Journal of Education and Educational Research
ISSN: 2957-9465 | Vol. 16, No. 1, 2025

A Study of Terminology Translation Strategies in CH'I MIN YAO SHU from the Perspective of Transknowletology

Meixi Chen

School of Southwest Petroleum University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Abstract: This paper discusses the translation strategies to be adopted for certain agricultural terms in A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU under the theoretical guidance of Transknowletology. Focusing on the two categories of crop cultivation terms and tool-related terms, the study analyzes how the specialized knowledge in agronomy is reconstructed, reorganized, and transferred by means of English translation. Guided by three essential standards that Transknowletology stipulates-authentic meaning, adequate preparation, and aesthetic view-the study further proposes three respective translation strategies: (1) correctly presenting the system of agronomic knowledge, (2) maintaining cultural context with proper explanation, and (3) enhancing the readability and naturalness of expression. Through case-based analysis, the research has demonstrated how these strategies help in preserving both the technical precision and the culturally embedded essence of the ancient agricultural knowledge. The findings show that a Transknowletological approach not only improves the fidelity and clarity of terminology translation but also provides very important guidance for the English translation of traditional Chinese agronomic classics.

Keywords: Transknowletology; CH'I MIN YAO SHU; Terminology Translation; Agricultural Knowledge; Translation Strategies.

1. Introduction

Agricultural knowledge constitutes one of the earliest and most systematic forms of technical wisdom in Chinese civilization. *CH'I MIN YAO SHU*, compiled in the Northern Wei Dynasty, stands as a milestone in the history of agronomy for its detailed descriptions of farming techniques, crop management, daily production activities, and the use of agricultural tools[7]. As Needham's research on Chinese scientific history indicates, ancient agricultural knowledge formed a highly coherent system of technical practice and empirical reasoning[4]. Its modern annotated edition, A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU, not only reconstructs the original text through philological interpretation but also provides English translations of numerous technical terms, serving as an important channel for global knowledge communication[1][14]. These English renderings serve as essential carriers for transmitting ancient agricultural knowledge to the global scholarly community.

In recent years, the translation of Chinese agricultural classics has gained increasing academic attention[2][8] [9] [13], yet the translation of terminology—central to the accuracy and accessibility of agronomic knowledge—remains underexplored. Terminology reflects not only concrete objects and operations but also the cultural logic, epistemic patterns, and technical systems embedded in ancient agricultural practices[5]. Therefore, the study of terminology translation requires an approach that goes beyond linguistic equivalence and addresses the transformation and reorganization of knowledge.

Transknowletology, a theory that conceptualizes translation as a process of knowledge reconstruction, provides a suitable framework for examining terminology translation in agronomic texts[12]. Its three evaluative standards—authentic meaning, adequate preparation, and aesthetic view—offer a multidimensional lens for understanding how specialized knowledge is mediated across languages and cultures[3]. These principles echo Newmark's observation that global communication depends on the accurate transmission of conceptual meaning and cultural information through translation[6].

This paper selects two representative categories—crop cultivation terms and tools/containers terms—from *A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU*, and analyzes their English translation from the perspective of Transknowletology. It aims to investigate how agronomic knowledge is transferred, how cultural meanings are preserved, and how terminological expressions are optimized to achieve clarity and readability. The discussion draws on research in both agronomic translation and cultural knowledge transfer [10][11][15], hoping to provide insights for future English translations of agricultural classics and contribute to broader discussions on knowledge-oriented translation studies.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. An Overview of Transknowletology

Transknowletology regards translation as a dynamic process of reconstructing knowledge rather than merely transferring linguistic forms[12]. When knowledge travels across linguistic, cultural, and cognitive boundaries, it undergoes structural shifts, conceptual reinterpretation, and epistemic reorganization. The translator plays a central role in reshaping the underlying knowledge system for new readerships, a process widely discussed in studies of translators' identity and agency[11][15]. Within this framework, terminology becomes particularly significant because it embodies concentrated conceptual and cultural information[6].

The theory is grounded in the three standard principles of authentic meaning, adequate preparation, and aesthetic view[3]. Authentic meaning deals with the conceptual precision and inner structure that hold a knowledge system together. In contrast, adequate preparation involves mobilizing interdisciplinary knowledge and contextual awareness from translators, ensuring logical soundness and epistemic trust of the translated version. The aesthetic view refers to the clarity, readability, and stylistic appropriateness that permits the restructured knowledge to be read and apprehended by target readers without any problem. These three standards jointly define the epistemological grounding of Transknowletology and remind translators of their responsibility to handle technically dense texts, such as agronomic writings.

2.2. Terminology as Knowledge Units

In agronomic literature, terminology functions as condensed knowledge units that embed technical, empirical, and cultural information[5]. In A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU, agricultural terms refer to crop varieties, farming practices, environmental conditions, tool structures, and accumulated practical experience[7][14]. Due to their strong systematicity, these terms form interconnected networks reflecting hierarchical and functional relationships within agricultural production[1][2].

Moreover, agricultural terminology is rooted in specific historical and cultural contexts, reflecting traditional ways of thinking and local knowledge structures [8][10]. This demonstrates that terminology translation involves restructuring conceptual systems rather than merely substituting lexical items [6]. Translators must therefore recover the embedded knowledge relations, cultural implications, and epistemic patterns underlying the original terms [9][13].

2.3. Relevance of Transknowletology to Agronomic Terminology Translation

Agricultural classics integrate technical procedures, environmental observations, and empirical reasoning, resulting in terminology that is both technically concentrated and culturally saturated[2][13]. The terminology they contain is both technically concentrated and culturally saturated; translation involves the negotiation between two epistemic communities-the ancient Chinese agronomists and the contemporary English readers. Transknowledgy provides a comprehensive framework for this knowledge movement. Its principle of authentic meaning ensures that scientific precision and conceptual coherence are preserved. Adequate preparation underscores the translator's need to interpret agricultural, historical, and cultural information from the source text with recourse to various disciplinary resources[3][12]. Simultaneously, the aesthetic view promotes clarity, readability, and stylistic suitability with regard to language variety in translation so that the transfer of specialized knowledge could be effective[6][8][9]. These principles demonstrate the strong relevance of Transknowletology to agronomic terminology translation and provide theoretical grounding for reinterpreting ancient agricultural knowledge in English contexts [10][11][15].

3. Knowledge Features of Selected Agricultural Terminology

3.1. Crop Cultivation Terms

The crop cultivation terms in *A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU* represent a summation of agronomic knowledge observed over a long period and acquired through practical experience. Most of these terms pinpoint particular growth phases, cultivation processes, environmental conditions, or material features that are crucial for crop production. In this respect, they express highly distilled knowledge which is sensitive to context, and the degree of technicality of these expressions is marked. Each term discloses an implicit awareness of the biology of crops, seasonal labor rhythms, and management decisions which are necessary to maintain agricultural output.

These terms are also deeply intertwined with the ecological conditions and agricultural customs of ancient China. Many terms are derived from practices determined by regional climate differences, soil types, and local crop species. Their meanings often extend beyond literal reference, relating instead to knowledge specific to historical and geographical settings. This combination of technical detail and regional specificity confers upon cultivation terminology a singular knowledge pattern, bringing with it opportunities and difficulties for translation. When such terms are translated into English, they have to be targeted toward readers without the cultural and experiential background provided by the original context. Understanding these features is essential for choosing translation strategies capable of conveying the conceptual depths of the terminology.

3.2. Tools and Containers Terms

Terminology referring to tools and containers represents another major component of ancient agricultural knowledge. These terms designate items used for sowing, harvesting, storage, processing, fermentation, or transportation. The knowledge encoded in these expressions is highly practical, showing the material technologies and production systems of the early agrarian societies. Unlike cultivation terms that frequently describe biological states or procedural actions, the expressions which deal with tools-related aspects emphasize structure, function, and mechanical principles. Many terms record specific shapes, capacities, or operating methods familiar to farmers of the time but likely unfamiliar to modern readers.

Such terminology also conveys cultural and historical information. Design and function of these implements evolved in response to local resources, economic situations, and technological conditions. Some refer to implements no longer existing in modern agriculture; others describe tools whose cultural implications cannot be detached from traditional production practice. Tool terminology reflects both material practicality and cultural meaning, and translation must therefore preserve both types of information. Translators should pay attention not only to the physical properties of the tools but also to the agronomic systems in which they were used. Only with such nuanced understanding can the technical and historical layers encoded in these terms be effectively conveyed across cultural boundaries.

4. Translation Strategies under the Framework of Transknowletology

The translation of agricultural terminology in *A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU* poses distinctive challenges because the terms embody dense networks of agronomic knowledge as well as historical and cultural meanings derived from long-standing production practices. When considered through the lens of Transknowletology, translation becomes a situated act of knowledge reconstruction in which conceptual relations, functional logics, and cultural connotations are reorganized for new readerships. The present chapter proposes and justifies a threefold strategy that corresponds to the standards of authentic meaning, adequate preparation, and aesthetic view. The first strategy emphasizes accurate presentation of the agronomic knowledge system, the second stresses the preservation of cultural context with calibrated explanation, and the third focuses on readability and naturalness as conditions for the effective transmission of specialized knowledge. Although these strategies are analytically separable, they interact in practice; success in one dimension often presupposes sensitivity to the others. Drawing on representative terms from crop cultivation and tools/containers, the discussion illustrates how conceptual precision, cultural embeddedness, and communicative clarity can be jointly realized in English translation without sacrificing the integrity of the original agrarian epistemology.

4.1. Presenting the Agronomic Knowledge System Accurately

Accuracy in terminology translation is not exhausted by lexical fidelity. In agronomic texts, a term usually functions as a node within a structured system that coordinates decision-making across seasonal cycles, processual steps, and material conditions. The requirement of authentic meaning in Transknowletology therefore compels the translator to recover the place of each term within the source knowledge network and to re-express that place coherently in the target language. This is especially salient for cultivation terminology that differentiates developmental stages of crops, specifies morphological thresholds that trigger management actions, and encodes the tacit expertise of observation and timing that shaped traditional farming.

A typical difficulty arises when a term designates a transitional stage—such as the emergence of particular spikelets or the softening of husks—that historically signaled irrigation reduction, pest-prevention measures, or the scheduling of harvest. If such a term is rendered as a vague botanical gloss, the functional link between the phenological cue and the agronomic action is erased, and the reader loses access to the logic by which the original system operated. The translator must instead reconstruct the pragmatic inference that the term invited. A concise solution is to select an English expression that names the visible change while tacitly pointing to its operational significance within the cultivation cycle. This can be achieved by embedding the term in syntagms that connote action thresholds or management relevance, thereby preserving both description and function.

Comparable issues arise with terms that denote mixtures, lixivium, or fermenting agents. These expressions encode knowledge about ratios, materials, and processing aims rather than merely referring to substances. In many cases, the terminological choice was motivated by properties such as leaching strength, buffering effect, or the gradual release of active components. Literal renderings that foreground only composition will obscure the teleology of the practice. The translator must therefore understand the causal role the substance plays in a process—clarifying, separating, preserving, or transforming—and select wording that keeps the procedural logic visible. An English phrase that combines identity and purpose often proves superior to a bare noun, because the functional nuance is crucial for the intelligibility of the method described.

The problem is even more acute for tool terminology. Implements in the source text were historically optimized for tasks like draining, grading, threshing, or fermenting, with forms that reflected material constraints of wood, bamboo, or earthenware as well as embodied knowledge about flow, pressure, and capacity. When there is no exact counterpart in contemporary Anglophone agriculture, mapping a Chinese label onto an English common noun may mislead. A draining urn is not simply a vessel but an instrument designed around principles of separation and gravity; a sowing device may not be a modern drill yet still enacts an underlying logic of spacing and rate control. The translator's responsibility is to isolate this logic and encode it in English through judicious compound nouns or descriptive nominals that foreground function while remaining terminologically economical. Doing so preserves the intelligibility of procedures which, in the source culture, were inseparable from the tools chosen to enact them.

Accuracy also entails consistency across the lexicon. A knowledge system becomes legible to readers when the same concept is named in the same way throughout, and when near-synonyms are not used to represent distinct agronomic categories. This consistency is not a mechanical constraint but an epistemic requirement: it allows readers to trace relations among practices, materials, and outcomes across chapters. The translator should therefore develop a micro-glossary during the reading process and refine it iteratively as new contexts clarify the scope of a term. When a choice must be made between competing English renderings, the criterion should be which option better preserves the term's position in the conceptual topology of the source text. In borderline cases, paratextual clarification or a brief in-text apposition can maintain fidelity without interrupting narrative flow.

At a higher level, accuracy requires sensitivity to the systemic coupling of terms across categories. A term naming a growth stage may call for a particular tool; a tool label may presuppose a certain medium, mixture, or container. If the translation of any one element is handled in isolation, the web of operational dependencies becomes opaque. The translator should thus read laterally, noting how terms co-occur, which sequences they organize, and what preconditions they imply. English choices can then be synchronized so that co-occurring terms retain their mutual intelligibility. This systemic alignment is an application of authentic meaning beyond individual entries, securing the comprehensibility of the agronomic world as a whole.

Finally, accuracy is historical. Many terms bear traces of local ecologies and premodern technological regimes. The translator must avoid anachronism that would transplant modern assumptions into premodern practices. Expressions that suggest industrial standardization, mechanized control, or laboratory-grade purification should be used sparingly unless the source context warrants them. Where the text indicates artisanal variability, seasonally responsive judgment,

or rule-of-thumb measurement, the English should admit controlled indeterminacy through qualifiers that mirror the epistemic texture of the original. Such calibrated restraint preserves the form of knowledge encoded in the terminology and aligns with Transknowletology's insistence that authentic meaning includes historically situated conceptual content.

4.2. Maintaining Cultural Context with Appropriate Explanation

Adequate preparation, as conceived by Transknowletology, requires the translator to recover the socio-cultural milieu within which agronomic knowledge was generated and circulated. Agricultural terminology is inseparable from subsistence patterns, ritual calendars, regional preferences in staple crops, and accumulated craft traditions in storage, preservation, and processing. Without this horizon, the semantic core of many terms will appear unduly narrow or arbitrarily opaque. The translator must therefore supply just enough context to let the reader perceive how the term functioned within a lived environment, while resisting the temptation to turn a technical translation into an ethnographic monograph.

Cultivation terminology makes this need immediately visible. The prevalence of millet and related grains in northern regions conditioned an elaborate vocabulary differentiating varieties, textures, and uses. Some labels are tacitly indexical of culinary or brewing practices; others point to resilience under frost, tolerance of poor soils, or suitability for intercropping. A single English gloss cannot carry the entire cultural freight, yet a carefully placed modifier or a short appositive can signal that the term sits at the intersection of agronomy and foodways. In narrative passages, where the text instructs farmers to act upon phenological cues, the translator can retain the core term and extend it with a phrase that gestures toward its traditional significance, thereby allowing readers to infer the broader matrix of practice.

Fermentation terminology is similarly culture-saturated. The use of bran-water lixivium, surface starters, and ambient-temperature processes presupposed a material culture of containers, microclimates, and microbial ecologies that were neither fully standardized nor fully idiosyncratic. Translating such terms as if they belonged to industrial enology or microbiology would misrepresent their practical rationality. A more faithful approach is to let the English phrasing retain the artisanal complexion of the procedures while indicating functional intent. When the text emphasizes qualities like "clarifying" or "sweetening," the translation can echo these aims in diction that keeps the reader oriented to purpose rather than to modern categories of analysis. This avoids excessive antiquarian explanation while safeguarding the recognizable aims that bound the practice.

Tool terminology often encodes social and environmental history as well. The ubiquity of bamboo, the availability of clay, and the cost of metal shaped the design space of implements. Containers and devices were not neutral supports but agents that co-determined the feasibility and tempo of operations. An English term that effaces materiality deprives the reader of clues to durability, permeability, and thermal behavior that made certain processes workable. Without lecturing, the translator can integrate material hints into the phrasing—by specifying "earthen jar," "bamboo sieve," or "wooden mallet" where the source warrants—to anchor the practice in the tangible world that sustained it. Such choices restore the affordances that ancient readers would have taken for granted, keeping the knowledge ecology visible without turning the translation into a museum catalog.

Cultural context also informs valuation. Certain terms carry positive associations of purity, freshness, or auspicious timing, while others warn against impurity, dampness, or misfortune. The translator should reflect these evaluative overtones where they motivate action or justify a technique. English can accommodate such nuances through adjectives and adverbs that are unobtrusive yet semantically charged. By retaining these tonal cues, the translation preserves the decision-making grammar of the source text, in which technical steps were often warranted by cosmological or moralized understandings of the natural world. Crucially, the aim is not to reproduce belief systems wholesale but to keep the inferential links that made techniques "make sense" within their home culture.

The calibrated explanation advocated here differs from either minimalism, which risks opacity, or maximalism, which burdens the text with digressions. It is a mode of cultural signaling that uses micro-context to sustain macro-intelligibility. A brief parenthetical indicating a traditional purpose, a material constraint, or a seasonal association may suffice to unlock a term for readers. When sustained commentary is unavoidable, it should be concentrated in preface, glossary, or endnotes to keep the main text fluent. This distribution respects the reader's need for orientation while honoring the stylistic economy that agronomic instruction typically exhibits. Such moderation embodies adequate preparation not as encyclopedism but as targeted cultural literacy mobilized in the service of knowledge transfer.

4.3. Enhancing Readability and Naturalness of Expression

The aesthetic view in Transknowletology emphasizes clarity, coherence, and stylistic aptness as conditions for effective knowledge communication. Specialized content loses its utility if presented in English that is grammatically correct but awkward, terminologically precise but rhythmically inert. Readability is not a cosmetic afterthought; it is the pragmatic medium through which conceptual accuracy and cultural contextualization become accessible to readers who were not socialized into the original knowledge community. In agronomic translation, the stylistic problem often surfaces as a conflict between the compact, paratactic density of the source and the hypotactic expectations of English academic prose.

Specialized cultivation terms tend to be semantically dense, often packing action and observation into a single lexical unit. Translated literally, such units result in cumbersome nominal strings or awkward genitives that create comprehension strain. The translator should redistribute meaning across clauses, allowing verbs to carry process and adjectives to carry state while maintaining the information hierarchy of the original text. Thus, a term that condenses a phenological cue and a management decision can be unwrapped into a sentence where the cue remains in the foreground and the decision appears as a routine response. This syntactic unwrapping enhances readability without sacrificing any agronomic logic. The same principle applies to terms referring to multi-step preparations; instead of reproducing the source's compression, English can stage the steps in a single fluid sentence, using participles or infinitival purpose clauses to preserve momentum.

Tools and containers invite different stylistic challenges. Without modern equivalents, literal calques may result in overlong compounds or unfamiliar metaphors. A functional paraphrase risks verbosity. The translator should search for succinct descriptors that are semantically transparent yet idiomatic. Compound nouns can be used sparingly, anchored by common heads such as "vessel," "sieve," "mallet," or "jar," with pre-modifiers indicating function or material. Where the source favors repetition to reinforce instruction, English may alternate between a short term and a slightly longer descriptive variant to avoid monotony without introducing ambiguity. Such micro-variation sustains reader attention and reflects English academic style, which tolerates modest synonymy provided that reference is clear.

Readability also depends on discourse structure. Agronomic texts often proceed by cumulative addition: a condition is observed, a tool is prepared, a mixture is applied, and a result is evaluated. English exposition benefits when these stages are signposted by connectives that articulate causation, contrast, or consequence. The translator should therefore supply light-weight discourse markers where the source relies on parataxis or context. Doing so does not interpret the text beyond its intention; it merely externalizes the logical relations that the original audience could infer without assistance. The result is prose that flows at a pace consistent with English informational norms while remaining faithful to the underlying procedural logic.

Terminology consistency, discussed under accuracy, has a stylistic dimension as well. Regular recurrence of stable labels reduces cognitive load and allows readers to track referents across paragraphs. At the same time, absolute uniformity can produce stiffness. The translator's task is to maintain a stable core form while permitting minor contextual adjustments that enhance fluency. For example, an implement might be "the draining vessel" at first mention and "the vessel" thereafter, provided no ambiguity arises. Similarly, a cultivation stage can be reintroduced with a succinct reminder of its agronomic significance when the narrative returns to it after a long interval. These devices are ordinary features of English academic discourse and help a specialized text read as a coherent whole rather than as a concatenation of glossary entries.

An additional dimension of naturalness concerns the calibration of technicality. English has registers that range from the colloquial to the highly specialized. Agronomic translation should aim for a professional, lucid register that is precise without unnecessary jargon. When a term has a recognized counterpart in English agronomy, adoption improves legibility; when it does not, over-technical neologisms can alienate readers. In such cases, plain descriptive English anchored in function often proves more communicative. The translator should also be wary of false friends—English words that appear to correspond to a Chinese term but carry misleading entailments in contemporary scientific usage. Careful collocational checking and attention to disciplinary conventions reduce this risk.

Readability finally requires rhythm. Sentences should vary in length, with dense passages relieved by slightly shorter clauses that summarize consequences or preview the next step. Paragraphs should cohere around a focal idea, often the role of a single term in a procedure, and conclude with a sentence that ties function back to the broader knowledge system. This rhythmic management is not ornamental; it is cognitive scaffolding that supports readers who must assimilate unfamiliar concepts quickly. Where the source text uses parallelism to reinforce instruction, English can echo the pattern in cadence while updating syntax to contemporary expectations. Such attention to rhythm aligns with the aesthetic view's emphasis on form as a vehicle for intelligibility.

Although discussed separately, the strategies of accuracy, cultural contextualization, and readability are mutually entailing in practice. A translation that accurately situates a term within its agronomic system yet suppresses cultural signals deprives readers of the background that makes the system intelligible; conversely, a version rich in cultural cues but imprecise in concept distorts the knowledge it seeks to transmit. Readability is the enabling condition that makes the other two accessible. In operational terms, the translator typically moves iteratively among the three: drafting a precise rendering anchored in function, enriching it with cultural hints where needed, and smoothing the prose to match English academic norms. Revisions then check for terminological consistency and historical plausibility, ensuring that no modern assumptions have crept in where the source text presupposes artisanal practice or seasonal judgment.

The interaction between strategies becomes evident when dealing with contested or ambiguous terms. Some expressions in agronomic classics admit multiple readings, because the underlying practices varied regionally, or because the textual witnesses diverge. In such cases, the translator should favor solutions that preserve functional coherence and cultural plausibility while remaining stylistically unobtrusive. When a single English label cannot bear the full range of possible meanings, the main text can adopt the most contextually supported rendering, while notes acknowledge alternatives. This is not an attempt to clear up ambiguity at any cost but, rather, to present it openly without prejudicing narrative flow. Transknowletology's insistence on knowledge responsibility supports this approach, whereby the translator remains responsible both to the historical text and to the contemporary reader.

A final implication concerns pedagogy and future research. Translations which enact the triadic strategy proposed here can serve not only as conduits of information but also as models of method. By seeing how conceptual accuracy, cultural literacy, and stylistic clarity reinforce one another, readers gain an implicit tutorial in how to engage responsibly with premodern technical literature. For scholars of translation, agronomy, and intellectual history, the approach suggests a replicable workflow: identify the functional core of terms within a system, recover the cultural affordances that sustained their use, and craft English that is as clear as the original was to its intended audience. The result is not a domesticated text stripped of strangeness, nor a foreignized text that resists comprehension, but a balanced reconstruction that lets the agronomic knowledge travel without losing its identity.

5. Conclusion

As illustrated through the above analysis, the translation of agricultural terminologies in *A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU* should not be based on direct lexical matching but rather on the reconstruction of agronomic knowledge. The three strategies explored here-securing conceptual precision, retaining cultural

understanding, and ensuring readability-jointly suggest that terminology translation should function as an integrated and knowledge-based method.

A major point emerging from this study is that accuracy and cultural intelligibility are inseparable. It is only within the production system in which they function that agricultural terms get their meaning; when translations weaken that system—by generalizing crop-stage expressions or detaching tool names from material and technological conditions—the original epistemic coherence becomes disrupted. Reconstructing the knowledge environment behind each term allows the translator to restore the logic that guided ancient agricultural decisions.

A related challenge is balancing faithfulness with accessibility. Technical distinctions are crucial to sustaining agronomic meaning, while the English renderings must remain clear enough for the readers who are unfamiliar with the traditional practices. The strategies proposed in this study demonstrate that this balance is possible when translators foreground functional logic and reorganize the dense expressions to align with English academic prose. Clarity, in this sense, does not dilute technical content but rather enables better engagement with it.

Cultural signaling is indispensable, too: since so many terms reflect local crops, materials, ecological conditions, or artisanal techniques, removing cultural elements would tend to obscure the identity of the knowledge system in question. At the same time, over-explicitation of culture threatens to disrupt the technical momentum of the text. Subtle contextual cues - brief indications of traditional uses, materials, or regional relevance - provide a practical accommodation between cultural depth and readerly overload.

Certain limitations remain, of course. Many terms harbor ambiguity either regionally or across time, and there is no modern equivalent for many instruments. The translator would thus have to assume a reflective attitude, so to say-knowing when not to be sure-and avoid placing anachronistic connotations on the text. This is in line with Transknowletology's understanding of translation as a responsibility to knowledge reconstruction rather than a mechanical exercise. In particular, a transknowletological approach is suitable for agricultural classics due to their emphases on conceptual structure, cultural grounding, and communicative clarity. It presents a coherent framework in the translation of premodern agronomic knowledge by applying these principles to transform terminology into an effective medium of knowledge transmission that allows the technical and cultural wisdom embedded in *A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU* to reach contemporary readers in an accurate and coherent manner.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Center for Language and Culture Studies of International Oil and Gas Resource Regions, Southwest Petroleum University (Project Number: YQCX2024003).

References

[1] Chen D.: On English Translation Strategies of Chinese Agricultural Classics with Reference to A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU (MS., Northwest A&F University, China 2018).

[2] Lu Z.X.: A Study on the English Translation of Ancient Chinese Agricultural Terms — A Case Study of Ren Yidu and Sun Shouquan's Translation of Tiangong Kaiwu (MS., Dalian Maritime University, China 2012).

[3] Martin R.M.: On Paradigms and Cognitive Translatology [A]//Shreve G.M., Angelone E.: Translation and Cognition (Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2010), p.169-187.

[4] Needham J.: Science and Civilisation in China: Volume 1: Introductory Orientations (Cambridge University Press, UK 1954).

[5] Needham J., Lu G.D.: Problems of Translation and Modernization of Ancient Chinese Technical Terms[J]. Annals of Science, Vol. 32 (1975), p.491-502.

[6] Newmark P.: No Global Communication Without Translation[J]. Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives, 2003, p.55-67.

[7] Shi S.H.: A Preliminary Survey of the Book CH'I MIN YAO SHU (2nd Edition) [M]. Beijing: Science Press, China 1982.

[8] Cao Wanzhong, Peng Qin. The Globalization Path of Local Knowledge in Huai River Culture — From the Perspective of Transknowletology [J]. Journal of Xinyang Normal University (Philosophy & Social Sciences Edition), Vol. 45 (2025) No.3, pp.107–113.

[9] Feng Huiyi, Xu Mingwu. Cultural Construction and Dissemination in the English Translation of Ceramic Classics Terminology — A Case Study of Tao Shuo [J]. Foreign Language Teaching, Vol. 44 (2023) No.3, pp.86–92.

[10] Jia Linlin, Yan Junqi. Translation of Culturally Loaded Words in the Chaozhou Opera Chaifanghui from the Perspective of Transknowletology [J]. Comparative Research on Cultural Innovation, Vol. 9 (2025) No.12, pp.20–23.

[11] Jiao Xiaoxia. A Study on Rewi Alley's Translator Identity from the Perspective of Transknowletology [J]. Journal of Gansu Normal Colleges, Vol. 30 (2025) No.2, pp.83–87.

[12] Kong Lingcui, Li Chunlan, Deng Lina. The Construction of Knowledge and Transknowletology from the Perspective of Chinese and Western Philosophy [J]. Contemporary Foreign Language Studies, 2024(04), pp.95–107.

[13] Kong Lingcui, Zhou He. A "Triad Model" Study of Collation, Modern Translation, and Self-Translation in the Agronomic Classic Fan Shengzhi Shu [J]. Foreign Languages and Translation, Vol. 26 (2019) No.3, pp.47–52.

[14] Kong Lingcui, Zeng Jie. Shi Shenghan's Contributions to the Collation and Translation of Agronomic Heritage [J]. Agricultural Archaeology, 2020(03), pp.218–223.

[15] Li Chunlan, Kong Lingcui, Liu Haiou. textual Investigations into Key Details in Chen Wangdao's Translation of The Communist Manifesto [J]. Contemporary Foreign Language Studies, 2024(06), pp.55–65.