

# Globethics Repository

The logo for Globethics, featuring the word "Globethics" in white, sans-serif font centered within a solid blue rectangular background.

## Problems of Translation of Orthodox Lexis to Chinese

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Kolpachkova, Elena
Publisher	Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies
Rights	International Journal of Sino-Western Studies
Download date	2026-07-08 03:43:21
Link to Item	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/169053">http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/169053</a>

# Problems of Translation of Orthodox Lexis to Chinese

Elena KOLPACHKOVA

(St. Petersburg State University)

**Abstract:** Church and religious vocabulary as a specialized terminology represents a single corpus of denominational terms servicing Orthodoxy as an important area of social life and human activity, since its linguistic units function in a niche sphere-in church use and religious practice. Nowadays, with interest in Orthodoxy growing in China and the Russian Orthodox Church launching international educational activities, study and standardization of the Orthodox vocabulary as a sui generis stratum within the Chinese language system has become a pressing need. Despite the seeming fixity of lexical units within this field, their comprehensive lexicographic and semantic analysis shows that both meaning and denotation of certain concepts do not always pay due regard to denominational context and existing speech practices, which results in translation errors and distorted understanding of theological terms and religious doctrines.

**Key Words:** Chinese lexicology, translations studies, Orthodox religious vocabulary, loan words in Chinese

**Author:** Elena Kolpachkova, Associate professor at St. Petersburg State University, Universitetskaya emb. , 11, St. Petersburg 199034, Russia. E-mail: e.kolpachkova@spbu.ru

Religion represents one of the most sacred fields of ethnic culture, affecting mechanisms of human psychology and ethical norms. Despite the overall supranational nature of religion, specific elements of the professed religion form within any given culture, which in turn evolve an inherent religious terminology and specific interpretation of texts sacral to the given culture. All this represents a special type of communication qualified as a religious discourse. This is a particular field encompassing the Orthodox Church philosophy, Russian religious culture, and a particular stratum of denomination-specific lexical units reflecting distinctness of Russian Orthodoxy.

In the current context, owing to computer and IT technology development, the religious discourse has long ago moved beyond the temple service and represents not just a corpus of sacral and canonical texts presently available to any interested persons anywhere in the world, but also various educational and op-ed articles on religious subjects published in the Internet. The cyberspace is being intensively filled with religious texts, since the library of Orthodox religious texts previously coming down to the Bible and patristic writings fundamental to Orthodox teachings is expanding through sermons and thematic lectures by priests, religious scholars, educational materials, wherefore the problem of unification and standardization of the relevant in languages wherein this substrate remains fixed arises.

In contemporary society, the religious field forms a constituent part of the global communication. The religious communication field is characterized by heightened requirements to precise conveyance of meaning-

therefore, the need for consistency of the used denomination-marked vocabulary, translation of which requires, from linguistic perspective, compliance with a number of principles and due regard to a number of specific features of this phenomenon, plays a particular part within this field.

Within any language system, the religious substrate is characterized by archaic, sacral, monosemic, symbolic and expressive nature. It appears that preservation of these features in translations to other language should be ensured by the xenonymic reciprocity. Due to their innate missionary and educational functions, religious texts are considerably pragmatic, which must be preserved in translation. This explains the strict requirements to foreign-language religious texts, since in this case a language becomes a medium for denominational identity in the modern polycultural and polyreligious world. It is exactly determination of equivalents between lexical units in two language systems with the view to convey religious experience that creates the greatest difficulties in translation and, as a result, may lead to certain difficulties in readers' comprehension of the text. Substitution of an Orthodox concept with a Catholic one due to better understandability to Chinese readers familiar with the Western culture leads to loss of the original denomination-specific meaning actualized as an element of Russian Orthodox culture. The descriptive interpretative translation of the Bible based exclusively on a translator's personal experience with the use of Catholic vocabulary and practiced on early stages lead to distortions of meaning and errors in Chinese translations of Orthodox literature along with apparent non-compliance with the precision principle in course of selection of lexical units for translation.

Russian Orthodox Church claims that every religious concept should have a number of unequivocal denomination-specific terms, whereas use of a similar Catholic lexical unit causes a shift in the text's religious meaning, disorienting the reader, forming an incorrect idea of religious dominants and submerging the reader into the sphere of the two Christian churches' disputes. Differentiation of such units should rely on lexicographical sources and specialized dictionaries designed to provide an accurate, detailed and true information on a particular church and religious concept of the Orthodoxy; today, however, the issue of such a comprehensive dictionary creation remains unsolved, which is explained by the complexity of the very subject due to its interdisciplinary nature that implies involvement of materials of such disciplines as theology, lexicology, lexicography, translation theory, cultural linguistics, and sociolinguistics<sup>[1]</sup>.

The problem is that since 1930's, upon suspension of activities of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in China and up to the reform and opening-up policy implementation in 1980's, virtually no religious literature was translated to Chinese, whereas Orthodox texts remained inaccessible to citizens of contemporary China up to early 21C. The translation tradition once formed within the Ecclesiastical mission in Beijing and account of the vast experience of other denominations' missionaries in the field of Christian literature translation to Chinese may help to elaborate a unified translation of Orthodox vocabulary within modern Chinese. Pioneer Russian orientalists, who made a great contribution to Russian and global sinology development-A. L. Leontyev, N. Y. Bichurin (archimandrite Iakinf), P. I. Kafarov (archimandrite Palladius)-laid the foundation for translation of religious and liturgical texts from Chinese to Russian<sup>[2]</sup>. However, despite the fact that the

[1] See *Russko-kitayskiy slovar' pravoslavnoy leksiki* (Russian-Chinese Orthodox Dictionary). // Ed. by M. V. Rumyantseva. Moskva, 《Vostochnaya kniga》, 2008. ; *Yazyk russkogo pravoslaviya* (Language of Russian Orthodoxy). Uchebnoye posobiye na osnove tekstov Yevangeliya ot Marka dlya govoryashchikh na kitayskom yazyke. // Ed. by Garbovskiy N. K. Moscow, Vysshaya shkola perevoda, 2011.

[2] See Khokhlov A. N. *Rossiyskaya pravoslavnaya missiya v Pekine i kitayskiye perevody khristianskikh knig*. (Russian Ecclesiastical mission in Beijing and Chinese translations of Christian books. ) *Kitayskoye yazykoznanie*. M. , 1996. P. 160-164.

history of the Orthodoxy in China goes back to centuries, only a few Christian literature translations to Chinese had been made throughout the entire period of existence of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Beijing. This is primarily due to suspension of the translation tradition caused by social and political events taking place in Russia and in China in early 20C, the problems out-of-datedness in the Soviet era, crackdown on citizens for their religious views, etc.

Chinese translations of the Bible number several stages and were targeted at different audiences. The earliest ones were translated to the classical Chinese Wenyan-the language of Confucian hymns at that time comprehensible only to the country's officials and representatives of the intellectual elite. The missionaries' pursuit to make the Holy Bible available to a broader audience manifested in emergence of translations to a more understandable variant of the classical language designed for educated Chinese-that is, to simplified Wenyan with its simple grammatical forms and colloquial inclusions. At the same time, a translation to then vernacular language Baihua, which rapidly acquired the status of the literary language in China after 1919, was made. Thereafter, religious matters had been almost completely neglected throughout nearly half a century due to social and political reasons. However, works by Russian writers-especially, F. M. Dostoyevsky, L. N Tolstoy, Silver Age poets and philosophers-translated to Chinese in 1940's may serve as a source of relevant lexis, although overall quality of these translations was rather unstable, since certain works were translated not from Russian, but from other European languages, which naturally lead to even greater distortion of the original text.

Early translations were characterized by translators' desire to adapt ideas new to Chinese culture-bearers using concepts habitual to them and to render religious texts into literary forms familiar to them. As a result, thus obtained translations oftentimes proved to be far from original texts, perplexing the unconsolidated terminology ever more. Among linguistic prerequisites to translation standards revision, changes in language should undoubtedly be noted. Over last two hundred years, Chinese underwent radical changes that cannot be narrowed down to the natural language evolution process. Whereas changes in European language systems may be neglected due to the age-old language comprehensibility to a contemporary reader, in China the language used for translation, say, in the 19C, differs so drastically from the modern one that it may prove to be simply incomprehensible for an untrained reader. Thenceforth, Chinese has changed significantly both in terms of vocabulary and in terms of grammar, and therefore many places in old translations seem archaic in what concerns the set of lexical units and stylistic features. Besides, many Chinese characters used in first translated versions of the Bible are already out of use today and cannot always be found in common dictionaries. Chinese vocabulary also changed, showing a manifest quantitative shift from monosyllabic words toward disyllables and polysyllables in the 20C; collocation rules changed within the language, too. In terms of style, contemporary translations of religious texts show a clear trend toward semantic and structural simplification of complex poetic constructions and use of contemporary lexis and vernacular elements, thereby necessarily preserving the elevated narrative style. In such situation, the Orthodox vocabulary continuum in Chinese remains unconsolidated; non-systemic formation of this lexical stratum of Chinese, slowed down as compared to borrowings from other areas of social life, manifests itself in discrepancies in translations, and in lexical and graphic variation of a great number of terms. The problem becomes particularly acute when it comes to translation of similar in form but semantically different phenomena present in Orthodox and Catholic religious and cultural traditions, such as names of church administrative and territorial divisions, clerical ranks, elements of church and liturgical utensils, holidays and rituals, etc.

In this regard, there is also a number of methodological problems. Religion is a field, wherein every word choice is treated with great reverence, wherein every element or connotation of a given religious concept's meaning was long disputed among religious scholars and theologians. Russian Orthodoxy represents entwinement of the Orthodox Christian Church and Russian culture. To a significant degree, this determined of the Orthodox vocabulary substrate formation in Russian, which in turn consists of borrowings and calques from other languages, as well as lexical units of the Church Slavonic and Russian languages. This poses the question as to what source language should be used during translation to Chinese of those lexical units that were borrowed to Russian from other languages. Success depends not just on translation of units from one language to another, but on proper conveyance of all shades of meaning and implications free from original text distortions; thereby, preservation of the Orthodox text component is the most significant to us.

Church and religious vocabulary as a specialized terminology represents a single corpus of denominational terms servicing the Orthodoxy as an important area of social life and human activities, since its linguistic units function in a niche sphere-in church use and religious practices. Dominants of Orthodox culture include units denoting basic Christian concepts, whose major part is represented in the Bible-the main source of Christian teaching<sup>[3]</sup>. Apart from these lexical units, canonical literature has a stratum of church or liturgical lexis that relates to mundane church life and includes units associated with temple rites and rituals, ministers' work and church holidays. This very stratum represents a rather distinctly marked denominational vocabulary.

Orthodox literature translations always contain, in addition to theological terms, everyday non-terminological religious lexis comprised of common literary lexical units, historicisms, and archaisms, whose active usage imparts distinctness and singularity to believers' speech. Chinese translations contain a rather considerable stratum of borrowed lexis, which per se is not religious: 榕树 róngshù 'fig tree', 葡萄 pútáo 'grape', etc.

Within this substrate, the following types of lexical units are distinguished:

1. Polyonyms or common religious lexis representing units denoting concepts incidental to all religions, not only Christian. These units relate to fundamental concepts of religious worldview: for example, correlative pairs like 恶 è 'evil' and 善 shàn 'good', 罪恶 zuì è 'sin' and 正义 zhèngyì 'virtue', 祈祷文 qídǎowén 'prayer', etc.

Polyonyms denote such elements of the surrounding world, which are featured in most linguistic cultures. In contrast to denomination-specific or transient lexis of temporal historical nature, usage of these units is not limited exclusively to the field of religion and theology, this lexis is not only found in sacral texts-it encompasses virtually all key issues of any social group's life regardless of denomination, mono- or polytheism. Having historically emerged in a particular language community, this substrate reflects a set of basic social values and is least exposed to changes over time: 上帝 Shàngdì 'God', 灵魂 línghún 'soul'.

2. Culturonyms representing universal Christian lexis that is common to the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church and assigned to specific elements of Christian culture. This lexical stratum also features cultural universals common to Christian milieu uniting cultures of different countries historically and denominationally. Consequently, this issue is relevant not only to Russian Orthodox discourse, but also to the entire Christian community. Full matches of the most used common Christian and Orthodox lexical units,

[3] Alekseyeva M. O. Terminologiya russkogo pravoslaviya (Terminology of Russian Orthodoxy). Moscow, 2011.

which would ensure proper correspondence between special religious concepts used in a particular field in all languages, rarely happen in practice. One-to-one correspondences are possible only for a small number of universal Christian concepts, such as 圣经 Shèngjīng ‘the Bible’, 福音 fúyīn ‘the Gospel’, 天使 tiānshǐ ‘angel’, 圣徒 shèngtú ‘apostle’, etc. — that is, concepts that emerged prior to division of the Churches. Other examples of such universal Christian culturonyms may be the following words: 圣三一 shèng sānyī, 三位一体 sānwèiyītǐ ‘holy trinity’, 圣灵 shènglíng ‘holy spirit’, 救主 jiùzhǔ ‘savior’, 教会 jiàohuì ‘church’, 忏悔 chànhuǐ ‘confession’, 羊羔 yánggāo ‘lamb’; 教区 jiàoqū ‘eparchy’.

3. Specific Christian lexis that includes words denoting concepts incidental to particular Christian denominations. Within this group, idionyms and xenonyms are distinguished depending on internal or external culture targeting.

Idionyms represent intracultural lexis that emerged as a result of primary verbalization of a cultural continuum assigned to specific elements of internal culture: ‘starobryadets’ (old ritualist), ‘starover’ (old believer) in Russian.

Xenonyms is a foreign-language way of idionym rendering, a result of secondary verbalization of a cultural continuum assigned to specific element of external culture. It is important to note that all possible xenonymic variants derive from their etymon idionym. For example, 旧教派信徒 jiù jiàopài xìntú ‘starover’ (old believer), 旧礼仪派 jiù lǐyí pài ‘starobryadchestvo’ (old ritualists), 临安息日会 lín ānxīrì huì ‘adventism’. In the case of xenonyms, the problem of impossibility of unequivocal differentiation of lexical units in a target language arises, for instance: 弥撒 mísa stands for ‘mass’, but not for ‘liturgy’, as in 安魂弥撒 ānhún mísa ‘requiem mass’ in Catholic.

Xenonyms represent is the most unstable, fluid stratum of lexis. A part of xenonyms consists of occasionalisms, and this field’s representativeness in any language is peripheral and varies significantly due to the field’s narrow specialization. Natural selection of an optimal xenonym variant is rather slow and may be accelerated only through centralized efforts of interested parties. The rate of Orthodox terms introduction to Chinese explanatory dictionary and recognition thereof as vocabulary units is yet rather low. This is due to absence of efficient ways for adoption of new translation variants furnished with adequate and comprehensive explanations comprehensible to Chinese neophytes. Because of discrepant translations, numerous religious terms have several variants and may be rendered in various ways. Thus, ‘svyatoy’ in Russian has a number of translations in Chinese: 圣 shèng (‘Sanctus’) in the meaning ‘coming from God, relating to God’ is translated as ‘holy’ (圣灵 shènglíng ‘holy spirit’, 圣水 shèngshuǐ ‘holy water’); if the word is followed by a proper name, it also should be translated as 圣彼得 shèng Bǐdé ‘Saint Peter’. A word ‘svyatoy’ can also be translated as 神圣 shénshèng ‘divine’ ‘hallowed’, 神圣地方 shénshèng dìfāng ‘halidom’.

Overall, Chinese assimilate the Orthodox vocabulary continuum in accordance with general trends found in other lexical strata of the system. The main strategies used in translation of Orthodox vocabulary are listed below:

Phonetic borrowing (full or partial) implies copying of an original word’s audible form, wherefore a special character set is used<sup>[4]</sup>. The need to use phonetic borrowings in religious terms translation is stipulated by better preservation of the word original flavor. The syllabic nature of Chinese does not allow accurate conveyance of a foreign word’s sounding, and considering the great disparity between Russian and

[4] Gorelov V. I. Leksikologiya kitaiskogo yazyka (Lexicology of the Chinese language). Moscow, 1984, p. 143.

Chinese, reproduction of a phonetic form may only be partial and conventional, usually representing a certain compromise in virtue of divergence between individual ways of perception of foreign-language units, which leads to divergent translation equivalents: 爱色尼派 àisènípài or 艾赛尼派 àisàinípài ‘essenes’. This way of borrowing is characteristic of biblical anthroponyms, proper names rendered through graphic means of Chinese. Chinese speakers are already familiar with a part of these names from English, Greek and other European languages: 圣尼古拉 shèng nígūlā ‘Saint Nicholas’, 尼古拉神医神医 Nígūlā shényī ‘Nikolaos the Wonderworker, wondrous healer’. Phonetically borrowed polysyllabic words may cause difficulties in text perception with Chinese readers and are hard to memorize for them.

Calquing or semantic borrowing implies creation of a new word or compound word to denote a particular object based on word-building patterns established within the system out of morphemes that already exist in Chinese<sup>[5]</sup>. This type of borrowing fills a gap within the language, whereby there often arises the need in its supplementary interpretation. Calques usually represent words consisting of two or more morphemes. They convey main features of a described object. In semantic borrowing, phonetic similarity of an original word and its calque is lost. Calques can be of two types: structural and etymological. Structural calques convey semantic and morphological word structure. It is, in fact, a literal translation of an idiom 领洗池 lǐngxǐchí ‘baptistry, kupel dly krescheniya’. Etymological calques reveal a borrowed word’s semantic meaning: 橄榄油 gǎnlǎnyóu ‘yeley, chrism’, 祝福 zhùfú ‘blagoslaveniye, blessing’.

Advantages of semantic borrowings include simplicity of reproduction and memorizing for language-speakers, since such borrowings are recorded in the target language using its own words and morphemes. Calquing is a borrowing through literal morpheme-to-morpheme word translation. Adoption of this type of borrowing allows rendering of an idiom to Chinese with maximum possible preservation of its semantic content; thereby, calques in form of phrases and compound words are most frequent.

A borrowing may be partial, when an original Chinese morpheme is combined with elements of a foreign-language word in a new word, for example, when a Chinese affix is added to a Russian root. This is a so-called hyponymic, or generalized loose translation, wherein source language words denoting specific concepts are rendered with Chinese words denoting generic concepts: 毕士大池 bìshìdà chí ‘Bethesda, a pool near the Sheep Gate’. Such species-to-genus substitution (generalization), wherein a Chinese morpheme/word with a broader definition complements a lexical unit with a narrower definition, is typical for Chinese. Generalization may be caused by extralinguistic factors. When a translation is intended for untrained readers unfamiliar with a particular subject field, generalization designed to explicate the meaning appears to be the most efficient translation method.

Another possible strategy for Christian literature translation may be use of a word denoting something functionally close, even though not identical, to a foreign-language concept. As a rule, functional analogues cause a similar response with Chinese readers—therefore, this strategy was widely used at early stages of Chinese people’s familiarization with Christian literature, when assimilative translation was primarily employed and substitution of foreign-language culturonyms with Chinese culturonyms as functional analogues was observed. Although this technique is admissible for polyonyms, it unavoidably leads to substitution of the original Christian flavor for something fundamentally different and extrinsic when it comes to culturonyms and idionyms. Thus, 圣徒传 shèngtú zhuàn ‘hagiography’ is rendered with the word 传 zhuàn ‘biography’,

[5] ibid., p. 146.

typical for Chinese historiographical tradition since ancient times, whereas in the matter of religious dominants, literature already has negative examples of mixing Christian religious terminology with Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist vocabulary in Chinese. At the initial stage, it allowed conveying meaning of culturonyms, even though not very accurate, thereby losing national and religious flavor and substituting connotative equivalents; starting from 经 jīng ‘text, classics’ for 圣经 the Bible, 鬼神 guǐshén for ‘supernatural being’, ‘spirits’, 净 jìng’ for ‘immaculate’, 长老 zhǎnglǎo was used for Russian idionym ‘starets’.

The difficulty was in conveying theological concepts that had no analogues in Chinese. First missionaries were Catholics, who saw the most efficient and appropriate method of denoting Christian concepts in use of the traditional Chinese philosophical dictionary and borrowing of terms already existing in the language simply accompanied by supplemental explanations concerning new word usage. This approach’s deficiency lay in excessive ‘confucianization’ or ‘buddhismization’ of the Bible.

Thus, such concept of the Christian world as 撒都该人 sādōugāi rén ‘Sadducee’, was purposefully borrowed through phonetic method; a semantic borrowing was used for 奋锐党 fènruìdǎng ‘Zealots’. As for ‘Pharisee’, a phonetic translation 法利赛人 fālìsàirén appears to be a more preferable equivalent for translation of the word ‘Pharisee’ into Chinese as compared to such variant as 伪君子 wèijūnzi ‘double-dealer’ just because of Confucian connotations undesirable for this term within Chinese culture.

The substrate of Russian Orthodox lexis is assimilated by Chinese rather unequally; a number of Orthodox dominants is still non-unified, no systemic fixation of the Russian Orthodox Church vocabulary had been performed up until recently. Availability of various ways of xenonym formation in the context of continuous selection of an optimal term fixation variant explains the observed variation of Orthodox xenonyms, when same elements are denoted with various xenonymic variants correlating to the same idionym. Xenonyms are primarily used in Orthodox conceptual terminology, ecclesionyms (names of places of rites or worship), church holiday names, names of religious movements and sects.

Therefore, xenonymic attribution is very important at the current stage, for it ensures accuracy and reciprocity of xenonymic nomination, along with identification of the Russian Orthodox element. Thus, liturgical white altar bread used in the Orthodox Sacrament of the Eucharist that has two xenonymic variants in Russian- ‘prospora’ and ‘prosvira’-has a unified translation in Chinese 圣饼 shèngbǐn, which literally means ‘holy pancake’ and reflects neither Orthodox nor Catholic practices due to absence of any type of bread in Chinese reality. Accordingly, distinctions existing between Catholic tradition using azyme for host preparation and Eastern Orthodox tradition using yeast bread in the Eucharist were blurred. Thus, the dispute concerning bread for the Eucharist, which played an important role in the history of interrelations between Eastern and Western Christianity and became one of the formal causes of the Great Schism, proves to be incomprehensible to Chinese readers.

Difficulties arise in translation of lexis, which emerged and exists only in the Orthodox culture and is unfamiliar to bearers of other cultures and other language speakers. For example, the Russian polysemic word ‘paskha’ has, in addition to the Easter holiday name translated to Chinese as 复活节 fùhuójié, a meaning of ‘a cake made of tvorog (quark, cottage cheese) consecrated for the Easter holiday to break the fast in the first festive day’. Knowledge of Christian lexis cannot ensure correct understanding and translation of the Orthodox term, since both the paskha dish itself as a realis and nomination of the product it is made of (tvorog) are not present anywhere outside of Russia.

A special note should be given to peculiar religious traditions, for instance names characterizing believers devoting themselves to particular deeds, undertaking commitments or renouncing temptations: 修道士 xiūdàoshi ‘novice’, 斋公 zhāigōng ‘faster’, etc.), in contrast to, for instance, the adjective ‘yurodivy’ (holy fool), can’t be adequately expressed by a word 痴呆 chīdāi with its markedly negative connotation in Chinese.

Although China has a rich monastic tradition, this aspect imparts a great distinction between religious doctrines of the two cultures; however, the very concept of monkhood as of isolated and ascetical lifestyle relates to polyonyms and is intelligible to Chinese readers. The problem is that the particularly broad gauge of the Russian monkhood institute is fixed in a long list of nominations of various types of monks in the Orthodoxy, which is reflected in F. M. Dostoyevsky’s works, wherein Russian text features numerous categories of monks, while in Chinese text all these monastic ranks (‘igumen’, ‘yieromonakh’, ‘inok’, ‘kelar’, ‘poslushnik’ etc) are generalized as 修士 xiūshi ‘monk, novice’, thus negating the differences between various hierarchical stages of Orthodox priests.

The same concern names of monasteries and churches: Russian-language nominations of “lavra”, ‘skete’, ‘podvorie’, ‘poustinia’ in translations to Chinese are generalized as 修道院 xiūdàoyuàn or 隐修院 yǐnxiūyuàn as ‘skete’ and seem to be mixed up with abbeys in Western Europe.

Similarly, variable Russian concepts ‘chapel’, ‘bell tower’, ‘zvonnitsa’ (bell-gable) have a single correlate in Chinese 钟楼 zhōnglóu, whose internal form indicates presence of a chapel bell in the tower. Rendering of these terms is a rather difficult task for translators, since most of them are unfamiliar to Chinese people. Generalization is used for nomination of items of priests’ gown, church utensils, etc.

Any culture contains concepts reflecting universal human ideals and values, whose expression by means of another language does not normally cause any problems; nevertheless, in terms of religious realia, many Orthodox concepts do not have even remote equivalents in Asian cultures and languages, and it is often impossible to find any analogues in another ethnic group’s mentality, philosophy and culture<sup>[6]</sup>. Whereas numerous universal Christian cultural and historical realia already have adequate equivalents in Chinese, Orthodox cultonyms, with rare exclusions, are virtually unknown to citizens of China—therefore, not just interlingual translation as a particular case of interpretation in general, which does not differ fundamentally from intersemiotic translation, appears to be adequate for denominational terms, but special procedures for identification and explanation of Orthodox vocabulary determinants stipulated by historical, lexicographical, stylistic and communication pragmatic factors are required.

At the present stage, when boundary spanning and single information area promoted by computer technologies development stimulate spiritual communication between representatives of Russian and Chinese religious, social and civil life, Chinese readers’ demand for catechetical, liturgical, patristic, missionary and other types of Orthodox literature becomes more and more acute.

Assimilation of Russian Orthodox lexis by Chinese in what concerns Orthodox Christianity as compared to, say, other field of Russian culture, is hampered by the fact that Chinese vocabulary lacks ready-made means relating to Christianity, while substitution of Orthodox elements for corresponding Catholic ones is particularly undesirable in view of the dispute taking place between these two major branches of Christianity

[6] Lomanov A. V. *Khristianstvo i kitayskaya kultura* (Christianity and Chinese culture). Moscow, 2002.

for over a thousand years.

Just as Orthodox vocabulary once formed at the interface of two worldviews-Christian and pagan, Chinese religious lexical substrate represents a result of Christian elements superimposition on the stratum of Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist terminology and requires due regard to all layers of religious lexis: universal religious, universal Christian, and Orthodox lexis pre se due to intricate entwining of universal human and universal Christian elements with specific elements of Russian Orthodoxy and Russian culture within the field. The Russian Orthodox xenonymic field is assimilated rather fragmentarily, many lexical sets are represented by single xenonyms, whereas certain idionyms are not represented in Chinese at all. Phonetic borrowings and hybrid xenonyms are the most productive ways of Orthodox xenonyms formation in Chinese.

All this indicates that this field requires systematic description and certain standardization in form of dictionaries and textbooks, which would afford correct representation of the lexis of the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian culture in Chinese-speaking world.

汉语题目:

## 浅析现代汉语中东正教术语的翻译

林一诺, 圣彼得堡大学副教授, Universitetskaya emb. , 11, St. Petersburg 199034, Russia. E-mail: e. kolpachkova@spbu.ru

**提要:**宗教和教会术语属于行业语的范畴,为精确地指明东正教概念的词或词组,它在社会活动和日常生活中用作具有一定意义的系统地约束的标记。目前,华人恢复对东正教的兴趣,俄罗斯正教会也深入开展教育活动,东正教网上资源越来越多,因此东正教术语汉译实现标准化是更为紧迫的问题。本文通过词项的语义分析和词典编纂成分分析作一综述,已经约定俗成的宗教词汇还缺乏一致性和系统性,有很多东正教概念的内涵和外延与其他教会普遍使用的术语不大相同,在推敲译名时,应充分考虑翻译的意义传达避免造成教义上的误解或混乱。

**关键词:**中国词汇学、翻译研究、东正教词汇表、汉语里的借词