

Original Paper

Comparative Study of Beijing Dialect Translation in *Teahouse* from the Aesthetic Perspective

Du Yu^{1*}

¹ Hubei University of Technology, Wu Han, China

* Du Yu, Hubei University of Technology, Wu Han, China

Received: June 29, 2024

Accepted: August 13, 2024

Online Published: August 31, 2024

doi:10.22158/eltls.v6n4p260

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v6n4p260>

Abstract

As one of Lao She's masterpieces, Teahouse is a gem and a milestone in Chinese drama which is renowned both domestically and internationally. This article examines the translation of Beijing dialects in two English versions of Teahouse translated by Ying Ruochen and Howard from the perspective of reception aesthetic theory. The results indicates that Ying's version focuses on stage performance, using simple or concise language which to some extent differs from the aesthetic expectations of the target language readers, while Howard's translation, aiming at readers' acceptance, tends to employ formal expressions and lengthy sentence structures, which are less suitable for stage presentation and performance. By revealing the translation differences in local dialects in the versions under this theoretical framework, this paper is hoped to provide valuable insights for translation studies and practice.

Keywords

Beijing dialect, Lao She, Teahouse, reception aesthetics

1. Introduction

As a famous modern Chinese novelist and playwright, Lao She is the first writer awarded the title of "People's Artist." *Teahouse*, a classic work of contemporary Chinese drama created by Lao She, has achieved high artistic accomplishments and became the first Chinese drama to go abroad with the help of successful Chinese to English translation. The performance of *Teahouse* has not only been highly appreciated by foreign friends, but has also attracted attention from foreign scholars. With China's rise on the global stage, the translation and understanding of Chinese literature have become increasingly important. Through in-depth study of the English translations of *Teahouse*, we can better understand the dissemination and reception of this outstanding literary work on the international stage, which helps

promote cultural exchange and understanding between China and other countries.

However, different English translations may present different aesthetic perspectives, thereby influencing readers' understanding and perception of this literary work. Therefore, this study uses a comparative research method, taking two English versions of Lao She's *Teahouse* as the research objects, to explore the presentation of *Teahouse* in these literary works and their impact on readers from an aesthetic perspective. The study aims to address the following research questions:

- (1) What translation methods did the two translators adopt when dealing with Beijing dialect?
- (2) Are their translations suitable for presentation on the stage?

Through this research, it is intended to highlight the significant importance of comparative translation studies in advancing translation theory and producing high-quality translations. It is hoped that this study can provide assistance to Chinese culture enthusiasts and drama translators, and promote the development of drama translation in China.

In addition, this article attempts to apply the theory of aesthetics to *Teahouse* by conducting a thorough analysis of the different versions of the translated works of it by Ying Ruocheng and Howard. The aim is to explore the two translators' understanding and application of the theory of aesthetics, and thus gain a deeper understanding and research of the theory of aesthetics, better serving the combination and application of the theory of aesthetics with the text.

Up to now, there have been many comparative studies on the two English translations of *Teahouse* in China. As of April 24, 2024, using the keyword "Comparison of *Teahouse* Translations" to search in CNKI, a total of 28 relevant research papers were obtained, including 22 master's theses and 6 academic journals, after excluding duplicate and non-translated chapters. However, most of them are analyzed from the perspectives of functional equivalence, linguistics, Eco-translatology and other aspects, while research from the perspective of the theory of aesthetics has been relatively scarce.

Currently, the academic community mainly studies the two translations of the play *Teahouse* from the perspective of translation theories such as Skopos theory and functional equivalence theory, and has achieved fruitful results. Scholars such as Wang (2007), Lu (2009), Zhang (2012), Zhou (2014), and Yan (2018) have used Skopos theory to analyze the two translations, and although their conclusions vary, they all believe that the translation by Ying is performance-oriented, emphasizing the performability of the drama, while the translation by Howard is reader-oriented, focusing on the cultural elements of the work. Zhang (2007), Hu, Xu, Huang (2012), and Wang (2013) have respectively analyzed the translations by Ying and Howard from the perspective of the performative function of drama, rhetorical methods, and specific translation techniques under the guidance of functional equivalence theory. From a linguistic perspective, Nie (2012) has conducted a comparative analysis of the two translations based on the three basic methods of metaphor translation: retention of metaphorical imagery, absence of metaphorical imagery, and borrowing of metaphorical imagery, emphasizing that translators must take into account the different cultural backgrounds of the Chinese and English-speaking peoples and avoid simple explanatory translation. Chen (2018) analysed from the

perspective of Eco-translatology, exploring the linguistic dimension, communicative dimension, and cultural dimension. It was concluded that both translations by Ying Ruocheng and Howard adapted to the translation ecological environment, but Ying Ruocheng's translation meets the evaluation criteria of the Eco-translatology to a higher degree.

2. Introduction to *Teahouse* and Its two English Versions

2.1 Plot Introduction and Language Features of *Teahouse*

Teahouse is a modern drama created by the literary master Lao She in 1956. The play reveals the dark, corrupt, and bizarre aspects of Chinese society over the past half century through the portrayal of “Yu Tai Teahouse” and the diverse characters within it. The play depicts the bleak operation of the ancestral Teahouse by its owner Wang Lifa, showcasing his shrewdness and hard work but ultimately unable to resist its decline, reflecting the direction of Chinese society. Apart from the Teahouse owner, the play features characters such as the privileged Banner people, capitalist entrepreneurs, eunuchs, impoverished peasants, as well as spies, thugs, police and gangsters, each with distinct personalities (Di, 2017). *Teahouse* is divided into three acts, each depicting the dark social reality of specific historical periods: the declining period, the reign of the Northern Warlords, and the period of the KMT. It reveals the tragic fate of the lower-class laboring people during these three historical periods, which are destined to be completely eradicated, and portrays the failure of the emerging bourgeoisie's “industrial salvation of the nation,” serving as a lament for the old society.

The language of *Teahouse* is extremely distinctive. As one of Lao She's representative works, it showcases his unique language style. In *Teahouse*, Beijing dialect is pervasive, especially the use of the rhotic accent, which best reflects the characteristics of Beijing dialect, such as “茶座儿、抓早儿、包圆儿,” etc. The use of rhotic accent highlights the linguistic features of *Teahouse* and adds a sense of vitality to the entire drama. The play also employs a large amount of colloquial language (Zhang, 2022). With over fifty characters in the three-act play, Lao She uses distinct and characteristic language dialogues to differentiate the characters. The use of colloquial language and even bad language creates vivid characters in the work, reflecting the real social conditions of the time and enhancing the authenticity of the drama. Another characteristic of the language in *Teahouse* is the use of humorous expressions. Despite exposing the dark side of society and depicting the hardships of the lower class, Lao She does not directly present these aspects. Instead, he cloaks them in humorous language, using humor to vividly showcase satire and criticism, evoking both laughter and deep contemplation, and leaving a profound impression on the reader's mind (Di, 2017).

2.2 Introduction of the Two Translation Versions

In 1957, Lao She published *Teahouse* in a magazine, which attracted different translators due to its unique linguistic charm. The most famous English translations are by Ying and Howard Gibbon.

In 1979, when *Teahouse* needed to go abroad but lacked a suitable translation, Ying took on the task of translating it into English. As a renowned translator and playwright in China, his fluency in Western

languages and passion for drama led to his identity as a famous translator of plays. With the same ethnic and cultural background as Lao She, Ying had a deeper understanding of certain expressions in the play, leading to a more accurate and meticulous translation (Ren, 2009). His translation focused more on conveying the true essence of the content, aiming to ensure that the subtle nuances of the dramatic dialogues in *Teahouse* could be accurately conveyed to foreign audiences, allowing them to better understand the original ideas.

Howard Gibbon, a Canadian who has a strong passion for Chinese literature, lived in Chinese mainland and Taiwan region, China for a long time, gaining a deeper understanding of the Chinese language and culture. His strong interest in Chinese literature, especially Beijing dialect, led him to translate several Chinese literary works, with *Teahouse* being the most representative. In 1980, he decided to translate Lao She's *Teahouse* out of curiosity and love for Beijing dialect, culture, and society, hoping to enhance his Chinese proficiency and introduce Lao She's timeless work to the Western world. His translation, relatively more westernized, aligns with the thinking and expression habits of Westerners.

3. The Theory of Reception Aesthetics

The concept of "reception aesthetics" was first proposed by the scholar Hans Robert Jauss and developed by the German Konstanz School represented by Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, becoming a literary trend that significantly influences literary creation and research. According to Ma (1990), through an examination of the translation process based on reception aesthetics theory, it is pointed out that within the overall relationship of author-work-reader, literary works are inherently created for readers, who are the active subjects of literary activities (Ma, 2000). This theory emphasises the position of the reader, highlighting the active role and participation of readers in the reading process, shifting the focus of traditional literary studies from the work and author to the reader.

The concept of "horizon of expectation" is an important notion in the acceptance of aesthetic theory, which is derived from the theoretical concepts of Heidegger and Gadamer, and was proposed by Jauss in "Toward an Aesthetic of Reception". The "horizon of expectation" manifests as a latent aesthetic anticipation during specific readings (Jauss, 1982). In 1982, Jauss suggested that different readers would have varying horizons of expectation for the same text due to factors such as social and cultural environments, life experiences, and aesthetic preferences (Liu, 2016). As readers' "horizon of expectation" are typically diverse, failing to address the text would generally hinder the direct achievement of "horizon fusion." Therefore, in interpreting and translating texts, translators need to consider these "potential readers" with different horizons of expectation, taking into account their reading needs and aesthetic expectation, meeting readers' "horizon of expectation", or reconstructing horizons to achieve "horizon fusion" among authors, translators, and readers, enabling readers to experience aesthetic enjoyment during reading.

Roman Ingarden from Poland mentioned in *The Literary Work of Art* that aspects or components of the object that are not specifically determined by the text as "places of indeterminacy" (Gadamer, 2004).

Based on this, Iser proposed in his 1979 speech “The Summoning Structure of Text” that a literary text is merely an uncertain “summoning structure” containing blanks and disconfirms, which can only be filled by readers through reading (Iser, 1994). The blanks and uncertainties in the meaning of the text, namely the places of indeterminacy, allow readers to actively engage in the reading process, drawing on their own experiences and aesthetic preferences to fill the undetermined aspects of the text, thereby constructing interpretations and meanings, leading to a more unique reading experience and appreciating the pleasure of reading.

4. Comparison of Beijing Dialect Translation

Lao She was born in Beijing and was a true Beijinger, familiar and highly proficient in the Beijing dialect. The drama background and character portrayal in *Teahouse* are also based in Beijing, so the characters’ dialogue is full of the “Beijing flavor”. The extensive use of rhotic accent and the characteristic vocabulary of Beijing dialect add vitality to the entire work, so when translating, it is important to convey the characteristics of the Beijing dialect as much as possible.

4.1 Translation of Rhotic Accent

Rhotic accent is a phenomenon in modern standard Chinese and most dialects, where the final vowel of some words undergoes a sound change due to the retroflexion. The most prominent feature of Beijing dialect is the extensive use of rhotic accent. It sounds relaxed, casual, lively, and playful, which are the advantages of Beijing dialect, but it can sometimes appear less serious in formal occasions. Rhotic accent is rarely used in formal written language, but it is very common in daily conversations. On the one hand, it reflects the local characteristics, and on the other hand, rhotic accent also conveys emotions such as affection and warmth (Zheng, 2007). Therefore, it is important to pay attention to conveying the meaning behind rhotic accent and its formal characteristics.

Example 1:

ST: 王利发 可是，您搜我吧，真一个铜子儿也没有啦! (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Wang Lifa: You better search me, I haven’t a copper left. (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Wang Lifa: ... but I really don’t have a penny left--you can search me if you like. (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

The term “铜子儿” refers to copper coins, which were various new-style copper coins minted in China from the late Qing Dynasty to the early Republic of China. Although the circulation time of copper coins in China was very short, lasting only half a century, they witnessed the historical process of China’s evolution from a feudal society to a semi-feudal and semi-colonial society, leaving an indelible imprint in the modern Chinese monetary history, and forming an important part of this period (Jiang, 2013). In the translation by Howard, the term is translated as “penny,” which refers to the British brass coin. However, from an aesthetic perspective, the strong association with the British currency unit “penny” may create a certain sense of dissonance with the novel’s historical background. On the other hand, the translation by Mr. Ying, “copper,” meaning copper coins, not only conveys the meaning

accurately but also the pronunciation of the word ending “er” happens to be similar to the rhotic accent in Chinese, thus achieving a similar effect. In this sentence, the rhotic accent of “铜子儿” realizes the transition from phonetics to semantics, representing small size and quantity of copper coins. Judging from the translator’s acceptance, Howard may not have known the specific meaning of “铜子儿” as a unit of currency, and selected a word similar to the British currency based on his own understanding of the term. However, “penny” with its strong association may easily lead the audience to a cognitive illusion about the time period of the drama. On the other hand, Mr. Ying, being familiar with the historical background at that time, not only allows the audience to appreciate the beauty of the rhotic accent but also enables the audience to intuitively understand the meaning of “铜子儿”.

Example 2:

ST: 唐铁嘴 赶明儿我一总还给你，那一共才有几个钱呢! (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Tang The Oracle: I’ll pay you back one of these days. But together, it won’t come to much. (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Soothsayer Tang: I’ll square up with you pretty soon. It’s only a matter of a few coins anyway. (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

The term “赶明儿” literally means “wait until tomorrow,” but it generally refers to the future. Ying Ruocheng translated it as “one of these days” and as “pretty soon” in Howard’s version, both conveying the idea of a short period of time, reflecting Tang Tiezui’s firm belief that his financial situation will improve soon. Both translators anticipate the readers’ expectations, enabling a second integration of the readers’ expectations with the translation, which makes the readers or audience readily accept it.

Example 3:

ST: 小刘麻子 我要组织一个“拖拉斯”。这是个美国字，也许你不懂，翻成北京话就是“包圆儿”。 (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Pock-Mark Liu Jr: I’m going to organize a trust. That’s an American word, so perhaps you don’t understand it. In Beijing dialect it means “it’s all yours”. (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Little Pockface Liu: I want to set up a “tlust”. That’s an American word, maybe you don’t understand. In Beijing talk its a baoyuaner--you know, a place that looks after everything. (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

In Beijing dialect, “包圆儿” means “to buy all the goods” or “to take on everything.” Xiao Liumazi used this term here to express a sense of being fashionable and proud. Ying Ruocheng translated it as “it’s all yours” in English, where “yours” is pronounced with an “r” sound. This translation takes into consideration the stage effect and the audience. As long as the actor can convey the expression and elongate the “r” sound, the original emotion and meaning can be accurately conveyed. Howard’s uses transliteration to directly translating “包圆儿” into Pinyin and adding an explanation. One advantage of this approach is that it can retain the local flavor of the original language, while the addition of “you know, a place that looks after everything.” helps readers understand the meaning. The downside is that

if this is performed on stage, it may seem less close to real life and somewhat formal. However, it is certain that both translators consider the translation of the rhotic accent and the portrayal of character expression, making both translations vivid and facilitating the audience's understanding of the rhotic accent.

Rhotic accent is the essence of the Beijing dialect, embodying the openness, affability, and composure of the people. While the two translators may fully grasp the original text, the linguistic gap between Chinese and Western languages makes it impossible to convey all rhotic accent to readers or viewers. Therefore, translators are required to incorporate the retroflex sounds such as “er” and “all” in English as much as possible to achieve a similar effect, allowing the audience to better appreciate the charm of the rhotic accent in the Beijing dialect.

4.2 Translation of Address Terms

The forms of address in the play *Teahouse* are rich and diverse, and different address terms can reflect the speaker's emotions and attitudes, indirectly reflecting the characters' personality traits. Therefore, when translating, it is important to ensure the accuracy of the translation, conveying these distinctive Chinese forms of address to the readers while also expressing the speaker's emotions and attitudes.

Example 4:

ST: 王利发 栓子的妈, 他岁数大了点儿, 你可得.....(Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Wang Lifa: Well, old girl, he's getting on. You'd better...(Ying, 2004)

Howard: Wang Lifa: Wife, he's getting a bit old, you're going to have to...(J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

The term “孩他妈” was a traditional way for Chinese husbands to address their wives after marriage and having children. In the original text, Wang Lifa referred to Wang Shufen as “栓子的妈,” which is similar to the traditional address. This kind of address between husband and wife carries a strong emotional connotation. In traditional Chinese culture, intimate terms between spouses are more implicit, and endearing nicknames are not as intimate as “honey” or “darling” in the West. Therefore, “old girl” reflects the reserved beauty of addressing a loved one, while also being more in line with the specific context of the language used between elderly Chinese couples. In contrast, the translation of “wife” by Howard is too direct, indicating a lack of understanding of endearing terms between elderly Chinese couples, resulting in a lack of subtlety in the translation. On the other hand, Mr. Ying's use of “old girl” is a refreshing change, significantly different from the terms used by Western couples, conveying the novelty of Chinese characteristics to Western audiences and sparking their curiosity about Chinese culture, meeting the aesthetic expectations of the audience.

Example 5:

ST: 王利发 老总们, 实在对不起, 还没开张, 要不然, 诸位住在这儿, 一定欢迎! (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Wang Lifa: Sirs, I'm so sorry we're not in business yet, otherwise we'd be honoured to have you billeted here. (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Wang Lifa: Listen officers, I'm really sorry, but we haven't opened for business yet; otherwise, you'd be more than welcome. (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

The term “老总” does not mean a big boss as we commonly understand it now. In the past, it was a term used by the public to refer to soldiers and police. The two translators used different words to translate the term “老总”. Ying Ruocheng used “sir,” which is a general polite term for men and does not emphasize the professional characteristics of them. Considering Wang Lifa’s character, he would not address every adult man with the same attitude, respectfully calling them “sir.” In the translation by Howard, the word “officer” was used, which is actually a respectful title for a superior. This clearly indicates that the person’s profession is a soldier or a police officer, which better suits his smooth and worldly character, fearing to offend soldiers, police, and others. Therefore, Howard’s translation of the term is more appropriate. The use of the word “officer” immediately confirms the identity of these soldiers for the readers or audience.

In Beijing dialect, on the face of it, the way people address each other may seem full of warmth, naturalness, and respect. However, during the translation process, it is extremely difficult to grasp. Direct translation of most words could easily lead to readers or audiences misunderstanding or confusion about the characters’ identities. Both translators have tried their best to translate appropriately, effectively helping readers or viewers to form a correct understanding of the characters.

4.3 Translation of Honorifics

The play *Teahouse* uses a large number of honorific words, each with its own unique meaning. Therefore, when translating, it is important to convey the cultural implications and phenomena behind these honorifics. As “您” is the most commonly used honorific in Chinese, there are numerous occurrences of “您” in *Teahouse*. However, as English does not distinguish between “您” and “你,” both translators used “you.” While this translation occasionally pairs with imperative sentences, in most cases, the honorific meaning is lost.

Example 6:

ST: 周秀花 大婶，您是要走吧? (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Zhou Xiuhua: Aunt, have you made up your mind to go? (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Zhou Xiuhua: Auntie, you’re going to go, are you? (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

Both translators translated “您” as “you”. In Ying’s translation, it is directly processed as a general question without the inquiring tone used when addressing elders. However, in the translation by translator Howard, a tag question is used to convey the sense of inquiry. Although this approach still lacks the respect for elders, compared to Ying’s translation, it helps readers understand the underlying hierarchical relationship better. Most of the translations of “您” in the article fall into this category, so there is no need to elaborate further. The translators’ handling is commendable and understandable, as the nature of the English language itself makes it difficult to convey the nuances of respect and hierarchy. It can only strive to approach as much as possible and use other supplementary means to make the translation meet the aesthetic expectations of the readers.

“请” is a word that exists in both English and Chinese, and both translators can easily use it in their translations.

Example 7:

ST: 松二爷 那，有话好说，二位请坐! (Lao, 2003)

Ying Ruocheng: Master Chang: We can easily settle this. Please take a seat. (Ying, 2004)

Howard: Second Elder Song: Well, if there's some problem, let's talk it over. Please sit down. (J. Howard-Gibbon, 2001)

In the first half of the sentence, the English translation by Ying Ruocheng does not translate word for word, but uses a concise translation method with a light and short rhythm, which can produce a better stage effect and is beneficial for the audience's understanding. The translation by Howard, on the other hand, provides a more detailed corresponding translation of the Chinese words, with a more formal written form. In the latter half of the sentence, both translators emphasize the word "Please" and avoid translating the word "二位" (two individuals), thus highlighting the tone of "Please". Therefore, comparatively speaking, the English translation by Ying Ruocheng is more in line with the actual stage performance, while the translation by Howard is more suitable for readers to comprehend through reading.

Honorific is another major feature of Beijing dialect, permeated with the modesty, politeness, and warmth of the people of Beijing. Some honorific have no direct equivalent in English, requiring translators to use a more polite and courteous tone throughout the entire sentence. This allows readers or audience to experience the charm of honorific through the conveyed tone, and enables them to participate in the specific process of acceptance, integrating it into the context of the time.

5. Translation Characteristics of the Two Versions

Two translators, based on a deep understanding and acceptance of the original text, have been relatively faithful to expressing the ideas of the original text in their translations, accurately conveying the intended effects of the original text, and also meeting the aesthetic expectations of readers and audiences. However, it is important to note that Ying Ruocheng's translation is more focused on stage performance and aims to cater to the audience's acceptance, hence the translation tends to use simple and concise language (Sui & Guo, 2013). Additionally, in some cases involving dialectal words, due to the need for conciseness in stage performance and the limited time to complete the entire play, the translators have sacrificed the conveyance of certain word meanings and have opted for omission in some words and expressions. While this approach may meet the aesthetic expectations of the audience watching the stage play, it may also create a certain gap with the aesthetic expectations of the target language readers to some extent.

The purpose of Howard's translation is to promote Chinese culture and help more foreigners understand it. Therefore, the translations are mainly aimed at meeting the aesthetic expectations of the target language readers. When dealing with Chinese-specific vocabulary, historical terms, or expressions that have no equivalent in foreign cultures, his translation employs additional explanations to bridge the cultural gap and cater to the readers' acceptance. However, it is important to note that

while focusing on readers' acceptance, it may overlook the aesthetic expectations of the audience when watching stage plays, such as overly formal expressions and complex, lengthy sentences. As a result, Howard's translation is not suitable for stage play performances, while Ying Rucheng's translation is less effective for cultural dissemination compared to Howard's. Therefore, under the guidance of aesthetic acceptance, both versions of the translations meet the needs of different audience categories and have been accepted and recognized by their respective audiences.

As an outstanding work of Chinese dramatic literature, the original work contains a large number of cultural terms, dialect-specific vocabulary, and expressions. For translators, the difficulty of understanding the deep meanings of the original work and accurately translating them can be imagined. At the same time, these expressions and content may have certain semantic gaps in the target language, requiring translators to use various methods to build a cultural bridge between the translations. Both the Ying's translation and the Howard's translation employ different translation strategies and methods, using various translation techniques such as addition and omission to build the corresponding cultural semantics, thereby conveying the original text's thoughts and emotions. However, it should be noted that due to the existence of these semantic gaps, it is difficult for many translations to convey the desired effect of the original text, allowing the target language audience to appreciate the essence of the original text. Therefore, in translation, translators not only need to accurately convey the original thoughts, emotions, and meanings, but also need to preserve the original features as much as possible and convey the author's intended effect authentically, in order to meet the aesthetic expectations of readers or audience.

6. Conclusion

This article explores the characteristics of *Teahouse* and conducts a comparative analysis of two translated versions, discussing how translators, from an aesthetic perspective, can center their translations around the readers and aim for readers' acceptance when translating literary works containing Chinese culture. The analysis of the translation of the Beijing dialect in *Teahouse* leads to the following conclusions. Firstly, a good translation needs to be guided by aesthetic acceptance and aimed at the acceptance of readers or audience. Both translators accurately conveyed the intended effects of the original text, meeting the aesthetic expectations of readers and audiences. However, Ying's translation is more focused on stage performance, using simpler and more concise language. While this meets the aesthetic expectations of the audience watching the stage play, it somewhat deviates from the aesthetic expectations of the target language readers. On the other hand, the translation by Howard, based on readers' acceptance, uses more formal expressions and lengthy sentences, making it unsuitable for stage presentation and performance. Secondly, a good translation needs to employ various methods to meet the aesthetic needs and expectations of readers or audiences. Both the Ying and Howard versions utilize different translation strategies and methods, employing various translation techniques to convey the original text's ideas and emotions.

As a refined art form, drama has played an important role in the history of human cultural development. A comparative study of two English translations can provide multiple perspectives for thinking about and drawing lessons from the translation of drama. This can help promote Chinese drama works to better enter the world stage of art, enhance the influence of Chinese culture in the world, and further achieve the purpose of cultural exchange and mutual learning with other ethnic groups.

References

- Di, J. W. (2017). *A Comparative Study on the English Translations of Tea House*. Wuhan: Central China Normal University.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2004). Truth and Method. *Continuum Impacts Changing Minds*, 2004(34), 237-241.
- Iser, W. (1994). On Translatability. *Surfaces*, 43(7), 5-13.
- Jauss, H. R. (1982). *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 125-130.
- Jiang, J. (2013). Analysis of Beijing Dialect and Its English Translation in Lao She's *Teahouse*. *Language and Translation*, 2013(01), 48-53.
- Lao, S. (2001). *Teahouse* (Trans. J. Howard-Gibbon, pp. 1-135). Beijing: Foreign Language Press.
- Lao, S. (2003). *Teahouse*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House.
- Lao, S. (2004). *Teahouse* (Trans. Ying Ruocheng, pp. 1-156). Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation.
- Liu, T. (2016). Interpreting Iser's "Appeal Structure". *Literature and Art Criticism*, 2016(3), 56-60.
- Ma, X. (2000). Aesthetic Reception Theory in Literary Translation. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 2000(02), 47-51.
- Ren, X. F. (2009). *A Systematic Study on Ying Ruocheng's Drama Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai International Studies University.
- Sui, R. Y., & Guo, L. Y. (2013). On the Choices of Translation Strategies in the Perspective of Horizon of Expectations: With Two Translations of *Teahouse* as an Example. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, 2013(08), 60-64+78.
- Zhang, Q. Y. (2022). A comparative study of two English versions of *Teahouse*--Take the translations of Ying Ruocheng and Howard as examples. Taiyuan: Shanxi University.
- Zheng, Y. M. (2007). *The Importance of Cultural Factors in the Translation of Teahouse: A Comparison of Two English Versions*. Shanghai: Shanghai International Studies University.