinese culture, and he also realized that it was the common symbol of emperors and auspicious signs. When compiling the *Portuguese-Chinese Dictionary*, Matteo Ricci and Michele Ruggieri could not find the Portuguese word equivalent to *lung* (Lee 233), so they translated it into “bicha-serpens” (a huge snake-like insect) (61). As they were keenly aware of the unique meaning of 龍/*lung* in the Chinese context, they added *keaou* in front of 龍/*lung* to form the expression “*keaou lung*,” or 蛟龍 in Chinese. Giulio Aleni, an Italian Jesuit priest who was the first Christian missionary in the province of Kiangsi, China, acknowledged in his *Kouduorichao* that he knew that the Chinese 龍/*lung* had a style of its own. From the perspective of translation, the Chinese word 龍/*lung* as known by Aleni could not be expressed in a European language at all.

The translation of 龍/*lung* as a challenge was ended by Robert Morrison. In the 12th year of Emperor Jiaqing in the Qing Dynasty (1807), Robert Morrison was sent by London Missionary Society to China to preach. Two years later, he was hired as a translator for the British East India

Company, a position he held for 25 years. Shortly upon his arrival in China, Morrison issued a book titled *A Grammar of the Chinese Language* in 1811. In this book, he rendered 龍/lung as *dragon* (33). Later, he compiled and subsequently revised a Chinese-English and English-Chinese bilingual dictionary: *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts*, consisting of 3 parts in 6 volumes. In Part 1 of the dictionary published in 1815, Morrison translated *dragon* as “龍/lung” in Chinese in the word retrieval section (9). In 1819, he translated 龍/lung as *dragon* in Part 2 of the dictionary, in which he compiled and explained the shape and different aspects of the cultural meaning of 龍/lung. He explained that 龍/lung was a kind of fleshly and tortoise-like creature, and also the chief of all reptiles. It had a magical stealth feature in Chinese culture and people admired it, so they often used this word to name stars, hills, cities, plants, offices, and even divinities. However, Morrison’s interpretation of 龍/lung did not stop there. He then pointed out that the *dragon* represented the symbol of Chinese sovereignty, and also the symbol of Chinese imperial power.³ In Part 2 of *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts*, published in 1822, Morrison went on to translate 龍/lung into *dragon*, but gave no further cultural annotation to the concept (129).

Morrison translated the full text of the Bible into Chinese and published it in 1823. In all his translations, *dragon* was made the equivalent to 龍/lung. He admitted that he used the *King James Version* for reference in his translation.⁴ According to statistics, *dragon* appears 34 times in the Old Testament and New Testament of the Bible. After examining these translations, it was found that Morrison changed 33 of them to 龍/lung (Li Chichang 16).

Morrison’s Chinese-English dictionaries laid the foundation for Sino-Western cultural communication, deeply affecting later sinologists. Both Samuel Wells Williams, author of *An English and Chinese Vocabulary in the Court Direct* published in 1844 and Walter Henry Medhurst, author of *English-Chinese Dictionary* published in 1847, regarded Morrison’s dictionary as a major reference. In addition, a series of pocket English-Chinese dictionaries and English-Chinese manuals followed Morrison’s translation, setting 龍/lung as the Chinese equivalent to *dragon*. For example, in *English and Chinese, Reader with a Dictionary*, *dragon* was translated as “龍, 蛟龍” (Condit n. p.).

In some Chinese-English dialect dictionaries, translators (mainly Western missionaries in China) often equated 龍/lung with *dragon*. For instance, in entry 212 in *A Chinese and English Pocket Dictionary*, 龍/lung was translated as “the dragon; imperial” (Stent 236). 龍/lung was translated as *dragon* in *Western Mandarin or Spoken Language of Western China with Syllabic and English Indexes* in 1900, such as “描龍画凤: to sketch dragon and phoenixes”; “龍胆草: dragon’s gall grass”; “蛟: dragon”; “龍: dragon,” and so on (Grainger 255, 436, 635, 663). In Darrell H. Davis and John Alfred Silsby’s *Chinese-English Pocket Dictionary: Mandarin and Shanghai Dialect*, 龍/lung was translated as *dragon* (236).

Even in the *Commercial Press English and Chinese Pronouncing Pocket Dictionary* (1912) edited and published by Chinese scholars, 龍/lung was translated as *dragon*, and followed by the additional explanation that *dragon* refers to fierce people, also taking the translated text made by missionaries in history as reference (The Commercial Press 294).

However, at about the same time, there were still some Westerners who realized that *dragon*

was not the equivalent English word for 龍/*lung*. For instance, in *A Chinese-Japanese-English Comprehensive Dictionary* compiled in 1884 by a missionary named Ambrose D. Gring, 龍/*lung* was interpreted as: A dragon; the chief of the sacred beings invested with supernatural power to change its shape; imperial (Gring 541). The annotation to the translation and cultural interpretation used here not only take into account the cultural implication of 龍/*lung* in the Chinese context, but also its political attributes. Some Chinese proverbs translated by Westerners also used *dragon* as the English counterpart of the Chinese 龍/*lung*. For example, in Arthur Smith's *Proverbs and Common Sayings from the Chinese Together with Much Related and Unrelated Matter, Interpreted with Observations on Chinese Things-in-General*, “强龍不压地头蛇” was translated as “the mighty dragon is no match for the native serpent” (14). Yet, it was pointed out here that the translation of 龍/*lung* as *dragon* was a cultural conflict that must be acknowledged, and that the cultural implication of Chinese idioms had a completely different meaning orientation from the same expression in the West (87).

2. Translation of 夷/*i* as *Barbarian*

Similar to 龍/*lung*, 夷/*i* also enjoys a long history and deep influence in Chinese culture. The earliest record of the word 夷/*i* was found in the inscriptions on bronze (Zuo 429). The ancient eastern nomads used bows and arrows as weapons; therefore, 夷/*i* was also used to indicate the eastern tribes who lived by hunting (Li Xueqin 909). The explanation in the book *Origin of Chinese Characters* (*Shuo wen jie zi*/说文解字, the first Chinese book to systematically analyze Chinese character shapes and look for character sources) is as follows: “夷/*i* means flat. It comes from the shape of the Chinese character 大/*big* and 弓/*bow*. It also refers to the people living in the east” (Xu n. p.). In this sense, 夷/*i* does not contain any derogatory meaning, but merely indicates ethnic groups, namely the people living in the East. The most comprehensive and authoritative Chinese dictionary, *Kangxi Dictionary* (康熙字典), interprets 夷/*i* as tribes living in the East of Tian Xia (天下). In the *Book of Poems: Zhou Song* (诗经·周颂), 夷/*i* is interpreted as people in a rush to Qishan Mountain, where the road is flat (Editorial Department of Zhonghua Book Company 249). In ancient China, 夷/*i*, in most cases, was treated as a relatively neutral concept whether as a cultural identity or ethnic identity.

Morrison's *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts* is the earliest “authoritative” documents, containing the translation of 夷/*i*. Morrison translated it as “foreigner” in the dictionary, which equates “远人/*yuan ren*” (people from far away, or people living on the edge of the Tian Xia System (Liu 54). The British East India Company translated 夷/*i* by taking Morrison's translation as a reference from the 19th century onward. This reflects the cultural consensus between the two civilizations at that time, as well as the “discourse interoperability” under the two different sets of political discourse systems. Neither party put forward the possible derogatory meanings of the word 夷/*i*.

The linguistic and cultural connection between 夷/*i* and *barbarian* was established in the Tianjin Treaty in 1858, signed after China lost the Second Opium War to Britain (Liu 39-40). The Article 51 says: “第五十一款、嗣后各式公文，无论京外，内叙大英国官民，自不得提书夷

字。” (Guo 92). The corresponding English text is: “It is agreed that, henceforward, the character “T” 夷 [barbarian], shall not be applied to the Government or subject of Her Britannic Majesty in any Chinese official document issued by the Chinese Authorities either in the Capital or in the Provinces.”

The British side added the following condition in the Tianjin Treaty in Article 50 to keep the meaning of 夷 */i* and other Chinese characters in British discourse system in Sino-British exchange and confirmed the legal-rational authority. It says: “嗣后英国文书俱用英文书写，暂时仍以汉文配送，俟中国选派学生学习英文，英语熟习，即不用配送汉文。自今以后，遇有文词辩论之处，总以英文作正义。此次定约，汉英文字详细校对无讹，亦照此例。”

However, the English version differs slightly from the Chinese one.

All official communication addressed by the Diplomatic and Consular Agents of Her Majesty the Queen to the Chinese Authorities shall, henceforth, be written in English. They will for the present be accompanied by a Chinese version, but, it is understood that, in the event of there being any difference of meaning between the English and Chinese text, the English Government will hold the sense as expressed in the English text to be the correct sense.

This provision is applied to the Treaty now negotiated, the Chinese text of which has been carefully corrected by the English original.

There is no doubt that the two articles reveal the difference of the legal binding of English in the treaty signed by China and Britain. The English text with the highest authority is the basic one while the Chinese text with reference to the English one is formed after careful proofreading and revision. According to this logic, the primary and secondary relations among “夷-*i*-barbarian” in Article 51 are pretty clear. By means of national power, Britain isolated the word 夷 */i* from the Chinese historical context forcibly, and established an equivalence between 夷 */i* and *barbarian* in the English context, and moreover, defined it in the form of law. They tied Chinese characters, pronunciation based on the Roman alphabet and English translation together, forming an unbreakable triune semantic unit (Liu 43). This goes against either linguistic rule or translation rules to equate 夷 with *barbarian*. Consequently, the question is about political manipulation and discourse intrusion instead of translation.

3. Translation Politics in Translation of 龍 */lung* and 夷 */i*

The cultural turn brings ideology and power relations into sight of translation studies, which regards translation as a process and result of social interaction instead of a pure text research paradigm. The translation of political discourses is part of a process of cultural manipulation due to the fact that discourses embody social changes and power distribution under two different linguistic and cultural contexts.

In this sense, the translation of political discourse does not equal to trans-lingual or cross-cultural practice; instead, it compares with the competition and clash of knowledge genealogy and ideology between the two main civilizations. Therefore, it is imperative to trace the origin for an

objective understanding of “translation equivalence” between 龍/*lung* and *dragon*, as well as 夷/*i* and *barbarian*. Such an origin also served as a cultural zone where different languages and cultures met and competed, and the powerful discourse could find its way to interfere with the host culture and penetrated into the ideological system.

The establishment of the virtual semantic equivalence between 夷/*i* and *barbarian* as well as 龍/*lung* and *dragon* were deeply rooted in a similar historical context.

“I have never heard a more convincing example of the confrontation between advanced and traditional societies than the haughty one between the first country seized by the industrial revolution and the most brilliant of traditional civilizations than when Macartney was on his mission to China.” (Peyrefitte 1). This is how Alain Peyrefitte, a French scholar and senior official, evaluates the “clash” between China and the West in the late 18th century. This clash forced China and Britain to break through the barrier of cultural cognition caused by geographical space and opened the prelude of the “competitive relationship” between the two civilizations. Since then, the Western view of China had become increasingly negative. The Western knowledge system generated under the Industrial Revolution impacted and challenged the traditional knowledge system of China; the Chinese national discourse was constantly undergoing incorporation into the Western discourse framework through translation, and the implication of Chinese political discourse was reconstructed with the Western discourse framework, so as to construct a set of Chinese discourse conforming to the orientation of Western values.

In such a historical context, the translation of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* was bound to be incapable of escaping the constraints of the Western discourse framework.

The early translators who had translated 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* into English were from the West (typically the UK). Their maneuver was to transplant 龍/*lung* (regarded as divine imperial power and folk worship) in a Chinese context into the Western context, reconstructing Chinese discourse by using a Western discourse framework, the dragon conceptual framework, which made it conform to the value orientation of Western readers; from there it achieved its goal of desanctification. The translation equivalence establishment of 夷/*i* and *barbarian* also ran in the same groove. 夷/*i* in the Chinese context was constructed through a Western barbarian framework, finally reconstructed as a “manipulative semantic equivalence concept” in Western context but not compatible with the Chinese context.

Of course, the English translations of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* are different from the perspective of manipulators and purposes. The semantic “equivalence” between 夷/*i* and *barbarian* was established by the national power, establishing its historical legitimacy in the form of a legally binding Tianjin Treaty; while the “consensus” of the semantic “equivalence” between 龍/*lung* and *dragon* was achieved via compiling dictionary and other literature by British missionaries in China, making it a cultural and political term that could be used selectively, but no longer sacred in English. Therefore, the translation of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* in the historical process reflected a cross-cultural and trans-lingual reconstruction of cultural discourse driven by national interest. This came about by transplanting discourse meanings suiting the British empire, by way of eliminating the original meanings of core political and cultural discourse of China. These meanings were reset into Chinese discourse with brand new meaning and legitimacy, ultimately in order to realize

the imperial discourse system that could dominate British overseas colonial interests. From the perspectives of translation subjects, translation dissemination objects, translation dissemination channels and translation impacts, there are some similarities and differences in the UK in the discourse eliminating mechanism of 龍 /lung and 夷 /i.

To begin with, from the perspective of translation subjects of 龍 /lung and 夷 /i, the British had dominated the entire process of such a “civilization clash”; hence, they could not escape but instead retreated to their own the cultural context space when interpreting special political and cultural discourse from the Chinese context. 夷 /i in a Chinese context indicates both the national image (to be civilized-barbaric) and national status (center-periphery in civilization). The UK, then an empire on which the sun never sets could not bear such an “offensive discourse” which categorized it into the periphery in China’s world order. Therefore, the UK resorted to national capital in the form of a “legally binding” treaty to prohibit China from referring to them with 夷 /i. However, it took a very different attitude to the translation of 龍 /lung. Although Jesuits and British missionaries knew the importance of 龍 /lung in Chinese political life very well since the late Ming dynasty, and the existence of 龍 /lung of emperor supremacy with “political correctness” was acknowledged widely (Lee 239), these missionaries did not accept the significance of 龍 /lung in Chinese culture nor other myths and legends. Nevertheless, although 龍 /lung carries dual identification functions in the Chinese context, including the political (imperial power) and cultural (cultural totem) dimensions, it was seldom considered a threat to the core interests of the UK and other Western countries. Therefore, it was unnecessary for them to take official actions to force China to change it. Furthermore, the purpose of Westerners coming to China (especially the missionaries) was to radically change Chinese culture and cause more Chinese convert to Christianity (Fairbank and Liu 528). Hence, it was enough for them to complete the mission of disseminating the gospel with a European vocabulary as the corresponding word for 龍 /lung.

Secondly, from the perspective of dissemination objects, the translation of 夷 /i as *barbarian* was mainly aimed at the British upper classes and the Chinese court. This was as much a contest for national capital as it was a political pledge. Translating 夷 /i into *barbarian* embodies the process of discourse manipulation and national capital competition. However, the translation of 龍 /lung is another story, since the potential readers of 龍 /lung and *dragon* were missionaries, with the purpose of constructing “selective” equivalent relationships between the Chinese 龍 /lung and English *dragon*, which would make it suitable for use in proselytizing. The British government had no intention to challenge the authority of 龍 /lung, a supreme royal discourse and representation in China, only a concept with no substantial implications for the British ruling classes and its sovereignty.

Thirdly, the English translation equivalents of 夷 /i and 龍 /lung were created through different dissemination channels. The semantic equivalence between 夷 /i and *barbarian* was established in the Treaty, representing the national power and political orientations, while the equivalence between 龍 /lung and *dragon* was achieved via translating the Bible and compiling Chinese-English Dictionary, with little direct connection with national power.

Fourthly, from the perspective of practical impact, the establishment of the relationship between 夷 /i and *barbarian* directly affected the subsequent discourse application, which separated

the consistency of historical and realistic significance of 夷/*i*. However, for a long time, translating 龍/*lung* as *dragon* was not a challenge to the Chinese and the British, and did not become so until the late 1990s when a group of Chinese scholars called for a re-translation of 龍/*lung*. They claimed that “dragon” was considered to be a monster in the Bible, with an evil nature that had the power to change the sacred image of 龍/*lung* in Chinese culture. Actually, both 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* were translated in a similar terminological framework. The political and cultural connotations of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i* were diminished and reconstructed by the UK through separating the relationships between signifier (龍/*lung*, 夷/*i*) and signified (龍/*lung*, the fetish, symbol of emperors; 夷/*i*, the ethnic groups living around the central kingdom) of Chinese political discourse, and then interpreting this based on British discourse and forming the combination of the signifier of Chinese 龍/*lung* and signified of English “dragon.” This was a “resurrection” of translated language, which obtained legitimacy through a dictionary in the political discourse system, with a special sign for alluding to China (negative issues in particular) coming into being. The translation of 夷/*i* as *barbaric*, with obtained legitimacy through a treaty, denied and isolated the meaning of any possible reference to Britain in the concept. In essence, the process of discourse operation reflects the national interest conflicts in Sino-British relations in its history at the level of civilization and discourse, which is overt discourse hegemony.

4. Reflection on Translation Competition and Manipulation

Adopting a sociological approach to translation, the translation of Chinese and Western political/cultural discourses mainly takes place in the “cultural contact zone” of the two civilizations.⁵ In this zone, China and the UK competed for the dominance over the translation of 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i*, and formed the competitive relationship based on the translation/interpretation of modern Chinese and Western cultural discourses.

The weakening of China’s competitive capital and power and the increasingly strong active input from the West have resulted in an inequality in cultural discourse translation. From the perspective of knowledge relations between China and the West, China, on the passive and defensive side, is the guardian of its tradition, and it is also a learner of the Western knowledge discourse system. The self that China sees at this time is not the real self, but the mapping of the Western knowledge genealogy. It is the self that sees through the West, an unreal China. The root of this fictitious and unequal cultural image lies in the conflict between Chinese and Western civilizations, an asymmetrical relationship between “core” and “periphery” based on different demands for national interests.

Since the national power and ethnic consciousness of contemporary China has become increasingly strong, academic circles are calling for introspection on the “castration” and “graft” of discourse in history, deconstructing the discourse regarding self core value constructed by the Western world, and reconstructing the Chinese cultural and political discourse system, thus forming a new pattern of competition between Chinese and Western political discourse in the new era. With the continuous awakening of a consciousness of Chinese nationalism, to deconstruct the cultural discourse of nationalism formed in history is not to deny the translation concept and discourse

formed by history, but to redefine its legitimacy starting from reality, forming the interpretation paradigm in accordance with modern cross-cultural communication in world. The relationships between 龍 /lung and *dragon*, were once not regarded as a “problem,” but it is now a new “problem.” The translation of 龍 /lung as *dragon* has become a symbol of political discourse manipulation.⁶

It is the incompatibility after the “controversy” between the Chinese and Western discourse systems that has stimulated China to start reflecting on discourse, advocate the reconstruction of national discourse, seek distinctive differences, and then establish the subject self-consciousness and national discourse security. Political discourse resistance behind translation is to reconstruct an old discourse from a new discourse perspective. Through the historical changes of these translations, from unconsciousness to consciousness, from obedience to resistance, two basic problems are reflected. One is the historical field. In an era of asymmetric capital between China and the West, following the Western framework of discourse, China has been lost in translation. The second is the real field. Now that China is rising increasingly as a global power, it is time to reallocate China’s position in global discourse order.

5. Conclusion

The authors propose that a dialectical analysis is crucial to the English translation of 龍 /lung and 夷 /i. On the one hand, it is imperative not only to go beyond the static single-latitude analysis of dictionary etymology and get around the illusion of setting an unjustified equivalence between words in two different languages, but also to re-examine the English translation process of the two core political discourses represented by 龍 /lung and 夷 /i from a dynamic perspective, discern the possible translation manipulation and discourse variation behind them, and reveal the logic of changes in the translation of political discourses in the historical process. On the other hand, judging from the process of translation variation for 龍 /lung and 夷 /i, what determines the meaning of discourse is not the discourse symbol itself, but the subject, the context, the orientation and the practical goal of discourse. Users of a strong discourse often change or modify the weak one in its context by manipulation in cross-language conversion.

Clearly, whether 龍 /lung should be translated as *dragon*, and 夷 /i translated as *barbarian* is not the essence of discourse competition between China and the West. The political discourse demands manifested in discourse practice and the relationship between different discourse subjects are the most fundamental constraints. The history of discourse translation has shown that discourse conflicts occur as long as conflicting elements exist. This confrontation arises in the cultural contact zone and disappears with the weakening or disappearance of the conflict attribute in the contact zone. Today’s world pattern is very different from that of 100 years ago. Significant changes have taken place in Sino-Western relations. With the rise of China and the spread of the international influence of Chinese culture, the perception of the Chinese 龍 /lung is changing in other parts of the world. Although people’s interpretations and image mapping of foreign discourses come from historical memory and knowledge inheritance, the ever-changing reality and intercultural communications at multiple levels will continuously reshape and reconstruct cultural cognition. A field study (Zhai 188-189) shows that in many parts of Europe today, the uniqueness of the

Chinese 龍/*lung* has been accepted, while *dragon*, with foreign origin, once combined with Chinese culture, has acquired new cultural implication and discourse orientation. This is enlightening in discourse translation research as well as in research on cross-cultural exchange and cognition.⁷

Notes

1. These dictionaries have a common feature, that is, they regarded Morrison's dictionaries as a major reference. In terms of translation involving 龍/*lung* and 夷/*i*, they were basically consistent.
2. The image of a dragon appears in the Bible. In Book of Revelation, Chapter 12, Verses 3 and 4: And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. Michael then fought this dragon. In Book of Revelation, the image of dragon is evil and it is the incarnation of Satan. This kind of image also runs through all kinds of Christian doctrines and derived literary works and cultures.
3. The translation and explanation of 龍/*lung* in *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language* in Three Parts, Part Two, Vol. 1 Morrison compiled is: 龍, from 月 Jow, flesh; The other parts are to represent flying in a tortuous manner. The chief of all reptiles; the draco or dragon; applied also to the lacerta species, including the alligator, said to possess the power of increasing or diminishing its size, of being either visible or invisible, and so on. Some have horns, and others have no horns; some ascend to heaven and others do not. The name of a star; of a hill; of a city; of an office; of a plant; and of a divinity. A man's name. Lung denotes the sovereign of China; and is an epithet applied to things pertaining to him. It is the Imperial badge or coat of arms affixed to his books and to his standards; on these it is embroidered or painted in the manner of the ancient Scythians, Parthians, Persians, and Romans.
4. The *King James Version* is a translation named after King James I of England who commissioned the new English Bible translation in 1604. King James "authorized" the new translation to be read in churches in England and beyond after it was first published in 1611. Later known as the *Authorized Version* in 1814, The *King James Version* became a standard among English-speaking Christians. See www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/King-James-Version/.
5. The conception of cultural contact zone was first seen in *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* by Mary Louise Pratt in 1992. In the discussion of Pratt, the contact zone was used to criticize the traditionally emphasized "advantage" or "subordinate" asymmetric relationships of rights, accepting how colonists developed hybrid culture and created various coping strategies through transculture.
6. The author wrote the article "Analysis on the New York Times' Double Interpretation of 龙 *Lung/Dragon's* Implication Meaning" by means of empirical analysis. In the article, through the statistical analysis of *dragon* used in the China-related reports of New York Times (1995-2010), the author found that the newspaper had a "dual" path on the interpretation of *dragon*; in political topics or discourse, the implied meaning of *dragon* was the Western, evil, negative "evil dragon"; in the "non-political" topic or discourse, the implied meaning of *dragon* was Chinese, cultural, and positive "good dragon." See Duanmu Iwan and Zhiheng Zheng, *College English Newspapers and Teaching Forum* (Fourth Series), Proceedings, Peking UP, 2017, pp. 142-155.
7. This paper is funded by China University of Mining and Technology, Research on the Evolution of Australia's National Security Strategy, No.2022ZDPYSK12

Works Cited

- The Commercial Press. *Commercial Press English and Chinese Pronouncing Pocket Dictionary*. The Commercial Press, 1912.
- Condit, Ira M. *English and Chinese, Reader with a Dictionary*. New York: Basic English, 1882.
- Davis, Darrell Haug, and John Alfred Silsby. *Chinese-English Pocket Dictionary with Mandarin and Shanghai Pronunciation and References to the Dictionaries of Williams and Giles; the Index Dictionary*. Shanghai T'u-Se-Wei, 1911.

- Doolittle, Justus. *Social Life of the Chinese: With Some Account of the Religious, Government, Educational, and Business, Customs and Opinions*. Cheng-Wen Publishing, 1966.
- Editorial Department of Zhonghua Book Company. *Kangxi Dictionary*. Zhonghua Book Company, 2010.
- Fairbank, John K., and Kwang-Ching Liu. *Late Ching 1800-1911 (vol. 1)*. China Social Sciences, 1985.
- Gring, Ambrose Daniel. *Eclectic Chinese-Japanese-English Dictionary of Eight Thousand Selected Chinese Characters*. Hong Kong and Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh, 1884.
- Grainger, Adam. *Western Mandarin or Spoken Language of Western China with Syllabic and English Indexes, China Inland Mission*. Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission, 1900.
- Guo, Tingyi. *Outline of Modern Chinese History, Third Edition*. Shanghai People's Publishing, 2009.
- Lee, Shixue. *Elaborations on English Etymology*. Zhejiang UP, 2013.
- Li, Chichang. "Between Polytheism and Monotheism: Translating Bible in Contextual Cultural Negotiation." *Journal of Shenzhen University*, vol.30, no.1, Jan. 2013, pp.12-18.
- Li, Xueqin. *The Origin of Chinese Characters*. Tianjin Ancient Books, 2013.
- Liu, He. *The Clash of Empires*. SDX Joint, 2014.
- Morrison, Robert. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts, Part I, Vol. III*. London: Black, Parbury, and Allen, 1823.
- . *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts, Part I, Vol. II*. London: Black, Parbury, and Allen, 1822.
- . *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language, in Three Parts, Part II — Vol. II*. London: Black, Parbury, and Allen, 1820.
- . *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts, Part II — Vol. I*. London: Black, Parbury, and Allen, 1819.
- . *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in Three Parts, Part I, Vol. I*. London: Black, Parbury, and Allen, 1815.
- . *A Grammar of the Chinese Language*. Printed at the Mission-press, Serampore, 1811.
- Peyrefitte, Alain. *The Immobile Empire: The First Great Collision of East and West*. SDX Joint, 1995.
- Smith, Arthur. *Proverbs and Commons Saying from the Chinese Together with Much Related and Unrelated Matter, Interpreted with Observations on Chinese Things-in-General*. Presbyterian Mission, 1902.
- Stent, George Carter. *Chinese and English Pocket Dictionary, Author of Chinese and English Vocabulary, Chinese Lyrics, Chinese Legends, the Jade Chaplet, etc*. Kelly, 1874.
- Xu, Shen. *Shuowen Jiezi*. (Chi.) Edited by Kejing Tang. Yuelu, 1997.
- Zhai, Shilei. *An Intercultural Exploration of Western Europe*. China Mining and Technology UP, 2020.
- Zuo, Min'an. *Elaborate Chinese Character: The Origin and Evolution of 1000 Chinese Characters*. Jiuzhou, 2006.