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O. INTRODUCTION

Latin as one of the daughter languages of Italic, which in turn is a first-level subgroup in the hierarchy of the Indo-European family, and as the ancestor language of the Romance languages is genetically rather far from German and English, which are different daughters of the (West) Germanic (see Vidos 1968, König 1978, and Baugh and Cable 1978), despite the relics of genetic relationships and of the structural similarities between them. Of the three, Latin is dead but remains to be a means for preserving and understanding the cultural, intellectual treasures of classical antiquity. As such, it is still being taught and learned in the institutions of higher learning and even in the schools of secondary education in some countries, especially in Continental Europe, such as in Germany and Austria (see Chiang 1985a).2

The amount of translated literature from Latin into German and/or English has been tremendous; so are translations from German into English or the other way round (see Jumpelt 1961 and Newmark 1981).4 Needless to say, many more such tasks, especially between the two “living” languages, are being undertaken.

The importance of the three languages—and in turn of the “bridge” or translation between them—is more than obvious: Latin, the most important classical language; German, one of the most important languages for art, literature, philosophy, science and technology, as well as for some other cultural and intellectual activities; and English, the international means of communication.5

Translation, as Newmark (1981) puts it, is “a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language” (p. 7), or, as defined by Gatford (1965), is “the replacement of textual
material in one language (source language) by equivalent textual material in another language (target language)’’ (p. 20). The two definitions are basically of the same purport, that translation, or, more exactly, the task of translation, is the replacement of a written text in one language by something “the same” or “equivalent” in another. And they leave the same question: Just in what condition(s) may two or more linguistic expressions—words, phrases, or complete utterances—be considered “the same” or “equivalent”?

To answer this question or similar ones, even only more satisfactorily, will not be easy at all and will entail lengthy and tedious discussions in philosophy, logic, linguistics, and a number of related disciplines. For the time being, however, it would be convenient to set up the dichotomy between physical and linguistic equivalence. We will leave the subject of physical identity (equivalence) to the discussion of those who work in the other branches of knowledge and look a little more into the question of linguistic equivalence, to which translation equivalents, which are our immediate concern, belong.

By linguistic equivalence here the author refers chiefly to the semantic equivalence (Lyons 1977:236ff.) which is supposed to exist between lexemes from different languages and which forms the basis for synonyms. Strictly speaking, however, there are few lexemes or words between two languages which are of exactly the same “meaning” (taken in a strict sense to include not only the denotation of a word but the bundle of connotations that surrounds it and/or the possible combination of emotional implications that may be associated with it). Since language is to a great extent culturally and ethnically specific, what is lexicalized in one language with respect to this culture of ethnic group may not be lexicalized in another language with respect to that culture or ethnic group. Or what is lexicalized or expressed in this way in one language may be lexicalized or expressed otherwise in the other language. It would not be surprising, therefore, to find that there was no word for “snow” in a language of equatorial Africa (Lyons 1977:236), and it is normal also for the translator to find no equivalent in the English or German language for the Chinese lexeme hsiao-jen 小人 (Usually translated as “(the) small man” in most of the translations of the Chinese classics in which it frequently appears), as the bundle of connotations surrounding the word is so complicated and the combination of emotional implications associated with it is so rich. In other words, the expression hsiao-jen in the Chinese language is so culturally specific that it can hardly find an exact equivalent in any other language than its own. The Chinese hsiao-jen is not just a “bad guy” or “villian” or any strict or loose synonyms of these terms; he is mean and he is more than that; and in physical build he may be tall and sturdy. What exact equivalents does it find, then, say, in German, French, Arabic, Russian,
or Japanese, or in the language of the Eskimos, or in one of the languages of the Africans or American Indians? Perhaps none. The English translation (not an equivalent!). "(the) small man" for Chinese hsiao-jen, as it stands and to the extent that it has somehow been established, is perhaps one of the "best" translations the translator can find, although the term, by itself, is not self-explanatory: it requires much more words to make clear just what a hsiao-jen or "small man" is, or is like, in the Chinese culture and language in which it originally appears.

In theory, there are "translatables" and "intranslatables" between languages. Terms like Chinese hsiao-jen belong to this latter group, although for the practical need of translation it does find a superficial, word-for-word "equivalent" in the English "small man." The translatables are like English man, German Mensch (or Mann), French homme, Chinese jen 人, Japanese hito (or otoko) and Latin homo, all referring to one and the same species of animals; so are; for example, English breakfast, German Frühstück, Latin ientaculum, Chinese tsao-ts’an 早餐, and Japanese asameshi, despite the fact that speakers of these languages, of ancient or modern times, definitely eat (ate) different things at different times and in different ways for the first meal of the day—that is, regardless of the cultural, ethnical differences of the expressions.

Just how does the one who knows two or more languages conceive or recognize such "equivalence" or "sameness" between languages? This may turn out to be another intricate problem—and very often one of controversy—among logicians, linguists, and psychologists. Lyons (1977) holds the view that such an ability in judging the semantic equivalence between languages is largely inherent and intuitive in bilingual speakers, whereas the second/foreign-language learner's awareness of such parallelism between two or more languages is mostly learned rather than intuitive. In this latter case, the process of learning plays an important role.

Further, it must be kept in mind that all translations are approximations, judging from the fact that exact semantic equivalence between languages seldom exists. And, in a strict sense, translation equivalents are not to be confused with semantic equivalents, for the former are merely, in Eugene A. Nida's words, "the closest natural equivalents" between the two languages involved, in terms of both meaning and style. Generally speaking, when two lexemes or some other language units (idioms, phrases, etc.), one in the source language and the other in the target language, are of the same denotation or basic meaning and no elements in their bundles of connotations clash, the two lexemes or expressions are possible, but not necessary, translation equivalents.
Translation theory is closely associated with comparative (contrastive) linguistics, and especially with semantics (Newmark 1981:5). As a matter of fact, many of the tenets in translation theory are derived from the observations or results of contrastive analyses between languages. So are the theories in sociolinguistics (as the crucial distinction drawn between langue, the system of language, and parole, the language in a real, communicative context), semiotics, and communication. The translator's concern, however, is usually with the final product of his work—the correctness, beauty, and expressiveness of his translated piece—rather than with the theory of translation, which they think is the job of the linguist or the translation theorist (p. 23).

Finally, with the practical task of translation, there is the distinction, or controversy, between free and literal (word-for-word) translation, or between “communicative” and “semantic” translation—together with a number of other terms such as “interpretative translation,” “technical (scientific) translation,” and the like (see Newmark 1981). Some of them are real; others are only superficial, conceptual, and relative if not totally hypothetical.

Above all these is the tenet or even “doctrine” of faithfulness, expressiveness, and elegance, which has had a relatively long standing among Chinese translators. The three requirements, which were attached equal importance formerly, have been reevaluated and retouted by some translators and scholars (as Chen 1971 and Wu 1982), claiming that faithfulness remains a must, that ta (達) does not necessarily mean fluency, and that elegance is unnecessary and trivial (Chen 1971:13–16).

1. THE LANGUAGES: SIMILARITIES AND DISSIMILARITIES

Latin as a “synthetic” language lends itself to a highly complicated picture of inflection. Free forms are relatively few; most of the forms, or “words” in the Latin sentence are grammatically bound to one another. Word-order is relatively free and meaning depends more on morphology than on syntax—that is, more on the inflection of the forms. Thus, *puellae magistram salutant* (the girls greet the (female) teacher), in the order of S + O + V) would mean basically the same as *magistram puellae salutant* (O + S + V) aside from a slight shift of focus (the latter placing a little more emphasis on the fronted object), since meaning and grammatical relationship are already specified by the inflectional endings of the words: *-ae* in *puellae* (specifying that the noun is feminine nominative...
plural), -am in *magistrum* (specifying that the noun is feminine accusative singular), and -nt in *salutant* (specifying that the verb is indicative present 3rd-person plural active)—all necessary grammatical information already there in the words themselves.

The grammatical categories or form-classes of Latin, on which those of English, German, and many other languages are traditionally but superficially based, fall firstly into a major distinction of three classes: nominals, verbs, and particles. Subsumed under the category of nominals are: substantives (nouns and noun equivalents), adjectives, pronouns, and numerals; under particles are adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. There are, therefore, altogether nine classes of words: nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, and numerals (but no articles)—by and large the same as the grammatical categories in the traditional Latin-based grammars of English, the “eight parts of speech” (the only difference being that numerals are usually not set up as a distinct class in English and that some grammarians set up the English articles as a ninth class). The classification into the three major categories is basically formal: all nominals and verbs are inflectional, whereas particles are not. The framework is, therefore, chiefly a formal classification of words.

Latin nominals (not nouns alone) lend themselves to a 3-way distinction of grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, and neuter), a 2-way distinction of number (singular and plural), and a 6-way distinction of case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, and ablative). There are, therefore, 3x2x6=36 different grammatical functions and the same possible number of forms for each noun, adjective, pronoun, or numeral, each fulfilling theoretically a different function. Actually, however, there are not so many, since many of the forms overlap. For the Latin adjective meaning ‘good’, for example, there are thirteen different forms—*bonus, bona, bonum, boni, bonae, bono, bonam, bone, bonorum, bonarum, bonis, bonos, and bonas*—fulfilling the thirty-six grammatical functions. Of these, *bonus*, the masculine singular nominative, formed from the “word-stock” (Ger. *Wortstock*)\(^{12}\) *bon-* and the suffix -*us*, is the so-called “name form” (by which a word is mentioned)\(^{13}\) or “dictionary form” (by which the lexeme is entered into the lexicons and dictionaries). Some forms—namely *bonus, bone, bonam, bonarum, and bonas*—fulfill only one grammatical function: *bonus* only as masculine singular nominative, *bone* only as masculine singular vocative, and the like. Most of them, however, assume a multifunctional grammatical role: *bonae* not only as feminine plural nominative, but also as feminine singular genitive, feminine singular dative, and feminine plural vocative; *bona* not only as feminine singular nominative, but also as neuter plural nominative, feminine
singular vocative, neuter plural accusative, etc.; and the like. The conjugation of the Latin verb is even more complicated: it is a "pompous"—so to speak—array of the possible combinations of the grammatical concepts of person, number, tense (aspect), voice, and mood. In order to speak Latin fast and correctly, "one must be able to process linguistic information as quickly as a modern computer."  

Modern German comes rather close to Latin in some significant ways. Word-order in German is also relatively free, and sentence meaning depends also heavily on inflection of words. Thus, der Junge liebt das Madchen 'the boy loves the girl', with the normal S + V + O word-order, does not differ much in meaning from das Madchen liebt der Junge 'the boy loves the girl', with the word-order O + V + S, aside from a shift of sentence focus (something like the English construction, 'it is this girl that the boy loves', but not so much emphasized). Meaning will be changed, however, when the two nouns in the sentence are otherwise inflected, as den Jungen liebt das Madchen (O + V + S) 'the girl loves the boy'. 

Likewise, Latin Nero interfecit Agrippinam 'Nero killed Agrippina' will mean basically the same as Agrippinam interfecit Nero (O + V + S) or Nero Agrippinam interfecit (S+O+V). Hence, in German, ich liebe dich (S+V+O) 'I love you' means basically the same as dich liebe ich (O + V + S), the only syntactic requirement being that the verb should always assume the second position of the sentence (thus, unlike Latin, *dich ich liebe is ungrammatical unless in an intentionally topicalized context, as in Chinese ta wo bu hsi-huan, literally, 'he, I don't like').

Grammatical categories in German are by and large the same as those in Latin and English, since both English and German grammars used to be Latin-based (see Michael 1970). Some minor differences exist, of course. For instance, while Latin has no articles, German and English do. While Latin draws a clearcut formal distinction between adjectives and adverbs (one inflectional and the other uninflectional), German does not. Most German adjectives and adverbs are of the same form and may conveniently be given the same form-class label. The inflectional system of German appears to be slightly less complicated than that of Latin, but much more complicated than that of Modern English: 3-way distinction of grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, and neuter), 4-way distinction of case (nomina- tive, genitive, dative, and accusative), and a much more complicated picture of conjugation than that of English.

English used to be much more complicated than it is now. While Modern English is an analytic language, Old English was a synthetic one. The inflectional system of Old English resembles that of modern German-(Baugh and Cable 1978). The language has gone through
a process of simplification to become analytic in the course of time. Thus, where Latin had a 6-way distinction of case and modern German has a 4-way one, Modern English keeps only a few relics of case inflections, namely the s-gentive—the 3-way distinction between nominative (subjective), accusative (objective) and genitive (possessive) is just superfluous and unreal.

2. SOME TRANSLATION PROBLEMS BETWEEN THE LANGUAGES

Owing to the structural similarities and dissimilarities between Latin, German, and English, may problems may arise while translating one into another. Linguistic transfer, both negative and positive, is common. We will present and discussion some of the problems below.

2.1 The problem of the article

Let us examine the Latin text and the German and English translations below:

(1) a. (Latin text)


b. (German translation)

Großvaters. Der Großvater mit den Freunden treibt das Boot mit den Rudern an. Sie segeln schon inmitten der Wellen, getrieben von dem Wind. Der Großvater zeigt den Freunden aus dem Boot die schönen Ufer, die lieblichen Dörfer, die Gärten und die Felder. Groß ist die Freude der Freunde und nachher erzählen sie anderen Freunden über die Wellen, den Wind und die lieblichen Dörfer.

c. (English translation)

August calls his friend Paul: "My grandfather invites us (in) to his boat. Hurry up, dear friend! He invites also Julius! My grandfather is already waiting for (expecting) us in his boat." Paul listens to (obeys) his friend. With his friend Julius he hurries to the shore. The grandfather—already in the boat—says: "I greet you, my friends! The wind is favorable. Get in the boat!" The friends greet him and enter the boat of the grandfather. The grandfather, with his friends, drives the boat with the oars. They are already sailing amid the waves, driven by the wind. The grandfather shows his friends from the boat the beautiful shores, the lovely villages, the gardens, and the fields. Great is the joy of his friends and later they explain to some other friends about the waves, the wind, and the lovely villages.

Much can be said of the Latin text above and of the German and English translations regarding all aspects of structure of the three languages with respect to the theory and the actual task of translation. For our immediate concern, however, let us begin with the problem of the article, and come to the rest later in our discussion.

As previously mentioned, Latin has no article, and definiteness of nouns and noun equivalents is either inferred from context or expressed otherwise by the use of demonstratives (hic, haec, hoc ‘this’; ille, illa, illud ‘that’; and the like) or by the use of relatives and relative constructions (qui, quae, quod, ‘who, which, that’, etc.). German has, as English does, the definite article (der, die, das ‘the’, with a full declension with respect to three genders, two numbers, and four cases), the indefinite (ein, eine, ein ‘a(n)’, with the same system of declension), and a "negative article" (kein, keine, kein ‘no’, with the same declension as the indefinite). The (idiomatic) use of the articles, however, varies between German and English. Generally speaking, the German definite article is much more frequently used, especially in idioms where no definite reference is present, than its English counterpart; and, in many idioms (adverbial or adjectival) whose English equivalents (see O. for the discussion of "equivalents") have no article or an indefinite article, German often
has the definite article. Thus:

(2) a. Er kommt einmal im Jahr.
   a'. He comes once (in) a year.

b. Zum Beispiel, . . .
b'. For example, . . .

c. Sie sind bei Tisch.
c'. They are at table.

d. Er ist beim Essen.
d'. He is at meal-time (at meals).\(^\text{17}\)

e. Sie ist (sitzt) am Tisch.
e'. She is (sitting) at (the) table.

f. Im Sommer wird es warmer (sein).
f'. In summer it will be warmer.

g. Die Bäume blühen im Frühling.
g'. The trees blossom in (the) spring.

h. Er geht zur Arbeit.
h'. He is going (back) to (his) work.

i. Am Sonntag mache ich nichts.
i'. On Sunday I do nothing.

j'. I watch TV at night (in the evening).

k. Zum Schluss möchte ich sagen, daß . . .
k'. Finally I'd like to say that . . .

l. Im Januar kommt mein Vater zurück.
l'. My father comes back in January.

m. Dann werde ich Ihnen meinen Artikel zum Raten schicken.
m'. Then I'll send you my article for advice.

In all these and many other examples contrasting the use of articles in German and English we might discern some general differences regarding the use of the article system in each language, though definite rules can hardly be generalized from them since the uses of articles, in German as in English, are to a great extent conventionalized and idiomatic. In the examples, \textit{im Jahr} in (a) means literally 'in the year', the form \textit{im} being a com-
bination of the preposition in ‘in’ and the definite articles dem ‘the’ (neuter singular dative), with the final consonant of the article incorporated into the preposition. Thus, im Jahr, in this context, is to be translated into English as (in) a year, rather than in the year, though the latter is possible in some other contexts, as he came twice in the year (a specific year). In (b), zum Beispiel means literally ‘for the example’, zum being a combination of zu ‘to/for’ and dem ‘the’. In the English equivalent, however, no article occurs. Sentences (c) and (c’) happen to be the same, both without an article and both taking the functional import of having a meal, as against the spatial meaning as conveyed by am Tisch ‘at the table’ in (e), though the functional meaning may be included in the spatial: when one is at the table, he may or may not be having a meal. Synonymous with bei Tisch is beim Essen, literally ‘at the meal’, in (d)—this time with the article. There is, however, a major difference in the use of the article between German and English when a preposition of time is used with a noun in connection with time, season, or the days of the week, as in the pairs of sentences (f), (g), (i), (j), and (l), where im Sommer means literally ‘in the summer’, im Frühling literally ‘in the spring’, am Sonntag literally ‘on the Sunday’, am Abend literally ‘in the night’, and im Januar literally ‘in the January’—all with the definite article. Their English parallels, however, usually occur without any article (in summer, in spring, at night, on Sunday, in January, and the like), though in some instances alternative expressions exist (in (the) spring, at night/in the night/in the evening, etc.). For (h), where zur Arbeit means literally ‘to the work’, it is hardly desirable or necessary to keep the definite article in the English translation, making it ‘going (back) to the work’; substitution of the definite article with a pronominal adjective would sound more natural. Thus, an elliptical imperative like also, zur Arbeit! will not be translated literally into English as well then, to the work!, but more idiomatically as well then, back to your work!. Zum Schluß in (k) means literally ‘to the end’ but idiomatically ‘finally’, and zum Raten literally ‘for the advice’, though no definite reference in the noun Raten, a gerund, is implied.

Let us now go back to our previous German and English translations of the Latin text in (l). Now, before we go into more details of the text and translations, it must be noted that the translations, both German and English, are not suppose to be idealistic or perfect; they are, perhaps, not the “best” ones—if one may otherwise do it better. What’s more important to be kept in mind is that those translations and some others that follow, all done by the author himself, are not supposed to be the most “fluent,” “beautiful,” and/or “elegant,” since fluency, beauty, and elegancy, in many cases, are not the most important qualities in translation (see Chen 1971); and, even if they were, they would have their own
problems and limitations. While translating the Latin texts into German and English, the translator (i.e., the author himself) has always kept in mind that faithfulness and accuracy are what counts, placing the other requirements such as fluency and beauty in a secondary position. On this account—not a plausible excuse, though—at some places in the translations, owing to the configuration of the original texts and to the structural, expressional differences and/or constraints between the languages involved, there may be expressions or structures which may not sound fully "fluent" or "idiomatic" to the native ear of each of the target languages into which the Latin texts have been translated—though, as far as the translator believes, they are faithful and correct and (hopefully) expressive translations. They come, so to speak, closer to the so-called "semantic translation" (see Newmark 1981: 22) than any other type.

Generally speaking, in order to treat a topic concerning the use of articles, longer texts, rather than discrete sentences, should be taken as illustrations and evidence; this is why a text like (1a) has been taken. When one scrutinizes (1a) against the suggested German and English translations, one finds:

1) Where the German and/or English translations should grammatically or idiomatically have an article, or at least some other substitute (a determiner of some other kind, say, a pronominal adjective like his, her, etc.), the Latin sentence has none, as:

(3) a. Augustus Paulum amicum vocat.
   August(us) Paul friend calls
   'August(us) calls (his) friend Paul.'

b. August ruft seinen Freund Paul.

c. August(us) calls his friend Paul.

(4) a. Avus nos iam in navicula exspectat.
   grandfather us already in boat expects
   '(My) grandfather is already waiting for (expecting) us in (the/his) boat.'

b. (Der/mein) Großvater erwartet uns schon im Boot.

c. My (the) grandfather is already waiting for (expecting) us in the (his) boat.

(5) a. Paulus amico obtenterat.
   Paul friend obeys
   'Paul listens to (obeys) (his) friend.'

b. Paul gehorcht seinem Freund.

c. Paul listens to (obeys) his friend.
(6) a. Cum Iulio amico ad ripam properat.
   with Julius friend to shore (he-)hurries.
   'With (his) friend Julius he hurries to (the) shore (beach).'

   b. Mit seinem (dem) Freund eilt er zum Ufer.

   c. With his (the) friend he hurries to the shore (beach).

(7) a. Ventus secundus est.
   wind favorable is
   '(The) wind is favorable.'

   b. Der Wind ist günstig.

   c. The wind is favorable.

2) The choice between the definite article and the pronominal adjective depends largely on the degree of definiteness desired (the latter being more definite than the former) and on idiomaticity. Thus, the choice of seinen and his in (3b) and (3c) respectively are better and clearer than dem and the because, especially in this beginning sentence of the discourse, a higher degree of definiteness for the noun amicum 'friend' is required to specify whose friend he is (Augustus's, his father's, or someone else's?). In (4b) and (4c), however, the choice of the definite article im 'in the' and the rather than in seinen 'in his' and in his, in each case, sounds better than the reverse. The same holds true for (5), (6), and many other sentences in the translations. With (7) and similar ones, idiom governs the choice of the definite article, der Wind, the wind, and the like, in both languages; so is the choice of zum 'to the' and the before Ufer 'shore, beach' and shore in (6b) and (6c).

3) Where the definiteness of a Latin substantive has already been specified by a pronominal adjective, translate as it is:

(8) a. Avus meus nos in naviculam suam invitat.
   grandfather my us in boat his invites.
   'My grandfather invites us (in) to his boat.'

   b. Mein Großvater lädt uns in sein Boot ein.

   c. My grandfather invites us (in) to his boat.

4) Where one Latin substantive (noun) is followed by another in the genitive case, as in the case of an English noun followed by an of-phrase, it is by nature definite and will be translated usually with the definite article both in German and in English, as:

--- 506 ---
(9) a. Amici salutant et naviculam avi intrant.
friends greet and boat of-grandfather enter
'The friends greet (him) and get into (the) boat of the grandfather.'

b. Die Freunde grüssen und betreten das Boot des Großvaters.

c. The friends greet him and get into the boat of the grandfather.

The lack of an article system does not necessarily mean that the ancient Romans and the other Latin-speaking people did not have in their minds the concept of definiteness or indefiniteness of beings, as long as they had some other ways to specify it. As a certain conceptual gradation of the definiteness of all beings seems to be to some extent universal in the minds of all language speakers, it is not necessary that such a gradation or classification in the mind, conscious or subconscious, be overtly marked by linguistic means—though in most of the cases it is, as by the use of article systems. By article system we mean a clearcut classification of the degree of definiteness of beings not only in the mind, but in the linguistic means by which such a classification is overtly expressed in speech. English has an article system, which consists of three forms, a, an, and the, together with all the rules, either explicit or conceptual, that govern their use in speech. German has, for its own sake, another, which consists of much more forms (see previous discussion in this section). Latin, however, happened to have none. The English articles serve fundamentally its definiteness-specifying purpose, except in those cases in which the occurrence or non-occurrence of an article is purely idiomatic, conventional, incidental, or optional, or is the result of historical change. The article system in German, aside from its function of specifying the definiteness of beings, fulfills also the function of specifying the grammatical gender of words (thus also called, in German, Geschlechtswort 'gender word'). In Latin, where grammatical relationships with respect to number, gender, and case are already specified by means of a highly complicated system of inflection in the nominals, there seems to be no need to complicate or supplement the picture with a further grammatical system of articles. This, of course, is only a conjectural reason for the non-existence of an article system in Latin; a better reason should be, plainly, that it simply doesn't exist.

As definiteness of reference in Latin substantives is to be inferred partly from context and partly by some other means (see above), there may be difficulty specifying the definiteness of a Latin noun when the context is not sufficient to enable the listener or reader to infer from it, as in the following sentence, taken alone:
(10) a. Puella cantat.
girl sings
‘(A/The) girl sings (is singing).’
b. Ein (das) Mädchen singt.
c. A (the) girl sings (is singing).

To check our understanding of the principles and techniques in inferring from a given context the definiteness of each Latin noun as discussed so far in this section, let us read the Latin text below and fill in each of the blanks in the German and English translations with a proper article or any other determiner (when nothing should be filled in, use a φ):21


c. Austria is _____ small but famous country of Europe. _____ glory of Vienna and _____ other beautiful provinces of Austria is great. Famous are our beautiful forests. Great is _____ industry of _____ residents of our fatherland. ____ music and _____ literature are cherished by ____ inhabitants of Austria. We love Austria, our beloved fatherland.

2.2 The problem of case

As discussed previously in 1., Latin had a highly complicated case system, modern German has one which is slightly less complicated than that of Latin but still rather complicated, and English has one which is downright simple compared with those of German and Latin.

The term case (in German, Fall or Kasus), derived from Greek πτῶσις and Latin casus, has been employed to refer to that grammatical category of the noun by which a noun in a sentence is held in some relationship, grammatical and/or semantic, to some other elements (usually also nouns) in the same sentence. Traditionally, case has been treated as a
surface phenomenon, indicated by overt grammatical signals such as inflectional elements, (as Latin and German) or by word-order (as English). Some "deep semanticists," such as Fillmore (1968), argue that case is fundamentally a deep phenomenon that is to some extent universal, and that similar systems of case relationships underlie all languages. There are, therefore, "surface" and "deep" cases.

The number of surface cases varies from language to language: Latin had six; German has four; Russian has six; Finnish has as many as sixteen; English used to have four but now at most three.22 Surface cases are specified either morphologically in the inflection of forms or syntactically in word-order and in the use of prepositions—a double, but unsatisfactory criterion. Notionally, both Latin and modern German are said to be languages of high precision and of unambiguity. This, aside from some other factors, is achieved mainly through the operation of the highly complicated, but accurate, case system in each. In both languages, it is well-known that specific cases go with specific verbs, prepositions, and occasionally even adjectives. Questions like, "What case should the indirect object to the verb lehren ‘teach’ in?", "In what case should it be for the object to the preposition wegen ‘on account of’?", "What case should be used with the predicate adjective eingedenk ‘kept in mind’, for the object?" and many similar ones have frequently been asked by learners of German, non-native as well as native ones.23 Let us contrast a few German sentences with their English parallels:

(12) a. Der Lehrer lehrt die Kinder das Lesen und Schreiben.
   b. The teacher teaches the children reading and writing.

(13) a. Wegen meines Studiums hier könntest du vielleicht nicht kommen.
   b. Because of my study here perhaps I could not come.

(14) a. Ich bin deiner eingedenk.
   b. I remember you.

Here in (12), while the indirect object to verbs like teach, give, and the like, is said to be in the dative case, German lehren takes the accusative (here, die Kinder instead of den Kindern)—thus, taking two accusatives, in the sentence pattern S + V + O + O. In (13a), the preposition wegen: takes an object, meines Studiums, in the genitive24; in (14a), which means literally *‘I am of you remindful’, the predicate adjective takes its semantic object, deiner ‘of-you’, in the genitive. This last example parallels exactly in case Latin, from which it has perhaps derived:
Another common problem for German and Latin learners and for translators dealing with the three languages is the choice of case between dative and accusative for the German reflexive pronoun *sich* (the name-form), paralleled by Latin: *se* (acc.) and *sibi* -(dat.), especially when translating the languages the other way round (i.e., from English back to German and/or Latin). The "*sich*-problem" to learners of German is already well-known: many German verbs are inherently reflexive, without even a reflexive semantic import; many others are optional, with or without a difference in meaning; then there is the problem of case, and finally that of position.

Since a better understanding of a Latin or German text, as previously mentioned, depends to a great extent upon an understanding of the rather complicated case relationships in each of the sentences that make up the text, the translator would hardly be able to do his job correctly and effectively without such an understanding. Luckily, there are a great number of similarities between Latin and German in this area, from which inferences and analogies can frequently be made. Generally speaking, the basic functions and meanings of the four cases (namely, the nominative, genitive, dative and accusative) of Latin and German overlap. The two surplus ones in Latin are to be incorporated into the four while translating Latin into German, and this will be further simplified when German is translated into English.

The nominative case, both in Latin and in German, which answers the question *quis?* or *quid?* (*wer od. was?*) 'Who or what?', is the case of the surface subject. It may, but does not necessarily, express the deep case relationship of Agentive, which may be otherwise realized in the surface sentence (Fillmore 1968). At this point, however, two characteristics about the surface subject of Latin and German, respectively, must be observed by the translator. The first is that, with German and a number of other Indo-European languages, a dative, instead of a nominative, may often serve as the surface subject of a sentence, as *mir ist kalt*, literally 'me(dat.) is cold', which is to be translated into English as *I am (feel) cold*, rather than the rather cumbersome *it is cold for/to me*, with the dative...
subject in German replaced by the nominative in English. Secondly, with Latin, when the pronoun subject of a verb is already sufficiently marked or incorporated into the verb itself, it is usually not necessary to repeat it unless when emphasized. Thus, Lat. *laudo* means already ‘I praise’, *canto* means already ‘I sing/am singing’, *laudabimus* means already ‘we shall praise’, and *laudabimini* means already ‘you(pl.) will be praised’. They are, so to speak, “subjectless” one-word sentences, whose pronoun subject will occur only when it is for some reason intentionally emphasized, as *ego canto* ‘I am singing (not anyone else)’.

The basic meaning and function of the genitive case in Latin and German, which answers the question *cuius? (wessen?)* ‘Whose?’, is basically the same. Latin, as an impressionally “logical,” “symmetrical” language, may lend itself to a long succession of genitives, as the second sentence in the Latin text (11a):

(16) a. Gloria Vindobonae et aliarum provinciarum pulchrarum Austriæ magna est.
   b. Der Ruhm von Wien und der (von den) anderen schönen Provinzen Österreichs ist groß.
   c. The glory of Vienna and (of) the other beautiful provinces of Austria is great.

The (case) structure of the Latin sentence, when broken down, will show the following stratification:

(17)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gloria</td>
<td>Vindobonae et aliarum provinciarum pulchrarum Austriæ magna est</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grammatical relationships among forms are strict: *gloria* (fem.sg.nom.) ‘glory’, head-noun of the subject; *Vindobonae* (fem.sg.gen.) ‘Vienna’, inflected from *Vindobona* (fem.sg.nom.—the name-form); *et* ‘and’, conjunction, uninflected; *aliarum* (fem.pl.gen.) ‘of-all’, pronoun, from *aliae* (fem.pl.nom. of *alis* ‘another’); *provinciarum* (fem.pl.gen.) ‘of-provinces’, from *provincia* (fem.sg.nom.); *pulchrarum* (fem.pl.gen.) ‘beautiful’, from *pulchra* fem.sg.nom.), in turn from *pulcher* (mas.sg.nom.); *Austriæ* (fem.sg.gen.) ‘Austria’, from the fem.sg.nom. name-form *Austria; magna* ‘great’, adjective, in feminine singular.
nominative to agree with the subject gloria in gender, number, and case; est ‘is’, the copula, indicative present 3rd-person singular active. Note also the complete grammatical concord as marked by the fem.pl.gen. ending -arum in the three words meaning ‘(the) other beautiful provinces’, and the highly balanced, symmetrical order of modification as achieved by all the grammatical means. When the proper articles are supplied, the sentence finds its German and English translations in (16bc).

Further, while there is usually only one way to show genitive relationships (i.e., by way of inflection) for Latin, there are, nevertheless, two different means for German and English: one morphological (inflectional) and the other syntactic. The former is the so-called s-genitive (China’s) in English, and the other is the so-called of-genitive (of China). German has the same alternatives, von China ‘of China’ vs. Chinas ‘China’s’, von Berlin ‘of (from) Berlin’ vs. Berlins ‘Berlin’s’, and the like. In actual translation, the decision to make depends largely on context, tone, and fluency. Thus, Vindobonae in (16a) has been translated as von Wien instead of Wiens in (16b), taking the von-genitive; and Austriae as Österreichs rather than von Österreich, taking the s-genitive. Doing it the other way round would result in der Ruhm Wiens (genitive relationship not clearly enough, especially for those who are not familiar with the name of the city) and der (von den) anderen schönen Provinzen von Österreich (two von’s may make it a little clumsy). Different speakers and translators, however, may have different opinions at this point. In addition, since modifiers in Latin usually come after rather than before the head-noun they modify (i.e., postmodification) and the succession of genitive modifiers following the head-noun may be long, it would be clumsy to do it likewise in English. Thus, a free translation of the same sentence into English would be like:

(17) The glory of Vienna is great; so is the glory of the other beautiful provinces of Austria.

Or into German:

(18) Der Ruhm von Wien ist groß; auch ist der (Ruhm) der anderen schönen Provinzen Österreichs.

The accusative case in the three languages (not to be confused with the deep-case concept of Objective—see Fillmore 1968:25), which basically answers the question quem? or quid? (wen? oder was?) ‘Whom? or What?’, deserves also interlanguage attention. While
Modern English no longer reveals formal distinction between the nominative and the accusative except in personal pronouns (thus the same John and Mary in John loves Mary and Mary loves John), Latin did, and modern German still does (but no longer for most proper names like Maria ‘Mary’ and Johann ‘John’, which usually take no articles). As objects to prepositions, there is the general distinction between what is “actional” and “static” in German: the use of an accusative with an action verb and a dative with a stative one, as die Mutter legte das Essen auf den Tisch ‘the mother laid the food on the table’ (actional) vs. das Essen liegt auf dem Tisch ‘the food lies on the table’ (static). The same distinction is made in Latin, except that the static, which is usually expressed by the dative in German, is usually designated by the ablative in Latin. Let us examine the Latin text and the translations below:


c.    A farmer works in a thick wood. The wife of the farmer is in the country house. The woman is preparing a good meal with great effort. The daughters of the farmer are decorating the table with beautiful roses. The farmer hurries out of the woods close by and into the country house. With his wife and daughters he enjoys the meal. The daughters amuse the farmer with new tales. Then the farmer hurries again out of the country house and into the woods.

In the Latin text above, where the verb is non-actional, i.e., one that involves no movement or change in position or space, an ablative object has been used with the preposition; otherwise an accusative has been used:
(20) a. *in silva densa laborat* (non-actional: ablative)
    in forest thick works
b. *in *einem dichten Wald arbeitet* (non-actional: dative)
c. works in a thick forest (wood) (no indication)

(21) a. *in villa est* (non-actional: ablative)
in country-house is
b. *im Landhaus ist* (non-actional: dative)
c. is in the country house (no indication)

(22) a. *in villam properat* (actional: accusative)
in country-house hurries
b. *ins Landhaus eilt* (actional: accusative)
c. hurries in(to) the country house (no indication except in the preposition)

(23) a. *in silvam properat* (actional: accusative)
in forest hurries
b. *in *den Wald eilt* (actional: accusative)
c. hurries in(to) the woods (no indication except in the preposition)

Furthermore, it must be noted that accusatives alone may, without a preposition, function as an adverb—as they do in German:

(24) a. *Femina magna industria cenam bonam parat.*
    woman great effort meal good prepares
b. Die Frau bereitet das gute Essen *mit großem Fleiß*.
c. The woman is preparing a good meal *with great effort*.

or as in:

    Rome we-shall-travel
b. Wir werden *nach Rom reisen*.
c. We shall travel *to Rome*.

In these and similar examples, the bare accusative (i.e., accusative without a preposition) fulfills the function of an adverbial—something which the translator must observe in order
to correctly translate the Latin sentences into German and English. The same happens also in German, which parallels the “noun adverbs” in English:

(26) a. Was machen die Kinder *den ganzen Tag*?
    b. What do the children do *the whole day*?

The vocative case, which is absent in modern German and English, is the case of direct address. If English were to have the vocative, it should have a different form for the word *John* in a sentence like *John, come here!* Even in Latin, the vocative does not lend itself to much variation in form: all vocatives take the same form as the nominative except for the vocative singular of nouns of the o-declension ending in *-us* (Latin nouns of the o-declension may end in *-us, -er, or -um*), as in the second sentence in (1a):

(27) a. Propera, care amice!
    hurry dear friend
    b. Eile, lieber Freund!
    c. Hurry (up), (my) dear friend!

In all the other cases it takes the same form as the nominative, as in the same text:

(28) a. “Saluto vos”, inquit, “amicis!”
    I-greet you(pl.) says (said)-he friends
    b. “Ich begrüße euch”, sagt(e) r, “(o) Freunde!”
    c. “I greet you,” says (said) he, “friends!”

The vocative case does not seem to cause trouble for the translator except that sometimes a pronominal adjective, or the interjection o ‘oh’, may be added to make the vocative noun more natural, intimate, or formal, as is the German expression for ‘ladies and gentlemen’, *meine Damen und Herren*, which without the pronominal adjective *meine* ‘my’ would sound unidiomatic. Thus, when a Latin imperative like the one below is translated into German, the pronominal adjective *meine* will be idiomatically added:

(29) a. Naviculam intrate, domini et dominae!
    boat enter gentlemen and ladies
Finally, while Latin has the ablative case but modern German and English do not, the ablative functions of Latin are to be incorporated into the dative and (less frequently) into the accusative to form adverbials of time, place, manner, and the like because it answers the questions *ubi?* (Ger. *wo?*) ‘Where?’, *quando?* (Ger. *wann?*) ‘When?’, *quam?* (Ger. *wie?*) ‘How?’, *qua re?* (Ger. *wodurch?*) ‘By what means?’, *unde?* (Ger. *woher?*) ‘From where?’, and the like. (It must be noted, however, that the actional concept of *quo?* (Ger. *wohin?*) ‘To where?’, is usually with the accusative, not ablative, in German: see above.) The Latin ablative is, therefore, basically adverbial in function. And, in terms of the deep-case models of Fillmore (1968) and the other deep semanticists, the Latin ablative is temporal, locative, instrumental and sociative, aside from some other functions.

We have so far discussed briefly the case relationships between Latin, German, and English. The translator’s job is to discern these relationships among them in order to translate more accurately, faithfully, expressively and, hopefully, also elegantly one into another. Let us examine the text and translations below. Note especially the case relationships among them and how they are translated into one another.


c. In the village a big farm is on fire. August and Paul are even hurrying into the fire. The farmhouse and the new stables of the farm are already in great danger. But the
farmers tread into the stables. They do not fear the great danger of the fire. With
great effort they save the bull, the cows, and the horses from the stables. Then
they calm down the fire of the farmhouse and the stables with a lot of water. In
this way they free also the neighboring buildings from the danger. Great is the joy
of the farmers.

Let us tabulate the case relationship of some elements across the texts:

(31)  Latin                        German                        English
      in vico (abl. locative)       im Dorf (dat.)                 in the village
      ad incendium (acc. actional) zum Brand (dat.; zu always with dat.)
      magno in periculo (abl.)    in großer Gefahr (dat.)         in great danger
      magno studio (abl.)          mit großem Streben (dat.)      with great effort
      e stabulis (abl.)            aus den Ställen (dat.)         from (out of) the stables
      multa aqua (abl.)            mit vielem Wasser (dat.)      with a lot of water
      periculo (abl.)              von der Gefahr (dat.)         from the danger

The correspondence justifies partly the author’s previous generalizations, which may be
approximately diagramed as follows:

(32)  Latin                        German                        English
      N                               N                                  S/O
      G                               G                                      S-G
      D                               D                                  prep-
      A                               A                                  phrase
      V                               AN                             main
      Ab1                             — secondary —
The diagram is not totally self-evident and needs some more remarks to make itself clear:

1) Since Latin is a synthetic language and, as such, depends more on morphology than on syntax, Latin adverbials formed with the ablative or the accusative may be without a preposition. That is, the "bare" ablative or accusative noun may function alone as an adverbial element, as *magnus studio* (abl.) 'with great effort' and *multa aqua* (abl.) 'with much water' in (30a) and *magna industria* (abl.) 'literally: with great diligence' (translated in (24c) as *with great effort* because *to prepare a meal diligently* would sound unidiomatic in English) in (19a) or (24a), or as *Romam* (acc. of *Roma*) 'to Rome' in (25a), where there is no preposition at all. When these and similar Latin ablatives and accusatives are translated into German, the German translation usually takes a preposition that idiomatically goes with the German noun (either dative or accusative), as *mit großem Streben* 'with great endeavor (effort)', *mit vielem Wasser* 'with a lot of water', *nach Rom* in (25b) 'to Rome', etc.—though both German and English have such "bare" adverbials (as (26)).

This optinality between taking and not taking a preposition for adverbials has not been shown in the diagram above.

2) Since Modern English, as an analytic or prepositional language that makes more use of syntactic means to convey meaning and to specify grammatical relationship, has no longer formal distinctions between the nominative and the accusative, the (syntactic) cases for the surface subject and the surface object have been grouped together into one formal category and given the more syntactic names "subjective" and "objective," which are more appropriate for English.

3) In practical translation, when the translator is looking for "the closest natural equivalent" (see Nida 1964, etc., and O.) in the target language to replace a textual material or message in the source language, such correlations between the surface case systems of Latin and German as they are applied to the practical task of translation may depend to a large extent on idiom or idiomatic usage, i.e., on the idiomatic choice of verbs, prepositions, etc., in the target language to convey supposedly "the same" message in the source language. And, as is well known, German verbs and prepositions govern specific cases of their own; so do the verbs and prepositions in Latin. The case of the object to the verb or preposition has
to follow usage and/or idiom in its own system (language). Thus, *zum Brand*, the closest German translation equivalent (see O.) to L. *ad incendium* in (30), has to be in the dative simply because the German preposition *zu* always takes or "governs" a dative object. In the following examples, while all the Latin locatives (destinational) are expressed in the accusative, with or without a preposition, their closest German equivalents, all prepositional, are in different cases (dative or accusative), depending on idiomatic choice of the preposition and in turn on what case that preposition governs:

(33) a. domum/Romam/in urbem Roman proficiscemur
   home/Rome/in city Rome travel-shall-we

   b. wir werden nach Hause/nach Rom/in die Stadt Rom reisen
   c. we shall travel home/to Rome/to the city of Rome

4) The dotted lines joining G, D in German and S/O in English indicate that German datives and genitives may serve as the object, and dative as the subject, of a sentence when they are translated into the latter.

2.3 Some problems with gender and number

As previously mentioned in (1.), both Latin and German lend themselves to a 3-way distinction of grammatical gender and a 2-way distinction of number. Grammatical concord with respect to them in the Latin or German sentence is strict. With gender, however, as each language has its own system, the translator is not to infer from one or the other, though sometimes they may happen to be the same. The Latin word for 'sun', which is a masculine idea in both English (referred to as *his* and *he*) and Chinese (referred to as *yang* 'masculine'), *sol*, is masculine, whose German equivalent, *Sonne*, however, happens to be feminine (thus, *die Sonne*). The Latin word for 'moon', *luna*, unlike its German counterpart, *Mond*, which is masculine (thus, *der Mond*), is feminine. The Latin word for 'girl, lass, maiden', *puella*, is feminine; its German equivalent, *Mädchen*, however, is neuter (thus, *das Mädchen*). Hence, when the translator is translating a Latin text into German, or reversely, it is no shortcut for him to infer the grammatical gender of a word in one language from that of its equivalent in the other, since the grammatical genders of the two words will be, more often than not, different.

For the translator, the problem of gender is not made sharp until he comes to the co-referential pronouns in a given text which is being translated, say, from Latin into
German and then into English. The grammatical gender markers like suus ‘his’, sua ‘her’, suum ‘its’, sui ‘their (m.)’, suae ‘their (f.)’, sua ‘their (n.)’, and the like, may or may not coincide with the the natural sex of the noun (human or nonhuman, concrete or abstract) the pronoun refers to; so are German er/sie/es ‘he/she/it’, ihn/sie/es ‘him/her/it’, ihm/ihr/(ihm) ‘him/her/it’, sein/seine/sein ‘his’, ihr/ihr/ihre ‘her’, and the like. When these and other seemingly clear “sex-markers” are carried over to English, most of them will become the impersonal, neuter it(s) except those which refer to real persons. Therefore, German die Sonne hat ihren Glanz verloren will be translated into English as the sun has lost its (his) splendour, despite the fact that ihren Glanz actually means ‘her splendor’. A similar German sentence, der Mond verbarg seinen Glanz vor uns will be translated into English as the moon concealed her (its) splendor from us, although seinen Glanz is literally ‘his splendor’.

Further, while Modern English makes no gender distinction in most nouns for which sex distinction is trivial or unnecessary and for which the form for one or the other sex prevails and has thus become the general term for both sexes (as horse(male), cow(female), tiger(male), duck(female), goose(female), bee(female), peacock(male), etc., vs. the less frequent mare, bull, tigress, drake, gander, drone, peahen, etc.),26 Latin and German, however, maintain a strict natural-sex distinction in morphology between the masculine and the feminine, especially for nouns denoting persons. In practical translation, nevertheless, such a distinction is usually not to be carried into English unless when necessary; otherwise the English translation will sound awkward. Thus, a Latin sentence like (34a) below will normally not be translated into English as (34c) but as (34c’), though the German translation should be (34b), with a clearcut sex distinction:

(34) a. Discipulae magistram monstrant.
    pupils-female teacher-female greet

    Die Schülerinnen Grüßen die Lehrerin.
    The school girls greet the female (woman) teacher.

    The school girls greet the teacher.

Problems with number are relatively few. Latin and German, as a highly “logical,” symmetrical language, have theoretically the plural form for almost every noun to make its paradigm complete, while English has dropped the plural of many words in the course of time to become an inflectionally defective language. Latin and German, therefore, will use the plural more often than English does. In (30a), for example,
(35) a. Magna pericula flammarum non timent.
great dangers of-flames not they-fear
'They do not fear (the) great dangers of (the) flames.'
b. Sie fürchten sich nicht vor den großen Gefahren der Flammen.
c. They do not fear (are not afraid of) the great danger of the fire.

A literal translation of the Latin plural *magna pericula flammarum* into English '(the) great dangers of the flames' will make the translation less idiomatic, though it matches exactly the Latin text. The German translation, *den großen Gefahren der Flammen*, which parallels exactly in number, seems to have no problem because, perhaps, modern German comes closer to Latin in its overall structure than Modern English does. The translator is to discern such subtle differences in expression between languages and not to be misled by exact compliance with the original text.

2.4 Some problems with word-order

Latin is basically a verb-final, and German a verb-second language. That is, the Latin verb usually comes at the end of a sentence, as a final syntactic element:

(36) a. *Errare humanum est.*
    \[
    \begin{array}{ccc}
        \text{S} & \text{Comp} & \text{V} \\
        \text{to err human is} \\
        \text{‘To err is human.’}
    \end{array}
    \]

b. *Rosae pulchare sunt.*
    \[
    \begin{array}{ccc}
        \text{S} & \text{Comp} & \text{V} \\
        \text{roses beautiful are} \\
        \text{‘Roses are beautiful.’}
    \end{array}
    \]

c. *Austria et Italia terrae clarae sunt.*
    \[
    \begin{array}{ccc}
        \text{S} & \text{Comp} & \text{V} \\
        \text{Austria and Italy lands famous are} \\
        \text{‘Autria and Italy are famous lands (countries).’}
    \end{array}
    \]

d. *Puellae magistram salutant.*
    \[
    \begin{array}{ccc}
        \text{S} & \text{O} & \text{V} \\
        \text{girls (female) teacher greet} \\
        \text{‘The girls greet the teacher.’}
    \end{array}
    \]
e. *Avus amicis e navicula pulchras ripas, amoenos vicos, hortos, campos monstrat.*

grandfather friends from boat beautiful shores lovely villages gardens fields shows

‘The (my) grandfather shows his friends from the boat the beautiful shores, the lovely villages, the gardens, and the fields.’

No matter how long the sentence is, the verb usually comes at the very end of it, though with *esse* ‘to be’, especially in the third person, the verb may alternatively come between the subject and the complement:

(37) a. *Rosa pulchra est.*

rose beautiful is

‘A/the rose is beautiful.’

a'. *Rosa est pulchra.*

b. *Sicilia insula est.*

Sicily island is

‘Sicily is an island.’

b'. *Sicilia est insula.*

And, it must be noted, as previously mentioned, 1) that the personal-pronoun subject is already incorporated into the verb itself and may thus be omitted:

(38) a. *Canto.*

sing-I

‘I sing/am singing.’

b. *Cantat.*

sings-he/she/it

‘He/she/it sings/is singing.’

c. *Cantum cantabimus.*
song sing—shall—we
‘We shall sing a song.’

2) that Latin adjectives usually follow, rather than precede, the head-noun they modify—
that is, lend themselves to a situation of postmodification:

(39) Austria et Italia terrae clarae sunt.

Austria and Italy countries (lands) famous are
‘Austria and Italy are famous countries (lands).’

but a reversal of the normal order is not impossible:

(40) Puellae claras terras et magnas insulas monstrant.

girls famous lands and large islands show
‘The girls point to the famous lands and the large islands.’

and sometimes there may be a subtle difference in meaning between the two positions:

(41) a. *magna silva* (as a compound)
‘a big forest’

b. *silva magna* (*magna* ‘big’ modifying *silva* ‘forest’)
‘a forest that is big’

(since no forest can be small, the semantic status of the latter is questionable), and 3) that
appositives in Latin consisting of a proper name and a common noun are in a reverse order
compared with German and English:

(42) a. Augustus *Paulum amicum* vocat.
August Paul friend calls
‘August calls his friend Paul.’

b. August ruft *seinen Freund Paul*.

c. August calls *his friend Paul*. 

— 523 —
A reversal of the word-order of the appositives in (42bc) would make the sentences unacceptable in the two languages:

(42)b'. *August ruft Paul seinen Freund.
c'. *August calls Paul his friend.

Still another characteristic of Latin syntax is the frequent use of the sentential focus of an adjectival complement, as:

(43) a. *Magna est industria incolarum patriae nostrae.
    Comp V S
    great is industry of-inhabitants of-fatherland our
    'Great is the industry of the inhabitants of our fatherland.'

b. *Magna est laetitia amicorum.
    Comp V S
    great is joy of-friends
    'Great is the joy of the friends.'

The normal, unemphasized word-order for these and similar sentences will be:

(43)a'. Industria incolarum patriae nostrae magna est.

b'. Laetitia amicorum magna est.

When translated into German, they happen to assume the verb-second order of the target language:

(44) a. Groß ist der Fleiß der Einwohner unseres Vaterlandes.

b. Groß ist die Freude der Freunde.

When translated into English, the translation may stick to the same word-order, which is more literal, or be changed to the normal order of S+V+Comp, where the emphasis on the complement is lost:

(45) a. Great is the industry (diligence) of the inhabitants of our fatherland. (literal)
a'. The industry (diligence) of the inhabitants of our fatherland is great. (colloquial)

b. Great is the joy of the friends. (literal)

b'. The joy of the friends is great. (colloquial)

The translator is to observe all these and other syntactic differences between the languages in translation. Let us consider another Latin text below and see how they are translated into German and English, paying special attention to the word-order in the original text and that in the translations:

(46) a. Augustus Iulium amicum salutat.


b. August begrüßt seinen Freund Julius.


c. August greets his friend Julius.

I am living with my grandfather, a hard-working farmer. How nice it is to be here! We tend to work in the field and in the vineyard, and then to sit in the shades of the tall beech-trees. In the garden of my grandfather are many fruit trees. The fruits are marvelous. I sail often with Anthony, the happy sailor, on the Danube. In the evening my grandpa tends to read from the books of famous poets. For my grandfather has (some) good books of poets and loves good poets.—What are you doing? Visit me soon! Goodbye!

In the text and translations above, supposedly a letter written by a boy to his friend while taking a vacation in the countryside with his grandfather, we find such cases of postmodification as Iulium amicum (literally ‘Julius friend’), avum meum (lit. ‘grandfather my’),
agricolam impigrum (lit. ‘farmer hard-working’), poetarum clarorum (lit. ‘of poets famous’), and the like, which have been translated in their right order in German and English as seinen Freund Julius ‘his friend Julius’, meinem Großvater ‘my grandfather’, einem fleißigen Bauern ‘a hard-working farmer’, berühmter Dichter (gen.pl.) ‘of famous poets’, etc., with the proper articles or pronominal adjectives added (see 2.1). The salutation of the Latin letter, Augustus Iulium amicum salutat ‘August greets (his) friend Julius’, when literally translated into German and English, as has been done here, may sound foreign to native speakers of both languages, for actually they do not begin a letter in this way. For the salutation of a personal letter like this, the German speaker would normally write Lieber Julius! ‘dear Julius’ and the English speaker would write Dear Julius: or simply Julius: The Latin translator may take the literal translation if it is meant for a translation, where conveying more exactly the meaning of the original text to the reader seems to be more important; or he may adapt it to take care of the cultural conventions in the target language and do a “free translation” here to let the translation itself take on real life. In this latter choice, the function of communication and the quality of “naturalness” are stressed.

In the English translation of the first sentence of the text, the verb living has been added to make it more natural in tone, though in the text there is only a verb-to-be, sum ‘I-am’, with the subject incorporated into the verb:

(47) a. Apud avum meum, agricolam impigrum, sum.
   by grandfather my farmer diligent I-am
b. Ich bin bei meinem Großvater, einem fleißigen Bauern.
c. I am (living) with my grandfather, a hard-working farmer.

The text demonstrates also some variation in word-order: when a main verb like soleo ‘be used (accustomed) to’ is followed by an infinitive, the main verb may be separated by some other syntactic elements from the infinitive and may thus be fronted to the beginning of the sentence, as:

(48) a. Solemus in agris et in vinea laborare.
      V       Adv.      Inf.
   we-are-used-to in field and in vineyard to-work
b. Wir pflegen, im Feld und im Weingarten zu arbeiten.
c. We tend to work in the field and in the vineyard.
Some other minor problems include the translation of the words *soleo* (a verb, inflected as *solemus* ‘I-am-used-to’ and *solet* ‘he-is-used-to’ in the text) and *nam* (a conjunction) in the text. The former word finds its German equivalent in *pflegen*, which causes no problem in translation. When the word, in the very context of (46a), is to be translated into English, say, (48a) above as “We are used (accustomed) to working in the field and in the vineyard,” or as “We are in the habit of working. . . .”, the English translation may sound more formal (if not bookish) than is appropriate to the context. In this light, therefore, an analogous word in English, *tend* (to), which in strict sense is not exactly synonymous with Latin *soleo* or German *pflegen*, has been chosen as an eclectic translation to preserve the lexical meaning, the structure, and at the same time to “lubricate” the English translation——i.e., to make it more colloquial to suit the informal, personal style of the original text. An even more colloquial translation for (48a) above would be something like “We usually (often) work in the . . .” or “We like to work. . . .”, in which case the translator has to give up the literal meaning of *soleo* or to replace it with one in the target language which is even farther in meaning (as *like*). The problem of the Latin word *nam*, as versus another word, *tum*, in the same context, may confuse those who translate Latin into German and/or English. Generally, L. *nam* parallels G. *denn* and E. *then*, whereas *tum* finds its closest equivalent in G. *dann* and in E. *then*. The problem for the translator lies in that, while all these pairs may in different contexts carry different meanings, it is sometimes difficult, in a given context in one language, to specify the exact meaning of any of these words. The parallelism, by and large, appears as follows:

(49) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>tum</em></td>
<td><em>dann</em></td>
<td><em>then</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>nam</em></td>
<td><em>denn</em></td>
<td><em>then</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first English *then*, as a pure adverb and usually to some extent stressed (as *I met him then, but it's a long time we haven't seen each other again*), takes its basic meaning ‘at that time’, either in the past or in the future, as specified by the context; otherwise it functions as a conjunctive adverb, or adverbial conjunction, taking the meaning of ‘soon afterwards’, ‘in that case’, ‘as a result’, and the like, or simply as an introductory, conjunctive expletive, carrying some emotive implications which are difficult to be specified as dictionary meanings. In this latter case the word indicates sometimes only a change of tone or mood, which may or may not be analyzed into dictionary meanings. German *dann* and *denn*, the
former coming etymologically closer to English *than* and the latter to *then*, and the former being usually considered more as an adverb whereas the latter more a conjunction, maintain the distinction, by and large, between the first and the second English *then*'s: *dann* is temporal; otherwise it is *denn* (as *was ist los denn?* ‘what’s the matter, then?’, in this sense usually unstressed). German *denn*, however, also takes on the causal meaning of English *for* (as *er kann nicht kommen, denn er krank ist* ‘he can not come, for he is sick’) and the comparative function of English *than* (although etymologically it is *dann* that comes closer to *than*) (as *er leistet mehr als Lehrer denn als Sprachwissenschaftler* ‘he achieves more as a teacher than as a linguist’). In some areas, meanings and functions of *danf* and *denn* may overlap; the two are, therefore, often confused, especially by non-native learners of German.  

Latin *tum* usually takes the temporal meaning of German *dann* and that of the first English *then*, and *nam* the causal meaning of German *denn*, which parallels English *for* and is absent in English *then* (at least in colloquial contemporary usage, as *he didn’t come, then he was sick, but he was sick; then he didn’t come*). Latin *nam* in (46a), judging from the context in which it occurs, therefore, should take the causal meaning of English sentence-initial *for* and has been translated in (46b) likewise. In the German translation, however, *nam* has been translated by and large with the adverb *nämlich* ‘namely; . . . , you know, . . . ’. another possible German equivalent to the word, for *denn hat mein Großvater . . . or mein Großvater hat denn . . . would be very vague, as it is difficult to ascertain which meaning *denn* takes there. In addition, with the word *tum*, like English *then* or German *dann*, which is not yet a conjunction proper, a full conjunction had better be added to make the English and German translations *and then* and *und dann*; otherwise a semicolon, instead of a comma, is to be used. For Latin, however, *tum* is enough, and *et tum* ‘and then’ appears to be unnecessary.

### 2.5 Some problems with tense and aspect

The Latin verb is a highly complicated system in itself. Grammatical information of the verb (person, number, tense, aspect, voice, and mood) is signaled mainly by inflectional endings (suffixes and infixes) attached to or inserted into the verb itself rather than by syntactic means. For every fully conjugated transitive verb there are three stems, the present stem (*Präzensstamm*), the perfect active stem (*Perfektaktivstamm*), and the perfect passive stem (*Perfektpassivstamm* or *Supinstamm*), on which all finite forms of the verb may be built. The verb *laudare* ‘to praise’, for example, has the present stem *lauda-* , the perfect active stem *laudav-* , and the perfect passive stem *laudat-* . Upon the first of these three stems,
lauda-, eleven forms may be built: three active forms of the indicative mood (the simple present, the simple past, and the simple future) together with their passives, one imperative form, and four forms of the subjunctive mood (subjunctive present and past, active and passive). Upon the second stem, laudav-, five forms may be built: three forms of the indicative mood (the present perfect, the past perfect, and the future perfect) and two forms of the subjunctive mood (the subjunctive present and the subjunctive past perfect), all active. Upon the third, laudat-, all the passive forms of the second stem. To specify the person and number of all the forms built upon the present stem lauda-, two sets of inflectional endings, namely (50a) and (50b) below, are attached to form all the actives and passives respectively:

\[(50)\ a. \quad \text{-(m)} \quad -\text{mus} \quad \text{b.} \quad -r^* \quad -\text{mur} \]
\[-s \quad -tis \quad -\text{ris} \quad -\text{mini} \]
\[-t \quad -nt \quad -\text{tur} \quad -\text{ntur} \]

(*in some forms of the 1st. per. sg. -or)

Taking, for example, the 2nd-person singular of these—remember that the pronoun subject may be incorporated into the verb—one gets:

\[(51)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lauda-s} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) praise’} \\
\text{lauda-ba-s} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) praised’} \\
\text{lauda-b-i-s} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) will praise’} \\
\text{lauda!} & \quad \text{‘praise!’} \\
\text{lauda-ris} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) are praised’} \\
\text{lauda-ba-ris} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) were praised’} \\
\text{lauda-b-e-ris} & \quad \text{‘you(sg.) will be praised’} \\
\text{laud-e-s} & \quad \text{‘(if) you(sg.) would praise’} \\
\text{laud-e-ris} & \quad \text{‘(if) you(sg.) would be praised’} \\
\text{lauda-re-s} & \quad \text{‘(if) you(sg.) praised’} \\
\text{lauda-re-ris} & \quad \text{‘(if) you(sg.) were praised’}
\end{align*}
\]

In all these and many other examples it must be remembered that the hyphens in the words are purely hypothetical, fulfilling only the function of separating the stem and the
inflectional elements. Actually, all of them are solid rather than hyphenated words. Take *laudaberis* as an example: one must understand that the infix *-b-* in the word indicates simple future, that *-e-* is a linking vowel inserted to separate the *-b-* from the person-number marker *-ris*, and that all these elements, together with the stem *lauda-*, have formed a complete sentence which parallels English *you(sg.) will be praised* or German *du wirst gelobt werden*. The perfect active stem is combined with some other sets of endings to derive its own forms (as mentioned above), and the perfect passive stem is combined with different forms of the verb-to-be, *esse*, to create its own forms: a form like *laudaverimus*, for example, will mean in English *we will have praised* and *wir werden gelobt werden* in German, and one like *laudatus sum* will mean *I (a male) have been praised* and *ich (männ.) bin gelobt worden*.

The conjugation of the German verb appears to be less complicated than the Latin verb, but still more complicated than that of the English. While Latin conjugation makes more use of morphological means and English chiefly syntactic, German seems to stand between. The overall tense-aspect system of German, however, comes closer to that of Latin than of English. Similar to the Latin system, the finite conjugation of a German verb consists of six forms in the indicative and subjunctive (Ger. *Konjunktiv*): the present (*Präens*), the preterit (*Präteritum*), the perfect (*Perfekt*), the past perfect (*Plusquamperfekt*), the simple future (the so-called "*Futur I*"—‘future one’), and the future perfect (the so-called "*Futur II*"—‘future two’). Each of these may have a passive form when the verb is transitive. Grammatical information regarding person and number is signaled by the following system of inflectional change:

\[(52) \quad \text{-e} \quad \text{-en} \]
\[
\text{-st} \quad \text{-t} \\
\text{-t*} \quad \text{-en} \\
\]

(*in the preterit identical with the 1st-per. sg.*)

Thus, for the German verb *loben* ‘to praise’ there are: *lobe* ‘(I) praise’, *loben* (we) praise’, *lobst* ‘(you/sg.) praise’, *lobt* ‘(you/pl.) praise’, *lobt* ‘(he/she/it) praises’, *loben* ‘(they) praise’; *lobte* ‘(I/he/she/it) praised’, *lobten* ‘(we/they) praised’, *lobtest* ‘(you/sg.) praised’, *lobtet* ‘(you/pl.) praised’; *lob(e)!* ‘(you/sg.) praise!’; *lobt!* ‘(you/pl.) praise!’; etc.

Comparing the tense-aspect systems of Latin and German with that of Modern English (English used to lend itself to a similar system of inflectional endings for person and number
in the conjugation of verbs\textsuperscript{28}, we find that:

1) Formally, Modern English is much simpler than the other two. As can be seen in (50a) and (52) above, where Latin had six different forms for person and number and modern German has four, Modern English has almost no change at all except in the 3rd-person singular and virtually no change in the preterit.

2) The aspectual concept of “perfectness” or, more technically, of *perfectivity*, is more important in the Latin and German systems than it is in the English system, as is the case in many other Indo-European languages (see Comrie 1976). In traditional grammars of English, the idea of aspect is usually subsumed under the concept of tense, and categories of aspect are usually considered as subcategories of tense (thus, “three (or four\textsuperscript{29}) tenses, each with four aspects”—as the traditional grammarian puts it). This is not the case with many other languages, for which a distinction drawn between what is “perfect” and what is not, or “imperfect,” appears to be much more important than the concept of time (tense). In Latin grammars, therefore, what parallels English simple past has been termed “imperfect” rather than “preterite,” as against two categories of the “perfect tense”—the present perfect (*Perfekt*) and the past perfect (*Plusquamperfekt*).

3) While the progressive aspect is important in the English system, it does not count much in the Latin and German systems. English keeps a distinct borderline, in form and in the conceptual structure of the speaker (since the two are closely correlated), between what happens as a single act or event (the non-progressive or “simple” aspect) and what as something “going on” or “continuing” at the moment of speaking (the progressive or “continuous” aspect). Such a distinction, however, is not kept—at least formally—in Latin and German: both languages have no distinct forms that parallel the English progressive forms. Latin and German have distinct forms which are either “simple” (the *Präsen*, the *Pretär*um or *Imperfekt*, and the *Futur I*) or perfect (the *Perfekt*, the *Plusquamperfekt*, and the *Futur II*), but nothing to match the English “continuous tenses.” The idea of progression is to be incorporated into the imperfect forms or expressed by some other means (as by the use of a preposition with progressive implication, like Ger. *während* ‘during’). Hence, Latin *cantat*, a verb in the simple present, may match either English *he/she/it sings* or *he/she/it is singing*; and German *er/sie/es* *singt* may have the same pair of meanings. The translator is to observe this difference in structure and judge which will be better in a given context. For his decision, however, there seems to be no fixed rule. Generally speaking, the context—
linguistic and nonlinguistic—-together with the translator’s wit, will be of help. In the few German sentences below, even when taken out of a broader context, one may find one translation better than the other:

(53) a. Er wohnt in Taipeh, aber jetzt wohnt er in Wien.
   a’. He lives in Taipei, but now he’s living (better than lives) in Vienna.
   b. Er wohnte in Wien, aber jetzt wohnt er in Salzburg.
   b’. He used to live in Vienna, but now he lives (better than is living) in Salzburg.
   c. Wo gehst du hin?
   c’. Where are you going (better than do you go)?
   d. Er arbeitet jetzt nicht.
   d’. He’s not working (better than does not work) now.
   e. Ich spielte Klavier, als meine Frau sang.
   e’. I played (not was playing) the piano while my wife was singing (better than sang).
   f. Ich spielte Klavier, als er in den Raum trat.
   f’. I was playing (not played) the piano when (as) he entered (not was entering) the room.
   g. Damals ging ich jede Woche ins Kino.
   g’. In those days I used to go (better than went) to the movies every week.
   h. Während ich in der Küche arbeitete, las meine Frau Zeitung.
   h’. While I was working (better than worked) in the kitchen, my wife read (not was reading) the newspaper.

4) The simple past in English may be matched either by the simple past (Pretäritum) or by the present perfect (Perfekt) in German, one being more formal and historic and the other more colloquial and personal, as:

(54) a. I saw (have seen) him recently.
   a’. Ich habe ihn vor kurzem gesehen.
       (more colloquial than: Ich sah ihn vor kurzem.)
   b. Where did you spend your vacation?
   b’. Wo haben Sie denn Ihren Urlaub verbracht?
       (more colloquial than: Wo verbrachten Sie Ihren Urlaub?)
   c. President Reagan spent his last vacation in Hawaii.
c'. Präsident Reagan *verbrachte* seinen letzten Urlaub in Hawaii.

(more formal than: Präsident Reagan *hat* seinen letzten Urlaub in Hawaii *verbracht*.)

5) Sequence of tenses is to some extent arbitrary and conventional in different languages. In this area, also, Latin, German, and English may have different practices and rules, which should be observed by the translator dealing with the three languages. Observe the following Latin text and its German and English translations:


c. Gaius (said) to his Greek friends: "Tomorrow," said he, "I'll show you Rome." *Alexander:* What are we going to see? *Gaius:* We'll be many hours in Forum Romanum. There we'll see many old churches, many magnificent public buildings, and many very famous monuments. From the Capitol we'll see the whole Rome. I'll be glad if you are pleased with the everlasting Rome. *Alexander:* Who of us will not be happy? All your Greek friends will be thankful to you and all will keep it in memory.

In the Latin text above we find one sentence in which a rule governing sequence of tenses is very different from that in German and English. Both in German and in English, a simple present verb will usually be used in a subordinate clause when the main clause contains one in the future. Latin, however, requires a future to match the future in the main clause. Thus, in the above text we find:
(56) a. Gratum mihi erit, si Roma aeterna vobis placebit.
   pleasant to-me it-will-be if Rome everlasting to-you(pl.)
   it-will-please
   'literally: it will be pleasant to me if the everlasting Rome will please you.'

b. Es wird mir angenehm sein, wenn das ewige Rom euch gefällt.

c. It'll please me (or I'll be happy) if (only) you're happy (pleased) with the everlasting Rome (lit. if the everlasting Rome pleases you).

While translating a Latin sentence like (56a) above, the translator must take care not to be misled by the language-specific tense sequence of the source language; otherwise improper collocation of tense and/or aspect such as es wird mir angenehm sein, wenn das ewige Rom euch gefallen wird 'it will be pleasant to me if the everlasting Rome will please you' will result. The transfer from Latin to German and English at this point is, therefore, negative.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The author has so far discussed, in the Introduction, some basic concepts and theories concerning the task of translation; in Chapter 1, some basic similarities and dissimilarities of the three languages involved; and in Chapter 2, in detail, some major problems in translating Latin into German and English, namely, the problems of the article, of case, of gender and number, of word-order, and of tense and aspect. In the light of such discussions and analyses, we may come to the following conclusions, some of which may be applied to the practical task of translating the three languages into one another and/or to the practical need of teaching or learning them:

1) Generally speaking, linguistic transfer between Latin and German is much greater than that between Latin and English, or between German and English, though previous knowledge of any of the three languages appears to be helpful to the learning of any other. This means, for any Chinese learner of Latin, previous knowledge of a structurally close language like German will be of great help (the author's own experience also confirms this), because there is a tremendous amount of positive transfer from German to Latin and reversely; difficulty lies only in those areas where the two languages are structurally very different. Grammatical inferences may often be made between Latin and German by anyone who knows one or the other. This happens especially in the areas of case of nouns and tense.
of verbs; in some other areas, such as gender and word-order, transfer from one to the other is less reliable or downright negative.

2) Cases of linguistic transfer among the three languages at the lexical level, as one may find in the translation illustrations, are many and self-evident, since there are so many loan words from Latin in German and English. What the student or translator must take heed to, however, are the “false friends” or pseudo-equivalents between them, especially between German and English (as G. bald ‘soon’ vs. E. bald).

3) Since syntactic transfer between each two of the three languages is more negative than positive, the syntax or word-order of each of the languages must be acquired as a separate system. In this area, inferences can scarcely be made; if one does, errors will often result. For Chinese speakers, the syntax of English among the three languages sounds most “reasonable” to them; that of German looks rather bizarre and tongue-twisting; and that of Latin is just utterly imaginable and monstrous. Great efforts, therefore, should be made at this level—not to convert the language learner’s existing system(s) into the new system(s), but to develop in him new ones.

4) Great care must be taken not to impose unnecessary, hypothetiκor historical grammatical categories on any of the languages whose structure, at that point, happens to be simpler. Never tell the student, for example, that the word John in John, come on! “should be vocative,” or that me in give me a book “is actually different” from the same word in someone loves me. It won’t help, but hinder. This has been practiced by many language teachers in the past and occasionally by some in our time who know Latin or, at least, who have read grammar books based on Latin.

5) It seems that the article system of every language that has one is hard to acquire, especially for non-native learners of the language. Latin, as it has no article at all, seems to have no such troubles in itself. When it comes to be translated into some other languages that have articles and when, in the translations, articles in the target language have to be supplied, the translator’s guide depends on the one hand upon the contextual hints in the original text and, on the other hand, on usage and idiom regarding the use of articles in the target language. With German, while the use of the definite article seems to be substantially more often than that in English, some idiomatic uses of the definite article, as in zum Beispiel (literally, ‘for the example’), am Tisch ‘at table’ (literally, ‘at the table’), and the like (see 2.1), had better be acquired as a single semantic unit. It is not desirable, therefore, in an actual teaching-learning situation, to further analyze the preposition-article combinations zum (zu ‘to/for’ + dem ‘the’), am (an ‘at’ + dem ‘the’), and the like, into their
syntactico-semantic components, saying that *zum Beispiel* 'for example' means actually "for the example," *am Tisch* is actually "at the table," and the like. Such explanation may have a negative, rather than positive, effect on the teaching-learning process.

6) With the problem of case, since Chinese, being ideographic in writing, has no morphological indication of surface case at all and English, an analytic language like Chinese, has now only little, it will be very difficult for the Chinese student with previous second-/foreign-language experience only of English to acquire and internalize the highly complicated case systems of German and Latin. In this area, no inference can be made from his native language, and only little from his first foreign language, English. In real classroom situations, an explanation of the general meanings and functions of the cases in each system (see 2.2) and the interrelations between the systems (as shown in (32)) may be, but not necessarily, of help to the Chinese student with previous knowledge of English beginning to learn German and/or Latin. For the adult learner, German and Latin may seem to be languages that require a lot of work of the mind (reasoning) and an excellent memory (remembering)—the grammatical genders of nouns, the cases going with specific verbs and prepositions the conjugation of verbs, the unfamiliar word-order, the formation of plurals, etc., together with all the inflectional endings that go with these and other grammatical notions. All these and other complexities seem to crowd, all at once, into the mind of the adult learner if ever he is to produce a grammatically correct sentence in German or Latin. "It drains the mind," so to speak. Small children before the critical age for language, whose minds are like blank sheets, acquire the linguistic system they encounter without much difficulty no matter how simple or complex the system is (see Chiang 1985c). 32

Latin, as a dead, classical language that no longer has a *locus existendi* in the minds of native speakers certainly does not lend itself to any kind of audiolingual method, and the effectiveness in using a purely audio-lingual methodology for teaching German to non-native learners remains uncertain and controversial. 33 In this view, an eclectic methodology that combines the favorable tenets in both the audio-lingual-and cognitive methodologies is bound to show up in the real DFS' (*Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 'German as a foreign language') classroom. 34
NOTES

1. The other two daughter languages, Oscan and Umbrian, have no known descendants.
2. Latin remains to be one of the two classical languages (Latin and Greek) that are learned, as a language requirement, not only in the universities and colleges, but in the middle schools. It is included in the matriculation examination of Matura for high school graduates, and required for many programs of study at college and graduate levels, including all the humanities, law, medicine, etc.
3. “Literature” here takes the broader sense to refer to all forms of written information preserved.
4. According to Index Translationum, published by UNESCO up to 1970, German has been the first language (the second is Russian) into which all kinds of information and literature of the world have been translated (see Newmark 1981:3).
5. As far as the personal experience of the author goes, English is not as international, at least in Europe, as it is supposed to be. The Germans and the French, for example, seldom speak English to foreigners even if they can.
6. In many languages a distinction is made between the species term for human beings in general and sex-specific term for a male person. In Chinese, jen is the generic-individual term, jen-lei is the generic-collective, and nan-jen is the sex-specific. In English, man serves for both. When the generic meaning is stressed, human beings, humans, or mankind may be the substitutes. The same distinction is held between Mensch and Mann in German, homo and vir in Latin, and hito and otoko in Japanese, the former being generic and the latter sex-specific. Very often, however, the distinction may not be so clear. Ger. Mann, for example, may take on the generic reference of ‘human being’, the sex-specific of ‘male person’, and the meaning of ‘husband’. And French, for one, does not seem to emphasize such a distinction in the lexicon: both may be expressed by homme.
7. It is these “translation equivalents” that are the immediate concern of the translator. It is clear from the context here that translation equivalents may be, but not necessarily are, semantic equivalents. For in a case where no exact semantic equivalent exists, translation equivalents between two languages are still possible.
8. There have been different translations of this well-known Chinese “trigram” for translation. Ronald A. Knox puts it as “accuracy, intelligibility, and readability”;
Chao Juen Ren translates it as “fidelity, fluency, and elegance”; and some other translations. The author, according to the view he holds, finds it desirable to translate it as “faithfulness, expressiveness, and elegance.”

9. A relatively old, if not totally outdated classificatory term for language.

10. For some synthetic languages, especially the “agglutinative” and “polysynthetic” languages such as Hungarian and Eskimo, where classes of forms come together in uninterrupted successions to form word-sentences, it is difficult to say what a “word” is Latin lends itself, to some extent, to the same situation: while, for instance, a “word” like laudabor means, and should be translated into, English ‘I’ll be praised’, it is hard to say whether it is one single word or a combination of two or more.

11. The same happens with some other topic languages like Chinese.

12. In German terminology, a Wortstock ‘word-stock (?)’ differs from a Stamm ‘stem’ in that it does not take the final, linking vowel of the stem (the Stammauslaute). For example, the stem of the Latin noun flammae ‘flames’ is flamma-, but, the “word-stock” is flamm-. 

13. Here “name-form” is used with a broader reference than Ger. Nennform, literally ‘name-form’ but actually referring only to infinitives of verbs.

14. This statement was made by Dr. Viktor Böhm, the author’s Latin instructor in Vienna, in a classroom lecture.

15. This is actually the practice of some German dictionaries. The usual practice is to label those words of dual function as: “adj.”, or to indicate their adverbial function by an additional symbol.

16. This Latin text and all the others that follow are taken from Liber Latinus, A, 1. Teil (Österreichischer Bundesverlag, Wien, 1982), the standard textbook of Latin for Austrian high schools (Gymnasiums). All the German and English translations of the Latin texts are by the author himself.

17. According to a check with native American speakers, at meals is not colloquial; a much more colloquial expression would be having a meal.

18. The same contrast of meaning is seen in English go to (the) church, at (the) table, and the like.

19. If, for example, ta in the translation trigram “hsin, ta, ya” (信達雅) were to mean ‘fluency’ alone and this principle of ta were to be strictly followed in all kinds of translation, how then, could one work out a fluent translation, say, of a tongue-twisting novel like Joyce’s Ulysses or Wang Wen-hsin’s The Family Catastrophe (家變)?
20. By “semantic translation” Newmark refers to the kind of translation in which, “the translator attempts, within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL, to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author.”

21. The suggested answers to (11b) and (11c) are:

(11b) ein, De, der (den), der, der, φ, φ, den, φ.

(11c) a, The, the, the, the, φ, φ, the.

22. Two for nouns (John, John’s; the sun, the sun’s) and three for personal pronouns (I, me, mine/my).

23. German grammars usually give whole lists of verbs, telling the student what verbs should go with what case.

24. In some dialectal use wegen may be followed by an object in the dative.

25. It must be noted at this point that the deep case-relationship of Agentive as proposed by Fillmore does not coincide with the surface phenomenon of “nominative” (morphological) or “subjective” (syntactic). In a passive sentence like The door was opened by John, John remains the agent of the action of opening and is thus Agentive. And, very often, what assumes the subject position in the surface sentence holds a case relationship other than the Agentive, as The key opened the door, where the surface subject key is in the Instrumental. The present article has demonstrated that the surface concept of “nominative,” which is more morphological, does not coincide with that of “subjective,” which is more syntactic.

26. The more frequent term, by which the animal is mentioned, may be considered the name-form of the pair. Only occasionally is the less frequent form, say, bitch, instead of the general term dog, used.

27. In the high language, Hochdeutsch, the two are not to be confused, as Na, dann (not denn) geht es eben nicht!

28. Old English, for example, took the ending -e for a verb in the ind. pres. 1st-per. sg., -(e)st for the 2nd-per. sg., -(e) for the 3rd-per. sg., and -a for the ind. pres. plurals. The relics are seen in the use of -(e)st and -(e)th in early Modern English (as in the King James Bible) and in poetic diction, for the 2nd and 3rd per. sg. respectively.

29. In some English grammars, “future-in-the-past” (as the second verb in He told us he would come) is considered as a separate fourth tense.

30. This happened in Vienna, Austria, where the author had to take Latin as a partial fulfilment of his academic requirements (see Chiang 1985a).

31. While English plurals are predominantly formed by adding -(e)s to the singular, German
plurals are formed, rather idiosyncratically, in eight major ways, aside from foreign plurals. On account of this great variation and idiosyncracy in plural formation, it has become a common practice in German dictionaries to provide this information along with each noun entry. German learners are, therefore, told to remember the plural of each noun they encounter. School children and beginners are often asked to recite, “der Lehrer, die Lehrer; der Mantel, die Mäntel; der Tag, die Tage; der Platz, die Plätze; das Kind, die Kinder; das Haus, die Häuser; die Stunde, die Stunden; der Student, die Studenten; der Krimi, die Krimis,” and the like, in order to remember both the grammatical gender and the plural of each noun. This method seems to hold good until a better one replaces it.

32. The study is a longitudinal description of the second-language development of the author’s bilingual child, which took place in the Austrian kindergarten. It includes, also, a horizontal description of the linguistic status of some fifty bilingual—in a few cases even multilingual—Chinese children in Vienna.

33. Teaching experiments conducted in the real classroom, as far as the author knows, have not yet confirmed either side of the issue.

34. As far as the author himself has observed the German language programs for foreign students (DFS-Programme) at the language center of the University of Vienna and those at the Goethe Institute, various versions of the eclectic method are what is actually used (see Chiang 1985a).
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從對比分析論拉丁文、德文與英文間一些翻譯問題

文學院 英語系

蔣泰暉

（中文摘要）

拉丁語、德語與英語同屬印歐語系中年之不同支流。拉丁語雖久已係一「死語」（dead language），但由於其在整個西方文化中所曾扮演的極其重要的角色，在今日西方（尤其歐洲）學術界仍普受重視。此不僅是整個歐洲古典主義之遺風，亦係就實用學術研究而言，對拉丁語文之某種程度的瞭解，仍具有相當價值。而德語亦係一種具有高度文化、學術、科技價值之語言。英語，作為一種國際性的溝通工具，其重要無容贅述。

就翻譯而言，拉丁語文獻之已譯譯為德文或英文者，頗為浩瀚。本文係就對比分析的方法和觀點，對此三種語言間一些與結構有關的翻譯問題，即冠詞的問題、格的問題、性與數的問題、字序（句法）的問題及時態的問題，作一較詳盡的分析，並指出在此三種語言間實際翻譯工作上對上述問題的處理辦法，最後並提示一些在教學上的應用。希生對此三種語言之翻譯，教學及研究，都能有所助益。