

A Preliminary Study of Engels' Translation Thought

Yunxi Xie

School of Marxism, Guangxi University, Nanning, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region,
530004, China

Abstract

This paper examines Engels' views on translation practice by situating them within their historical context. Engels' core insights on translation encompass eight aspects: 1) translator selection; 2) translator authority; 3) professional ethics for translators; 4) faithful reproduction of the original work's central ideas; 5) enhancing communication effectiveness through linguistic optimization; 6) promoting refinement of the original work via multiple translations; 7) adapting to local conditions; and 8) standardization of operational norms. Engels' practical approach to translation emphasizes an integrated system combining translation and dissemination, focusing on text selection, translation strategy, and reader reception.

Keywords

Engels; translation insights; translator.

1. Introduction

Translation is the activity of accurately and completely converting information expressed in one language or semiotic system into another language or semiotic system. Translation behavior is regarded as an indispensable part of German cultural existence. From Luther's German translation of the Bible in the 16th century to Schleiermacher's publication of the specialized work *On the Different Methods of Translating* in the 19th century, translation activities in Germany during this period were quite extensive, and discourses on translation emerged in an endless stream. The core views in 19th-century translation philosophy and approaches were proposed by German scholars and writers, yet no mainstream translation method was formed during this time. Against this background, Marx and Engels engaged in numerous translation activities and achieved commendable results.

Beyond translation practice, Marx and Engels frequently proofread their works and offered translation insights. The German translation of Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* was published with his consent, and he personally proofread the French translation of *Capital*. Engels systematically presented some of his views on translation in *How Not to Translate Marx*, most of which were individual but always principled opinions directed at certain translations. Their translation thoughts manifest as principles and methods to be followed in the process of linguistic transformation, mainly focused on textual translation, including both translation and editorial translation. The former involves their own conversion of text or guidance during the translator's work, while the latter refers to their involvement in publishing and editorial processes such as proofreading.

In the process of editing and publishing classics such as the *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*, Engels embodied his specific thoughts on textual translation. These thoughts broke the traditional binary opposition between original text and translation in translation theory, predating similar views in modern Western translation theory by nearly a century. When criticizing Hyndman's translation of the first section and its first two parts of Chapter 1 of *Capital*, Engels emphasized that translating Marx's works is "truly honest scientific work." He not only engaged in translation activities himself but also put forward specific requirements for

other translators, demanding that they not only master the target language but also have in-depth knowledge of relevant specialized fields. For example, in his 1893 letter to Giovanni Domenico concerning the publication of the Italian edition of *Capital*, he clearly stated that "the translator must not only be proficient in German but also well versed in political economy." [1] Engels' monographs, letters, and manuscripts likewise contain abundant resources for researching his translation thoughts. His correspondence, in particular, directly records his views on specific translation issues and his grasp of standards. These primary sources provide first-hand materials for systematic research. Engels believed that Dühring "unthinkingly translated the economic concept of rent, which should have been explained, into a legal term," so that readers "do not understand any more than before." Because Dühring distorted Marx's exposition of the concept of capital, he could not accurately explain ground rent—this is a problem arising from the translator's lack of professional knowledge. Moreover, since what Dühring discussed was the situation in Germany, while the theory of rent is "the part of economics that bears an English characteristic." Additionally, when translating *A Newly Discovered Example of Group Marriage*, Engels "replaced the original terms with those from *The Origin of the Family*, to facilitate reader comprehension." At the same time, the academic community has already accumulated considerable research in this area. From the 1950s onward, scholars have successively paid attention to this field, and research in recent years has become more in-depth, laying an academic foundation for subsequent studies.

2. Core System of Insights

Engels' reflections on translation do not proceed from theoretical definitions of translation and translation practice, but rather emphasize the translator's subjective agency and the operability of the translation. He prominently highlights the translator's professional competence and professional ethics, clearly articulates the rights and obligations of translators, advocates giving full play to the translator's subjective initiative so that the translation fulfills the same role as the original, and, while stressing faithfulness to the original, places greater emphasis on the expressive and communicative effects of the translation, highlighting the important role of readers in the production of translations.

2.1. Translator Selection: Primacy of Textual Cognition

Textual cognition is an important factor in selecting translators. In 1883, M. Kowalewski wrote to Engels hoping to translate *The Poverty of Philosophy*. However, he did not understand the essence of Marx's socialist thought because he praised the Hohenzollern dynasty's social empire. Therefore, it was impossible to let him "extract anything" from Marx. Engels resolutely rejected his request and humorously remarked: "If I agreed to let this self-advertising worshipper of the Hohenzollern dynasty and conservative state socialist translate *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx would strangle me in my sleep." [1] In his 1893 letter to M. R. K. K. de Cotta, Engels emphasized that it was impossible to entrust the formidable task of translating *Capital* into French to a complete stranger. This indirectly reflects that knowing the translator is a prerequisite in the selection process, and fully understanding the source text is the primary principle for confirming a translator. Marx and Engels also once entrusted translations to some literary figures, but due to their insufficient understanding of the original text, the translations turned out somewhat stiff, as these literary figures could not grasp the core ideas.

2.2. Translator Authority: Unity of Rights and Obligations

Translators are only responsible for their own translations during the translation process, enjoying certain autonomy over the revision and circulation of their translations, but they must also maintain close contact with proofreaders, with the obligation to listen to proofreaders' opinions and remain faithful to the author. In 1883, in the preface to the English edition of

Volume I of Capital, Engels stated: "The translators are responsible only for their respective translations, while I am fully responsible for the entire work." [1] Precisely because Engels had an overall grasp of the translation, the style of the translation was unified as much as possible, and linguistic errors in the translators' work were also avoided, thereby making the translation more faithful and fluent. The close connection between translation and proofreading can, to a certain extent, make the translation more perfect through the exchange between the two parties. Mao Dun considered proofreading to be a manifestation of the spirit of collective cooperation and an important part of the translation enterprise.[2] In his 1886 letter to Laura Lafargue, Engels said: "Then I shall examine the translation and write my comments in pencil. Then we shall consult and settle disputed points. Then I shall have to read it through once more, checking it from the stylistic and technical points of view, to see whether it is ready for printing, and at the same time check whether the quotations found in the English original by Dussy are correct." [3] From this it can be seen that proofreaders and translators are very closely connected, and their cooperation plays a decisive role in the presentation and dissemination of the translation.

Translators have a certain right of determination over the circulation of the translation before publication. In his 1888 letter to Florence Kelley-Wischnewetzky, Engels stated: "Another old translation of the Communist Manifesto has appeared in the Justice. This gives Reeves a pretext for inquiring whether there is a translation authorized by the author." [1] This indirectly reflects that translations may not be circulated to others without the translator's consent. Such measures to some extent respect the translator's translation rights and ownership of the translation.

Translators have autonomy over whether and how to revise the translation. This can be glimpsed from Engels' 1885 letter to Laura Lafarge: "Therefore, the opinions I express, insofar as they do not concern the meaning, are only for reference, and their value must be judged by yourself." [1] Respecting the translator's autonomy in revision is based on the translator's excellent command of language and the need to accurately convey the meaning of the original. Laura's outstanding linguistic ability and precise exposition of the text earned Engels' repeated praise. However, for translations of inferior quality, Engels refused to let them translate, because it would increase the proofreading workload. This also coincides with the emphasis on translator subjectivity in the recently emerging cognitive translatology, both advocating the full play of the translator's subjective initiative.

2.3. Translator Professional Ethics: Excellent Linguistic and Cultural Proficiency, Specialized Knowledge

Translators must be proficient in both the source and target languages and their related cultures. Engels required that translations must pay attention to grammatical correctness and avoid those with nonstandard wording. Engels not only scrutinized and carefully weighed his own translations but often asked others (such as Laura) to polish them. He highly appreciated translators with high linguistic proficiency and often praised Laura's excellent French in his letters to her, while expressing deep disgust toward translations that were "nonsensical." At the same time, "it is necessary to have experience in writing in both languages, and not merely experience in daily newspaper writing." [4] The translator's solid command of writing can to a certain extent enhance the readability of the translation and reduce much proofreading work.

"Marx was adept at using everyday idioms and dialectal proverbs. He coined new words, drew examples from all scientific disciplines, and cited books and periodicals in more than a dozen languages. To understand his works, one must master German—both colloquial and standard—and also know something of German life." [5] Engels repeatedly emphasized the importance of cultural mastery. In his 1852 letter to Marx, he also stated: "At least one of us should have some knowledge of the language, history, literature, and social institutions of the

peoples with whom we may soon come into conflict." [6] "Translation, as experience and operation, carries with it a unique cognition of language, literature, culture, and communicative activities." [7] Placing translation in the macro perspective of cross-cultural dialogue requires translators to possess dual cultural competence: they must be both interpreters of the source culture and explicators of the target culture.

In addition, translators need interdisciplinary knowledge (e.g., translating *Capital* requires familiarity with political economy and philosophical terminology). In his 1893 letter to M. R. K. K. de Cotta, Engels emphasized that undertaking the translation of *Capital* requires not only a profound understanding of German but also proficiency in economics. Engels spoke highly of Samuel Moore's English translation of *Capital* because Moore himself had a solid foundation in economic theory and was familiar with economic texts, and could grasp the essential content and understand it rather thoroughly. Conversely, Engels refused to let Aveling translate *Capital*, not because of any incorrect stance, but because his specialty was natural science rather than economics. "Though he has the best will in the world, what he has to translate is for him an unfamiliar subject," "If it were natural science, it would be quite easy for him, but this is political economy and industrial facts, in which he does not even know the most ordinary terms!" [1] Translators were expected to be erudite, which was quite difficult at the time, hence the need for interdisciplinary development between translation studies and other disciplines, similar to the refinement and implementation seen in business English.

2.4. Faithful Reproduction of the Original Work's Core Ideas

Marx and Engels believed that "faithful and fluent" translation is the standard and principle for translating their works. [8] Engels' requirement for faithfulness is reflected in multiple aspects, such as wording, annotations, and original meaning. In terms of wording, Engels demanded precision. In his 1884 correspondence with Eduard Bernstein, Engels emphasized: "In the German text, Hegel's technical terminology should be accurately retained, otherwise it will be incomprehensible." [1] "For necessary foreign words, I have not appended so-called explanatory translations. These necessary foreign words are mostly commonly used scientific and technical terms; if they could be translated, they would not be necessary." Uniform terminology not only makes the translation more concise but also avoids misunderstandings.

In terms of textual content, Engels used methods such as searching for materials and adding annotations to restore the textual content as much as possible, and opposed arbitrary abridgment. In his 1884 letter to Karl Kautsky, Engels said: "The passages concerning Hegel and Hegelianism I can only check in London, because I still need to consult Hegel's works." [1] Engels considered the new Danish edition of the *Communist Manifesto* published in 1885 to be insufficiently mature, because some passages had been deleted simply because the translator found them difficult to translate. He also opposed fuzzy translation, requiring precise correspondence for key terms. He would ask translators to inform him promptly when encountering unfamiliar words or to consult relevant dictionaries, so that he could compile and send them the terminology, and he would also remind translators to pay attention to specialized terms.

In terms of original meaning, in 1884, Engels said to Paul Lafargue: "You have no right to attribute to Marx what he did not actually say." In 1886, in a letter to Laura, Engels again mentioned: "I cannot allow Marx to be distorted in Germany using Marx's own words, and seriously distorted at that." [1] From this, it is clear that Engels attached great importance to the expression of the original meaning in translations.

The translation principle of "faithful and fluent" advocated by Engels has at its core the defense of absolute accuracy in ideological content, especially as manifested in the translation of Marx's works. This principle requires precise terminology, complete content, and no distortion of the

original meaning. It can be seen that "faithfulness" is the primary principle among his translation principles.

2.5. Enhancing Communication Effectiveness Through Linguistic Optimization

Linguistic optimization is mainly reflected in two aspects. On the one hand, it is reflected in the optimization of wording and phrasing. Engels was very rigorous in his use of words, striving for accuracy and elegance in expressing the original language. In his 1852 letter to Marx, Engels pointed out that wherever vivid, concrete images appear in the original, one can almost always find equally concrete and vivid expressions in Saxon etymology, so that the English reader can understand at once what is meant. For unfamiliar words, consulting a dictionary was the last resort (except for terminology), mainly because dictionary meanings are highly diverse and context-dependent, and translators may not always find the appropriate sense. For some older texts (especially those whose original meanings have been lost in the source language), Engels also tried to modernize the language to facilitate reader understanding and acceptance.

On the other hand, it is reflected in the optimization of writing style. Engels' requirement concerning translation of treatises was that the key point was to return as much as possible to the context in which the author wrote and spoke, in order to understand the core ideas and textual style of the author's works, just as he demanded that translators of Marx's works proceed from Marx's contemporary practical context. As Flaubert said, Style is the man himself. Hemingway's telegraphic short sentences and Proust's extended sentence structures carry distinctly different cognitive logics. Imitating the minimalist style of *The Old Man and the Sea* can fully preserve the aesthetic qualities of the iceberg theory. Engels also mentioned this point in his 1885 letter to Pasquale Martignetti: "In many places, as long as you have grasped the meaning well, I think you can translate more flexibly and boldly." [1] Even Marx's marginal annotations, if they affected the overall readability of the text, would not be adopted by Engels. Adhering to stylistic unity not only achieves the author's presence but also enhances the organic wholeness of the translation.

2.6. Multiple Translations Promoting Refinement of the Original

Engels supported the mutual reference among multilingual translations and between different language versions of the same text. In his letter to August Radimsky, Engels expressed his pleasure that the *Communist Manifesto* was also to appear in a Czech translation. In the 1890 German preface to the *Communist Manifesto*, Engels also stated: "Certain annotations in this edition, I have incorporated into the present edition." This shows that Engels would add new terms that conformed to the original's intended meaning and could promote its refinement, because exchange and mutual learning are what drive the development of civilization. For example, the Yang Xianyi and Hawkes translations of *A Dream of Red Mansions*—multiple perspectives in translation can also better restore the core content of the original and optimize communication effectiveness, achieving precise dissemination of the translation. In the 1894 preface to Volume III of *Capital*, Engels also noted that corrections, prefaces, supplements, and the like require new research to provide support before the work can be refined. Different translators may understand the same text differently at different times, and with the development of practice, certain concepts may acquire new meanings; only by constantly absorbing fresh ideas can the scientific nature of a work be preserved. Engels himself frequently engaged in interlingual translation between different languages, for example translating Portuguese texts into French. This distinguishes Engels' translation principles from others: Engels was keenly aware of the subjectivity of translators and authors and the historical gap in cognition, and innovatively proposed the comparative translation of different versions—for example, the significant differences between classical Chinese and modern English in various aspects make it necessary to consult multiple translations and related annotations in order to accurately convey the original meaning of the *Tao Te Ching*.

2.7. Adapting to Local Conditions

In his 1887 correspondence with Friedrich Adolf Sorge, Engels mentioned: "I long ago advised Mrs. Wischnewetzky to rewrite the most important parts of Capital into several popular pamphlets." [1] Because the content was then very difficult for American workers to understand. From a practical standpoint, this could accelerate the dissemination of Marxist theory in the United States. This also coincides with Marx's approach of adapting to local conditions in translation. In his 1883 letter to Quail, Engels also mentioned: "Those places that you find difficult, I think, are equally difficult for French readers without annotations." [1] And he had also said that many changes were made simply to bring the English translation closer to the French original. In his 1893 letter to Giovanni Domenico, Engels mentioned that a translation based solely on the French edition would not be perfect, because Italian is far more suitable for the author's philosophical style than French. Engels was demanding regarding the reading experience of target-language readers, hoping to produce translations that matched local aesthetics according to local characteristics, and striving to make them accessible to the working class.

However, this does not mean absolute domestication. Here, adaptation to local conditions is a dialectical unity of domestication and foreignization. For example, for culture-loaded terms lacking in the target language, both must be taken into account. Engels' principle of adaptation essentially emphasizes the subjectivity of the reader; it fundamentally serves the reader without demanding anything from the reader, but instead actively satisfies the reader's needs. Adaptation is more about bridging the cognitive differences caused by cultural gaps, thereby producing works that readers appreciate.

2.8. Standardization of Operational Norms

Beyond overall principled guidance for translations, Engels' specific operational practices were also forward-looking. These specific operations, based on Engels' extensive translation and proofreading practice, were primarily aimed at bridging cultural differences to meet readers' reading needs. His operational standards cannot be simply summarized as literal versus free translation, but rather involve flexible handling of the original and the scientific and creative presentation of the target language.

2.8.1. Neologistic Translation

Cultural differences determine the untranslatability of certain words ("some places are almost untranslatable" [1]). Therefore, Engels advocated that for words absent in the target culture, translators could coin new terms to compensate for semantic loss. "Newly created German nouns require the creation of corresponding new English nouns." [1] Neologistic translation is a manifestation of the translator's subjective initiative; for example, the English translation of "logic" as "logic" requires the translator to be innovative on the basis of a strong command of language.

2.8.2. Supplementary Translation (Supplemental Use of Annotations and Explanations)

Engels himself engaged in much translation work, writing annotations for many translations. Adding annotations to a work is itself a combination of theory and practice. In the translation process, considering the varying degrees of development of the workers' movements and the different historical and cultural foundations in different regions, Engels often thoughtfully added special annotations for them to facilitate understanding by the working class. For example, Engels added different annotations to the term "commune" in the English and German editions. In the 1888 English edition, he added a note, Even before they had wrested local self-government and political rights as the 'Third Estate' from the feudal lords, they had already been called 'communes.' And in the 1890 German edition, he added a note concerning the

Italian and French "communes." This was conducive to the localization of theory, enabling it to truly exert practical force.

2.8.3. Abstract Translation

When translators comprehend the content, sentence translation should not cause ambiguity. For example, in John Broadhouse's translation of Volume I of *Capital*, Engels pointed out a problem: he rendered the German into English in a way that made it meaningless. For instance, he translated "production of use-value" as "determination of use-value," and "India's primitive commune" as "venerable commune." The root cause was that he fundamentally did not understand the meaning that the original intended to express; he merely understood the literal meaning of the text. Therefore, the abstract method should be used to elicit the meaning behind the text, so that the target language possesses all the style and interest of the original. From a certain perspective, while following the original, free translation is instead a good choice. In other words, the translation must be consistent with the style and genre of the original (turning poetry into a novel is inadmissible), and one must strive to convey the meaning behind the content—for example, the English translation of "Ji Ji Ru Lü Ling" (a Chinese Daoist incantation) where Western culture has no such expression, requiring non-Chinese readers to understand its underlying meaning; literal and rigid translation are inadvisable here.

2.8.4. Deletion Translation

Engels agreed that there may be some meaningful passages in a text, but they have to be sacrificed in translation. In a letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht, Engels stated: "To adapt to the market here, this book should be considerably revised, deleting all superfluous words in the introduction, removing the entirely inappropriate lengthy discussion of Chinese-style books, and changing obscure text into plain English." [1] For untranslatable parts, content that does not harm the original meaning nor affect reader understanding may be deleted, which is also a practical consideration. Every nation has its specific culture-loaded terms or particular literary forms that have no equivalent in other cultures—for example, the "eight-legged essay." Given the practical needs at the time, "plain and comprehensible" was a consideration (with the working class as the target audience). Therefore, when the target reader does not need to understand obscure knowledge, such terms and sentences generally adopt deletion translation. This method is mainly for the general public and does not seem to apply to academic texts.

2.8.5. Inversion Translation

This method is "grammatical adaptation," a key method for ensuring the natural fluency of translations, requiring the translator to deeply understand the syntactic differences between the two languages. For example, when translating from French into German or from German into French, sentences should be turned around. Chinese tends to use animate subjects, while English often employs inanimate nouns (such as time and place) as subjects, enhancing personification effects. This is a necessary requirement for fluency and vividness in translation, and a key step for smooth translations.

2.8.6. Back Translation

Engels agreed with the suggestion of Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor Marx-Aveling, to restore many passages quoted from English authors and the Blue Books and translated by Marx into German, back to the original English. Moreover, in publishing the fourth edition of Volume I of *Capital*, Engels also referred to the original text restored by Eleanor using back translation, rather than using retranslation. Second-hand literature that has undergone retranslation can hardly fully present the effect of the original. The use of back translation effectively avoids the possibility of losing meaning through retranslation, greatly enhancing the authority and reliability of the translation.

2.8.7. Literal Translation (Word-for-Word Translation)

Some works have to be translated word-for-word, because any omission or attempted alteration would only impair the value of the original. In a letter to Louis Pio, Engels wrote: "I translated the Portuguese article into French, because this language can be translated almost word-for-word. I therefore translated as literally as possible." [1] This is a case where the etymologies are relatively close; in such situations, literal translation does not harm the original meaning. For vastly different languages, when translation is necessary despite untranslatability, word-for-word translation can preserve the thought and linguistic effect to the greatest extent possible. Lu Xun was also a representative of literal translation; literal translation can also minimize the influence of the translator's cognition, leaving more room for readers' understanding and imagination of the original.

Here is the English translation of Sections III and IV of your paper, following the academic style and terminology established in the previous translation.

3. Rethinking Engels's Insights on Translation

Translation directly confronts language; it reconstructs the expression of the original work so that the work can reveal its core ideas in a new context. However, the expression of the original work's ideas is a lengthy process, and translation, as an intermediate link, is constantly and dynamically evolving.

The translator's self-imposed limitation of being faithful to the original precisely grants creative freedom. For a qualified translator, the translatability inherent in linguistic structures is the focal point for exercising subjectivity; fidelity is manifested in the untranslatable parts, which also serve as the main arena for self-reflection, and this fidelity ultimately serves the meaning of the translated work. However, it should be noted that the translator's subjective cognition must not compromise the fidelity of the translation, and a certain degree of social cognition is required to achieve accurate fidelity and objective critique. This also constitutes an important manifestation of translatability: a translator who embraces and desires the original; moreover, the translator's competence requires sound social cognition (accurate fidelity and objective critique) as its foundation.

The complete manifestation of the relationship between a work and its ideas is an important means of bringing the work to completion; this can only be achieved through translation, and only a translator with dialectical thinking can accomplish this emancipatory task. This process is not about seeking equivalents, but about establishing new correspondences, so that the ideas of the specific work can be extended and expanded through translation. Just as the totality of a work is only relative, its meaning requires translation—as a critical activity—to be continually supplemented and perfected.

If we seek the essence of language itself and its ever-changing meaning not in the life of language and its works, but in ever-evolving subjectivity, even taking into account the influence of extremely naive psychologism, it still amounts to confusing the cause of things with their essence. The vast disparity in social cognition between the translator and the author inevitably leads to differences in understanding the original (provided that the translator is qualified); only the intersection of multiple perspectives can restore the true face of the work.

In today's era of artificial intelligence, human-machine collaborative translation is becoming increasingly common, and generative AI translation cannot be separated from human translation; thus, the post-editing step cannot be ignored. When generative AI completes the initial translation, the translator's post-editing is by no means a simple correction of syntax and grammar; the translator must, with a critic's eye, examine the textual connotations obscured by instrumental rationality in the AI translation, intervene and transform, so that translation becomes once again a critical dialogue between two languages. This process is not only

technical but also ethical and aesthetic judgment: the translator must decide which heterogeneities to preserve and which defamiliarizing effects to create, thereby countering the homogenizing tendency of technology and redeeming the language flattened by AI.

4. Conclusion

Against the backdrop of Europe's complex linguistic and cultural ecology and the rise of the international workers' movement in the 19th century, Engels' translation practice transcended mere linguistic conversion. To overcome the theoretical deviations and cultural barriers that Marxism faced in transnational dissemination, he drew on his remarkable multilingual abilities and literary acumen to form a systematic and comprehensive system of translation thought. The core of this system lies in adhering to the fundamental principle of "faithful and fluent," emphasizing the dialectical unity of absolutely accurate transmission of theoretical essence and the reception effect on target-context audiences. Specifically, his thought is rich and multifaceted: at the subject level, he established the principle of textual-cognition primacy in translator selection, emphasized the unity of translators' rights and obligations, and required translators to possess excellent bilingual proficiency, cross-cultural literacy, and necessary subject-knowledge foundations; at the operational level, he creatively proposed a series of standardized translation methods, including neologistic translation to compensate for semantic gaps, supplementary translation to bridge cultural cognitive differences, abstract translation to convey deeper connotations, and flexible strategies such as deletion, inversion, back-translation, and literal translation for different textual contexts, demonstrating a high degree of flexibility and scientific rigor. Furthermore, he supported the cross-fertilization of multiple translations to refine the original work and advocated adaptation to local conditions as a dissemination strategy, aiming to achieve a shift from author-centeredness to reader-centeredness. Translation is a critical practice whereby translators, drawing upon social cognition and dialectical reasoning, negotiate a dynamic equilibrium between faithfulness and creative freedom. In the era of artificial intelligence, far from being superseded, this practice requires translators to engage with and reshape AI-produced translations with increased ethical and aesthetic consciousness, in order to counter the tendencies toward vacuity and uniformity, and to preserve the linguistic wealth and intellectual profundity of the original works.

References

- [1] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1978). *Marx and Engels on translation*. People's Publishing House.
- [2] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1986). *Statements on publishing issues*. China Prospect Publishing House.
- [3] Chen, F. K. (2009). *A history of Chinese translatology*. Shanghai People's Publishing House.
- [4] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1975). *Collected works of Marx and Engels* (Vol. 36). People's Publishing House.
- [5] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1982). *On art* (Vol. 1). People's Publishing House.
- [6] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2016). *Collected works of Marx and Engels* (Vol. 49). People's Publishing House.
- [7] Zhang, W. (2021). *The test of the foreign: Culture and translation in the German romantic period*. SDX Joint Publishing Company.
- [8] Yu, S. X. (1980). Engels' contributions to the history of Marxist translation. *Journal of Xinjiang University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, (4).