

## Description of Concepts

The Code for The Council of Oriental Medical Publishers is a way to label books, articles and other Oriental medical materials such that readers know how the information was prepared, why its producers believe it to be accurate, and how they can cross reference its information to the work of other authors. The Code establishes a set of standard labels that anyone can use, whether or not they consider themselves members of C.O.M.P. It does not exclude any approach, approve any approach, or suggest that any translator is better than any other. In other words, the C.O.M.P. code is not a regulation or ruling. It does not concern what can and cannot be sold or used for any purpose. It is a voluntary trade convention that provides useful labels anyone may apply. C.O.M.P. has no formal membership, anyone who wishes to participate is welcome.

The main product of the C.O.M.P. code is a set of labels that describe books and other information in Oriental medicine. These labels are distinguished by qualities of the writer or publisher's Stylebook. A Stylebook is a list of materials used to make intellectual works consistent. Thus a Stylebook is not necessarily a book. For example, it may be a list of references. One publisher or writer may use more than one Stylebook. A Stylebook can be simple or it can be complex. For example, a sinologist's Stylebook could easily consist of several published books and articles that describe his or her approach to translation, the research on which that approach was based, samples of its application, and descriptions of the methods and logic behind its creation. Stylebooks can include reference books, terms lists and other tools. In sum, a Stylebook is a catalog of the resources two professionally-trained translators would need to arrive at identical translations of the same text without consulting one another.

Following are the main concepts that apply to Stylebooks in the C.O.M.P. code. However, since the idea of the code is that everyone labels their own works, the only examples I will use are those which it is my responsibility as a participating publisher to label. I do not mean thereby to slight anyone, but to stand firmly in favor the C.O.M.P. principle of self-labeling.

A Guarantee of Validity is a claim of accuracy. Although the most common guarantees of validity are unspoken, all information has some implicit or explicit guarantee of validity. For example, when a friend or colleague tells you that a particular treatment works well, you probably accept their opinion. The guarantee of validity is your respect and trust for your colleague, the experience you share with your friend. The same is true for an author whose reputation inspires your trust. On the other hand, the guarantee of validity for a scientific experiment is the formal principles on which it is founded. For example, the statistical calculation that determines whether the results of a clinical trial are better than random is a formal guarantee of validity. It is valid when used by

someone you like and trust; it is valid when used by someone you dislike and distrust. If the formal math is correct, the conclusion is correct. There are several guarantees of validity appropriate to translated literature. The C.O.M.P. code does not demand that anyone offer any particular guarantee; it does not approve of any or disapprove of any; it provides an easy way to report whatever guarantee a writer offers.

Source Documentation describes how an English text relates to a foreign source and how that foreign source fits in its own culture. This too is an aspect of fair labeling. Everyone is familiar with one aspect of source documentation, that is basic bibliographic data. For example, many professional books use a combination of introductory comments, footnotes and bibliographies to create a map between the "departure language text" (e.g. a Chinese article, book or books) and the "arrival language text" (e.g. the English translation). Readers can use that map to discover where information came from and how it was processed in translation. In some forms of translation this map is very loose, in others it is very precise. This choice belongs to the writer or publisher. The C.O.M.P. code provides a common ground for these descriptions, it does not recommend or require one.

Knowing information's place in its own culture is important. If we translated "Terrains and Pathology in Acupuncture" into Chinese, then titled the Chinese book "The Practice of T.C.M. in the West," Chinese readers with no western contact might conclude that Yves Requena's system was predominant in Europe and America. The book could be accurately translated but it would nonetheless be misleading. In other words, footnotes and an bibliography do not tell the whole story. There is also information about culture, language and history that can guide a translation. These issues are the domain of philology and there are C.O.M.P. labels which are appropriate for authors or publishers who wish to assert that they have applied philological principles. However, the C.O.M.P. code does not tell anyone that they must adopt a philological method, or how they should document their work. Neither does the C.O.M.P. code say what is and what is not philologically correct, it merely organizes people's claims in a useful way.

Freely Available Standard Glossaries are lists of relationships between words in a foreign language (e.g. Chinese characters or German words) and English words that can be referenced by any reader, author or publisher. "Freely available" does not mean "at no cost," it means that it is practically available to anyone without entering into a legal or commercial arrangement with the person or organization that owns it. The idea is that readers should be able to cross-reference any author's work to any other author's work. For example, because "A Glossary of Chinese Medicine and Acupuncture Points" is available, anyone can learn what English word is used for any particular Chinese character in any book that uses this source. They can use this information to cross reference books that follow different Stylebooks that provide a reference to the Chinese language.

In sum, the C.O.M.P. code encourages peer review and audience information. Again, the focus is on making it easier for writers who accept the idea of universal cross-referencing to accurately implement that idea, not on requiring people to accept a Stylebook. The code lists items that a Stylebook should include to be practical; a glossary, an acupuncture nomenclature, and a standard for reporting bibliographic information. However, the code also states that none are required to produce a Stylebook.

C.O.M.P. Labels are voluntarily applied to books or other Oriental medical products. These labels are: Original Documents, Functional, Connotive and Denotive Translations. Each of these designations marks a point along a continuum of relationship between a foreign source and an English work. These are not the only possible labels and some books or articles may need different labels for different parts. It is possible one publisher will label a document "connotive" when another publisher would have labeled the same book "denotive." C.O.M.P. leaves these decisions to publishers and writers. However, if everyone's self-labeling is consistent, readers will nonetheless know what to expect.

The "Original Document" label applies to writings that claim no authority from any particular foreign source. Such a book might contain translations, paraphrases or quotes from Chinese, Japanese or another language, but it is not in essence a translation. This does not however prevent the writer or publisher from labeling the translations. Rick Fiet and Paul Zmiewski's "Acumoxa Therapy" books are examples of original documents. There is no Chinese or Japanese book from which these texts were translated. The information is implicitly guaranteed by the authors' expertise. Although this example is of student books, C.O.M.P. labels describe qualities of a book's production not its intended use or complexity. For comparison, "On the development of a mathematical model for the 'laws' of the five phases" by Mark Friedman and Stephen Birch is also an original document. However, it is a research report where the guarantee of validity is formal mathematics. In sum, the authors of original documents claim no direct basis in a foreign source. These materials are the original expressions of their authors.

"Functional Translations" are based on a foreign source but the map between that source and the English book is not so firmly fixed that another translator could reproduce the work. Functional translators claim to use their experience to produce materials that serve the same function, do the same job as a source without replicating the wording, or even necessarily the exact content. The functional translator's guarantee of validity is his or her understanding of the information.

"Character and Health" is a functionally translated text. While it is based on "Acupuncture et Psychologie," the author reoriented the wording, the structure and the examples for lay readers. In other words, there is no systematic, one-to-one relationship between the French source and the

English book. The relationship between the French and English works is actually Yves Requena's understanding of how to express the same ideas for different people in different languages.

The last two sample labels: "Connotive Translations" and "Denotive Translations," are both based on a foreign source. Both have a fixed relationship to that source that other translators could replicate based on the source documentation and Stylebook. Both approaches can be cross-referenced, if the appropriate glosses are freely available. What distinguishes these approaches is in the claims made by the translator. The translator of a connotive work claims to have chosen terms their readers will best understand. The guarantee of validity is the translator's understanding of the information. On the other hand, the translator of a denotive work claims to have chosen terms that best represent the ideas of the original writer by following a specific philological method. The guarantee of validity is the method used. In a sense, connotive translation emphasizes qualities of the arrival language and denotive translation emphasizes qualities of the departure language. Connotive translation emphasizes the translator's understanding. Denotive translation emphasizes the system applied, which may or may not be the creation of the translator.

The revised edition of "Fundamentals of Chinese Medicine" is a representative denotive translation. The map between the Chinese original and the English edition is exact, the Stylebook is known, and the glossary is freely available. The philological rationale has been published and the source text's role in Chinese culture has been documented. In other words, there is a map for every level of the translation and that map is precise enough that the English version and Stylebook are in fact used to reconstruct the Chinese version in language classes. In other words, given the appropriate materials any translator of appropriate skill could repeat the translation.

My example of a Connotive Translation is, one of the most complex possible. Thus it shows how these few C.O.M.P. labels can be applied in a complex case. First, George Soulie de Morant's "Chinese Acupuncture" is five different books under one cover. The first three books are original documents that use translation extensively; the last two books are re-ordered translations of more than one Chinese source. Thus, in C.O.M.P. terms the multi-source books will be "compilations." Finally, the English edition is actually a translation of a translation. Thus, there are actually two translations to label. George Soulie de Morant's fifth book, his treatment book, is an example of a "Connotive Compilation." His work was grounded in a stylebook, (his own dictionary and comments), there is map to his sources that is almost line for line. However, his sources of definition were taken from his era, not from the era of his sources and were selected because they had already adapted to early twentieth century biomedicine. This fit his stated intent, the persuasion of French physicians. Thus, since he tells us his primary criteria was to provide a structure his readers would most easily understand, we have labeled this book connotive. Since

the claim of the translators of the French edition is to have followed de Morant's intent, both the French and English edition fit the C.O.M.P. label ``Connotive Compilation."

In sum then the C.O.M.P. labeling convention is an agreement among some writers and publishers working in Oriental medicine to cooperatively adopt a set of flexible but generally applicable labels. By so doing, we hope to better inform readers, thus increasing the value of information. However, C.O.M.P. will be a product of the people who use Oriental medical literature. If readers ask book and periodical publishers, writers and teachers, to label their works, they will. In reality, C.O.M.P. has just put the matter forward for your approval.