

大学翻译学研究型系列教材

总主编 张柏然

# 语料库翻译学研究导引

Critical Readings in Corpus-based Translation Studies

主 编 胡开宝



南京大学出版社

南京国民政府中央研究院历史语言研究所

1956年 12月

# 语料库语言学研究导引

南京国民政府中央研究院历史语言研究所 编

1956年 12月

南京国民政府中央研究院历史语言研究所

大学翻译学研究型系列教材

总主编 张柏然

# 语料库翻译学研究导引

Critical Readings in Corpus-based Translation Studies

主 编 胡开宝

副主编 李 鑫 孟令子 刘慧丹



南京大学出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语料库翻译学研究导引 / 胡开宝主编. — 南京 :  
南京大学出版社, 2012. 12

大学翻译学研究型系列教材 / 张柏然总主编

ISBN 978-7-305-10627-9

I. ①语… II. ①胡… III. ①语料库—翻译学—高等  
学校—教材 IV. ①H059

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2012)第 227034 号

出版发行 南京大学出版社  
社 址 南京市汉口路 22 号 邮 编 210093  
网 址 <http://www.NjupCo.com>  
出 版 人 左 健  
丛 书 名 大学翻译学研究型系列教材  
总 主 编 张柏然  
书 名 语料库翻译学研究导引  
主 编 胡开宝  
责任编辑 张雪芹 裴维维 编辑热线 025-83592123  
照 排 南京南琳图文制作有限公司  
印 刷 南京新洲印刷有限公司  
开 本 787×1092 1/16 印张 25 字数 624 千  
版 次 2012 年 12 月第 1 版 2012 年 12 月第 1 次印刷  
ISBN 978-7-305-10627-9  
定 价 48.00 元  
发行热线 025-83594756 83686452  
电子邮箱 [Press@NjupCo.com](mailto:Press@NjupCo.com)  
[Sales@NjupCo.com](mailto:Sales@NjupCo.com)(市场部)

\* 版权所有,侵权必究

\* 凡购买南大版图书,如有印装质量问题,请与所购  
图书销售部门联系调换

# 大学本科翻译研究型系列读本 大学翻译学研究型系列教材

## 顾 问(按首字母排序)

- |     |          |
|-----|----------|
| 黄国文 | 中山大学     |
| 廖七一 | 四川外国语学院  |
| 潘文国 | 华东师范大学   |
| 王宏印 | 南开大学     |
| 王克非 | 北京外国语大学  |
| 谢天振 | 上海外国语大学  |
| 许 钧 | 南京大学     |
| 仲伟合 | 广东外语外贸大学 |

# 总 序

张柏然

到了该为翻译学研究型系列教材说几句话的时候了。两年前的炎炎夏日,南京大学出版社责成笔者总揽主编分别针对高等院校翻译学本科生和研究生学习与研究需求的研究型系列读本和导引。俗话说,独木难撑大厦。于是,笔者便千里相邀“招旧部”,网罗昔日在南大攻读翻译学博士学位的“十八罗汉”各主其事。寒来暑往,光阴荏苒,转眼两年过去了。期间,大家意气奋发,不辞辛劳,借助网络“上天”,躲进书馆“入地”,上下求索,查阅浩瀚的文献经典,进而调动自己的学术积累,披沙拣金,辨正证伪,博采众长,字斟句酌,终于成就了这一本本呈现在读者面前的教材。

众所周知,教材乃教学之本和知识之源,亦即体现课程教学理念、教学内容、教学要求,甚至教学模式的知识载体,在教学过程中起着引导教学方向、保证教学质量的作用。改革开放以来,我国各类高校组编、出版的翻译教材逐年递增。我们在中国国家图书馆网站上检索主题名含有“翻译”字段的图书,检索结果显示,1980至2009年间,我国引进、出版相关著作1800余种,其中,翻译教材占有很大的比重。近些年来,翻译教材更是突飞猛进。根据有关学者的不完全统计,目前,我国正式出版的翻译教材共有1000多种。<sup>\*</sup>这一变化结束了我国相当长一段时间内翻译教材“一枝独秀”的境地,迎来了“百花齐放”的局面,由此也反映了我国高校翻译教学改革的深化。

但是,毋庸讳言,虽然教材的品种繁多,但是真正合手称便的、富有特色的教材仍属凤毛麟角。教材数量增多并不足以表明教学理念的深刻转变。其中大多都具有包打翻译学天下的纯体系冲动,并没有打破我国既往翻译教材编写从某一理论预设出发的本质主义思维模式和几大板块的框架结构。从教材建设看,我国翻译理论教材在概念陈设、模式架构、内容安排上存在着比较严重的雷同化现象。这表明,教材建设需要从根本上加以改进,而如何改则取决于我们有什么样的教学理念。

有鉴于此,我们组编了“大学翻译学研究型系列教材”和“大学本科翻译研究型系列读本”这两套系列教材。前者系研究生用书,它包括《中国翻译理论研究导引》、《当代西方翻译理论研究导引》、《当代西方文论与翻译研究导引》、《翻译学方法论研究导引》、《语言学与翻译研究导引》、《文学翻译研究导引》、《汉语典籍英译研究导引》、《英汉口译理论研究导引》、《语料库翻译学研究导引》和《术语翻译研究导引》等10册;后者则以本科生为主要读者对象,它包括《翻译概论读本》、《文化翻译读本》、《文学翻译读本》、《商务英语翻译读本》、《法律英语翻译读本》、《传媒英语翻译读本》、《科技英语翻译读本》、《英汉口译读本》、《英汉比较与翻译读本》和《翻译资源与工具读本》等10册。这两套教材力图综合中西译论、相关学科(如哲学、美学、文学、语

<sup>\*</sup> 转引自曾剑平、林敏华:《论翻译教材的问题及编写体系》,《中国科技翻译》,2011年11月。



言学、社会学、文化学、心理学、语料库翻译学等)的吸融性研究以及方法论的多层次研究,结合目前高校翻译教学和研究实践的现状进行创造性整合,编写突出问题型结构和理路的读本和导引,以满足翻译学科本科生和研究生教学与研究的需求。这是深化中国翻译学研究型教材编写与研究的一个重要课题,至今尚未引起翻译理论研究和教材编写界的足够重视。摆在我们面前的这一课题,基本上还是一片多少有些生荒的地带。因此,我们对这一课题的研究,也就多少带有拓荒性质。这样,不仅大量纷繁的文献经典需要我们去发掘、辨别与整理,中西翻译美学思想发展演变的特点与规律需要我们去探讨,而且研究的对象、范畴和方法等问题,都需要我们进行独立的思考与确定。研究这一课题的困难也就可以想见了。然而,这一课题本身的价值和意义却又变为克服困难的巨大动力,策励着我们不揣浅陋,迎难而上,试图在翻译学研究型教材编写这块土地上,作一些力所能及的垦殖。

这两套研究型系列教材的编纂目的和编纂特色主要体现在:不以知识传授为主要目的,而是培养学生发问、好奇、探索、兴趣,即学习的主动性,逐步实现思维方式和学习方式的转变,引导学生及早进入科学研究阶段;不追求知识的完整性、系统性,突破讲授通史、通论知识的教学模式,引入探究学术问题的教学模式;引进国外教材编写理念,填补国内大学翻译学研究型教材的欠缺;所选论著具有权威性、文献性、可读性与引导性。具体而言,和传统的通史通论教材不同,这两套系列教材是以问题结构章节,这个“问题”既可以是这门课(专业方向)的主要问题,也可以是这门课某个章节的主要问题。在每个章节的安排上,则是先由“导论”说明本章的核心问题,指明获得相关知识的途径;接着,通过选文的导言,直接指向“选文”——涉及的知识面很广的范文,这样对学生的论文写作更有示范性;“选文”之后安排“延伸阅读”,以拓展和深化知识;最后,通过“研究实践”或“问题与思考”,提供实践方案,进行专业训练,希冀用“问题”牵引学生主动学习。这样的结构方式,突出了教材本身的问题型结构和理路,旨在建构以探索和研究为基础的教与学的人才培养模式,让年轻学子有机会接触最新成就、前沿学术和科学方法;强调通识教育、人文教育与科学教育交融,知识传授与能力培养并重,注重培养学生掌握方法,未来能够应对千变万化的翻译教学与研究的发展和需要。

笔者虽说长期从事翻译教学与研究,但对编写教材尤其是研究型教材还是个新手。这两套翻译学研究型教材之所以能够顺利出版,全有赖各册主编的精诚合作和鼎力相助,全有仗一群尽责敬业的编写和校核人员。特别值得一提的是,在这两套系列教材的最后编辑工作中,南京大学出版社外语编辑室主任董颖和责任编辑裴维维两位女士全力以赴,认真校核,一丝不苟,对保证教材的质量起了尤为重要的作用。在此谨向他(她)们致以衷心的感谢!

总而言之,编写大学翻译学研究型教材还是一项尝试性的研究工程。诚如上面所述,我们在进行这项“多少带有拓荒性质”的尝试时,犹如蹒跚学步的孩童,在这过程中留下些许尴尬,亦属在所难免。作为教材的编撰者,我们衷心希望能听到来自各方的意见和建议,以便日后再版修订,进而发展出更好更多翻译学研究型教材来。

是之为序。

二〇一二年三月二十七日  
撰于沪上滴水湖畔临港别屋

## 前 言

语料库翻译学,顾名思义,是指凭借语料库技术和数据统计的方法,对翻译现象和翻译过程进行系统分析和解释,以揭示翻译的本质。语料库翻译学最早是由英国曼彻斯特大学 Mona Baker 教授于 1996 年在题为“Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead”的论文中提出,英语对应词是 Corpus-based Translation Studies。1998 年, Tymoczko 将该领域的研究命名为 Corpus Translation Studies。

近年来,语料库翻译学发展势头迅猛,许多语料库翻译学研究的论著相继发表、出版,一批基于语料库的翻译研究项目先后立项。以国内为例,自 2005 年至 2010 年,国家社会科学基金立项的语料库翻译学研究项目共有 14 项,而 2009 年至 2010 年,与语料库翻译学相关的教育部人文社科基金项目就有 10 项。为帮助读者了解语料库翻译学的学科渊源、发展历程、研究内容和研究路径等,培养读者的研究意识,提高读者开展语料库翻译学研究的能力,编者精选语料库翻译学研究的学术论文,编写了《语料库翻译学研究导引》这本研究性教材。

为突显本教材的研究性,编者首先以问题为导向,选择触及语料库翻译学研究重要问题的学术文章,并设计需要读者深入思考的问题或研究课题。其次,在决定相关学术论文的取舍时,编者重视选文的代表性和经典性。这些文章代表了特定课题研究的较高研究水平,反映了相关研究领域的前沿性研究成果,体现了学界对相关研究课题的当下思考。这些选文可以作为具体研究案例,读者可以通过研读文章掌握相关课题的研究方法及学术论文的写作方法。

本书共分九章,分别是“绪论”、“译学研究语料库的建设与应用”、“翻译语言特征研究”、“译者风格研究”、“翻译规范研究”、“翻译实践研究”、“翻译教学研究”、“口译研究”和“语料库翻译学研究:现状与未来”。每章由“导论”、“选文”和“研究实践”等三部分组成。

“导论”部分简要介绍语料库翻译学相关研究领域的历史演变和现状,梳理研究领域的研究内容、研究路径和代表性研究成果。

“选文”部分以语料库翻译学具体研究内容为依据,提供 2~3 篇代表性学术论文。这些文章绝大多数选自学术期刊,少量文章选自国际学术会议论文。编者





在收录这些学术论文时,秉承尊重作者的原则,除少数文章因格式统一考虑作了适当调整之外,力求保持选文的原汁原味及其完整性。此外,个别文章的图表不够清晰,在收入本书时予以删除。

每篇选文配有“导言”、“延伸阅读”和“问题与思考”。“导言”位于选文的正文之前,介绍作者的学术背景、所选文章的来源及其主要内容。“延伸阅读”提供了一些专题论文或著作。通过阅读这些论著,读者可以深化对相关研究课题的认识和理解,从而全面、辩证地分析问题。“问题与思考”提供一些有助于读者理解选文内容的问题或者需要读者进一步探索的问题。

“研究实践”部分根据选文所讨论的问题,设计一些专题研究课题,旨在帮助读者开展语料库翻译学研究,培养读者的学术研究能力。

需要说明的是,本书是胡开宝所写学术专著《语料库翻译学概论》(上海交通大学出版社,2011)的姊妹篇,其章节的安排与后者大致相同。所不同的是,后者侧重于理论阐述,前者注重选文的阅读和相关问题的探索。因此,在使用本书时,读者可以阅读《语料库翻译学概论》。

本书在编写过程中得到了南京大学博士生导师张柏然教授和南京大学出版社领导的大力支持,在此表示衷心的感谢。

本书主编为胡开宝,孟令子、刘慧丹和李鑫担任本书的副主编。此外,侯钰璐、刘静、潘峰也参与了本教材的编写工作。由于水平有限,书中肯定存在谬误和疏漏之处,敬请广大读者批评指正。

胡开宝

2012年11月

# 目 录

<b>第一章 绪论</b>	1
导 论	1
选 文	3
选文一 Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies; Implications and Applications	3
选文二 Corpus-based Translation Research; Its Development and Implications for General, Literary and Bible Translation	18
<b>第二章 译学研究语料库的建设与应用</b>	45
导 论	45
选 文	48
选文一 Corpora in Translation Studies; An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research	48
选文二 The ACTRES Parallel Corpus; An English-Spanish Translation Corpus	63
选文三 莎士比亚戏剧英汉平行语料库的创建与应用研究	71
<b>第三章 翻译语言特征研究</b>	85
导 论	85
选 文	88
选文一 Core Patterns of Lexical Use in a Comparable Corpus of English Narrative Prose	88
选文二 Spelling Out the Optionals in Translation; A Corpus Study	100
选文三 A Parallel Corpus-based Study of Translational Chinese	112
<b>第四章 译者风格研究</b>	127
导 论	127
选 文	129
选文一 Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator	129
选文二 Translation Style and Ideology: A Corpus-assisted Analysis of Two English Translations of <i>Honglouloumeng</i>	150
选文三 Phraseology and Idiomaticity: A Progress Report on a Corpus-based Study of Two Contemporary Chinese Versions of Cervantes' <i>Don Quixote</i>	167
<b>第五章 翻译规范研究</b>	173
导 论	173
选 文	175
选文一 Collocations in Popular Religious Literature; An Analysis in Corpus-based	



	Translation Studies .....	175
选文二	Translation Norms for English and Spanish: The Role of Lexical Variables, Word Class and L2 Proficiency in Negotiating Translation Ambiguity ...	194
<b>第六章</b>	<b>翻译实践研究</b> .....	<b>213</b>
导  论	.....	213
选  文	.....	214
选文一	A Corpus-based Approach to Tense and Aspect in English-Chinese Translation .....	214
选文二	基于语料库的翻译语言分析——以 so ... that 的汉语对应结构为例 .....	238
选文三	汉语“副职”英译的语料库调查研究 .....	248
<b>第七章</b>	<b>翻译教学研究</b> .....	<b>257</b>
导  论	.....	257
选  文	.....	258
选文一	Towards a Methodology for a Corpus-based Approach to Translation Evaluation .....	258
选文二	Bilingual Comparable Corpora and the Training of Translators .....	279
选文三	语料库与翻译教学 .....	292
<b>第八章</b>	<b>口译研究</b> .....	<b>298</b>
导  论	.....	298
选  文	.....	300
选文一	Corpus-based Interpreting Studies as an Offshoot of Corpus-based Translation Studies .....	300
选文二	An Approach to Corpus-based Interpreting Studies: Developing EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus) .....	308
选文三	汉英会议口译语料库的创建与应用研究 .....	320
<b>第九章</b>	<b>语料库翻译学研究:现状与未来</b> .....	<b>334</b>
导  论	.....	334
选  文	.....	335
选文一	Computerised Corpora and the Future of Translation Studies .....	335
选文二	Corpus-based Translation Studies: Where Does It Come from? Where Is It Going? .....	345
<b>参考文献</b>	.....	<b>362</b>

# 第一章 绪 论

## 导 论

本章以一个问题开篇,即什么是语料库翻译学?“语料库翻译学是指以语料库为基础,以真实的双语语料或翻译语料为研究对象,以数据统计和理论分析为研究方法,依据语言学、文学和文化理论及翻译学理论,系统分析翻译本质、翻译过程和翻译现象等内容的研究。”<sup>①</sup>它诞生于20世纪90年代,属于一个新兴的研究领域。它的出现是语料库语言学(Corpus Linguistics)方法与描写性译学(Descriptive Translation Studies)理论有机结合的结果。通常认为,1993年英国曼彻斯特大学翻译与跨文化研究中心的Mona Baker发表“Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications”一文标志着语料库翻译学这一新范式的确立。

作为一个依托于语料库语言学和描写性译学发展起来的新兴研究领域,语料库翻译学研究具备这两个领域的特征,即运用语料库方法和注重描写与实证。它的出现弥补了传统翻译学研究上的不足。传统译学研究过多强调定性研究(qualitative research),忽略实证和定量研究(quantitative research)。学者们往往通过主观判断,诉诸个人的直觉和语感,根据极其有限的数据和材料提出理论假设或作出判断,主观性强,缺乏科学性和系统性。语料库翻译学研究则不同,它注重实证研究(empirical research),强调数据统计在提出假设和验证假设方面的重要性,并且将定量分析与理论研究有机结合起来。

自1993年至1998年,语料库翻译学研究逐渐得到学界的认可,并逐渐发展为重要的译学研究范式。在此期间,英国、美国和意大利等国学者相继建设翻译语料库、平行语料库和可比语料库,试图界定语料库在译学研究中应用的意义、语料库翻译学的研究路径和研究内容,同时开展了基于语料库的译者风格、翻译共性、翻译教学等方面的实证研究。学者们利用语料库对大量客观存在的翻译语料进行描写和分析,揭示翻译文本的本质,探讨翻译语言规律及其内在动因,以及对翻译文本特征产生影响的各种因素。同时,语料库翻译学研究的一些重要概念和课题都是在这个时期中提出来的,这些概念包括译者风格、翻译共性、隐化、显化、简化、泛化、齐整化等。虽然有些概念之前已经存在,但是,语料库翻译学研究的出现赋予了它们新的内涵和研究价值。

1999年以来,语料库翻译学研究进入快速发展时期。一批重要的平行语料库、可比语料库和翻译语料库相继建成,愈来愈多的学者投身于语料库翻译学研究,相关论文先后发表于主

<sup>①</sup> 胡开宝. 语料库翻译学概论[M]. 上海:上海交通大学出版社,2011:1.



要学术期刊上,语料库翻译学专题学术会议在世界各地召开。

国内的语料库翻译学研究较之于国外起步稍晚。1999年,国内第一篇有关语料库翻译学的文章问世<sup>①</sup>。此后,语料库翻译学的相关概念和研究方法开始受到国内学界重视,并陆续出现语料库翻译学相关课题的研究。

据胡开宝<sup>②</sup>的统计,自1999年至2009年,国内外语类核心期刊和CSSCI期刊共发表语料库翻译学研究论文61篇,出版专著近10本,且呈递增趋势。而到了2010年,发表于外语类核心期刊和CSSCI期刊的语料库翻译学研究论文数量明显增加,共计17篇。这些论文和著作主要探讨了译学研究语料库建设、翻译共性、具体语言对翻译语言特征、翻译教学及其他相关课题。

目前,语料库翻译学研究主要集中于译学研究语料库的建设、翻译语言特征、译者风格、翻译规范、翻译实践(translation practice)、翻译教学和口译等领域的研究。译学研究语料库建设的研究内容包括语料库的设计、语料采样方法、翻译语料和原创语料的可比性、双语语料之间的平行对齐,以及语料的标注等。翻译语言特征研究包括翻译共性研究和具体语言对翻译文本语言特征研究。译者风格研究主要是描述并阐释译者在词语、句式结构和标点符号的使用,语篇结构的布局等方面的偏好,以及译者特有的语言使用习惯。翻译规范研究是将翻译作品和翻译行为放置于大的社会文化背景中进行研究,探讨对翻译行为施加影响的各种社会文化因素,阐明翻译与社会文化之间的互动关系,描写和分析影响具体历史时期翻译行为的各种规范,以期揭示翻译的社会属性。基于语料库的翻译实践研究是指探讨如何利用语料库的技术优势,分析并解决翻译实践中遇到的困难或与翻译实践密切相关的问题,从而指导翻译实践。语料库在翻译教学或译员培训方面的应用研究主要关注如何将语料库应用于翻译课堂教学、翻译评估和翻译教材的编写之中。基于语料库的口译研究不仅涉及传统口译研究的一些内容,如口译策略和方法,口译过程中不同语言词汇间的对应关系以及语言转换的规律等,而且还包括语料库口译研究特有的研究课题,如口译中的翻译共性、具体语言对口译语言特征和口译规范等<sup>③</sup>。

本章所选的文章主要分析了语料库翻译学的起源、研究方法和研究内容等基本理论问题。Mona Baker所撰的文章“Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications”阐明了语料库翻译学研究的理论意义及其应用价值。Kruger博士的“Corpus-based Translation Research: Its Development and Implications for General, Literary and Bible Translation”梳理了语料库翻译学研究的起源、发展、意义、研究工具、研究手段、研究课题等。

① 冯跃进,陈伟.汉语“副职”英译的语料库调查研究[J].外国语,1999,(2):43-49.该文章中,作者利用Bank of English语料库,分析与汉语词汇“副”对应的英语词汇deputy, associate, assistant和vice的常见搭配,探讨了不同汉语副职的英译。

② 胡开宝.语料库翻译学概论[M].上海:上海交通大学出版社,2011:23.

③ 同②:31.

## 选 文

选文一 Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies:  
Implications and Applications

Mona Baker

## 导 言

本文是语料库译学研究领域的奠基之作,收录于1993年出版的 *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* 一书中。

作者 Mona Baker 是语料库翻译学研究的重要代表人物,现任英国曼彻斯特大学翻译与跨文化研究中心教授和国际译学期刊 *The Translator* 主编,著有 *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*; *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*; *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* 和 *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* 等。作者首先对翻译学这一学科进行概述,之后阐明了翻译学开始向基于语料库的研究方向发展的趋势以及造成这一转变的因素。其次,作者分析了利用语料库进行翻译学研究的可能途径,包括研究翻译共性、翻译规范、翻译过程、翻译对等的实质等。文章写于20世纪90年代初,体现出作者的前瞻性和创新性。

## 1. Introduction

A great deal of our experience of and knowledge about other cultures is mediated through various forms of translation, including written translations, sub-titling, dubbing and various types of interpreting activities. The most obvious case in point is perhaps literature. Most of us know writers such as Ibsen, Dostoyevsky and Borges only through translated versions of their works. But our reliance on translation does not stop here. Our understanding of political issues, of art and of various other areas which are central to our lives is no less dependent on translation than our understanding of world literature.

Given that translated texts play such an important role in shaping our experience of life and our view of the world, it is difficult to understand why translation has traditionally been viewed as a second-rate activity, not worthy of serious academic enquiry, and why translated texts have been regarded as no more than second-hand and distorted versions of "real" texts. If they are to be studied at all, these second-hand texts are traditionally analysed with the



sole purpose of proving that they inevitably fall short of reproducing all the glory of the original. A striking proof of the low status accorded to translated texts comes from the young but by now well-established field of corpus linguistics. A recent survey commissioned by the Network of European Reference Corpora, an EEC-funded project, shows that many corpus builders in Europe specifically exclude translated text from their corpora.<sup>①</sup> This is presumably done on the grounds that translated texts are not representative and that they might distort our view of the “real” language under investigation. It is perhaps justifiable to exclude translated texts which are produced by non-native speakers of the language in question, but what justification can there be for excluding translations produced by native speakers, other than that translated texts per se are thought to be somehow inferior or contrived? Biased as it may be, this traditional view of translation implies, in itself, an acknowledgement of the fact that translational behavior is different from other types of linguistic behavior, quite irrespective of the translator’s mastery of the target language.

The starting point of this paper is that translated texts record genuine communicative events and as such are neither inferior nor superior to other communicative events in any language. They are, however, different, and the nature of this difference needs to be explored and recorded. Moreover, translation should be taken seriously by related disciplines such as linguistics, literary theory and cultural and communication studies, not least because these disciplines can benefit from the results of research carried out in the field of translation. At the same time, as a phenomenon which pervades almost every aspect of our lives and shapes our understanding of the world, the study of translation can hardly be relegated to the periphery of other disciplines and sub-disciplines, those listed above being no exception. What is needed is an academic discipline which takes the phenomenon of translation as its main object of study. For many scholars, this discipline now exists. Some refer to it as the “science of translation,” other as “translatology,” but the most common term used today is “translation studies.”

Eco (1976:7) distinguishes between a discipline and a field of study. The first has “its own method and a precise object” (my emphasis). The second has “a repertoire of interests that is not as yet completely unified.” It could be argued that translation studies is still largely a “field of study” in Eco’s terms. The vast majority of research carried out in this, shall we say emerging discipline, is still concerned exclusively with the relationship between specific source and target texts, rather than with the nature of translated text as such. This relationship is generally investigated using notions such as equivalence, correspondence, and shifts of translation, which betray a preoccupation with practical issues such as the training of translators. More important, the central role that these notions assume in the literature

---

① INL Working Paper 92-11, J. G. Kruyt & E. Putter, *Corpus Design Criteria*: report submitted to the European Commission by the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie, Leiden, as a contribution to a European enquiry into corpus design criteria.



points to a general failure on the part of the theoretical branch of the discipline to define its object of study and to account for it. Instead of exploring features of translated texts as our object of study, we are still trying either to justify them or dismiss them by reference to their originals.

It is my belief that the time is now ripe for a major redefinition of the scope and aims of translation studies, and that we are about to witness a turning point in the history of the discipline. I would like to argue that this turning point will come as a direct consequence of access to large corpora of both original and translated texts and of the development of specific methods and tools for interrogating such corpora in ways which are appropriate to the needs of translation scholars. Large corpora will provide theorists of translation with a unique opportunity to observe the object of their study and to explore what it is that makes it different from other objects of study, such as language in general or indeed any other kind of cultural interaction. It will also allow us to explore, on a larger scale than was ever possible before, the principles that govern translational behavior and the constraints under which it operates. Therein lie the two goals of any theoretical enquiry: to define its object of study and to account for it.

Section 2 below offers an overview of the emerging discipline of translation studies and explains why translation scholars are now in a position to use the insights gained from corpus linguistics, and some of the techniques developed by it, to take translation across the threshold of “field of study” and into the realm of fully-fledged disciplines.

## **2. Translation studies: the state of the art**

### **2.1 Central issues: the status of the source text and the notion of equivalence**

Until very recently, two assumptions dominated all discussions of translation and were never questioned in the literature. The first is that of the primacy of the source text, entailing a requirement for accuracy and faithfulness on the part of the translator. The second is a consequence of the first and is embodied in the notion of equivalence which has been the central concern of all discourse on translation since time immemorial. Translations should strive to be as equivalent to their originals as possible, with equivalence being understood, mainly as a semantic or formal category. The implied aim of all studies on translation was never to establish what translation itself is, as a phenomenon, but rather to determine what an ideal translation, as an instance, should strive to be in order to minimise its inevitable distortion of the message, the spirit, and the elegance of the original.

The essentialist question of how equivalence per se might be established in the course of translation has gradually been tempered by experience and by an explosion in the amount and range of texts which have come to be translated in a variety of ways on a regular basis. Hence, we now have a massive amount of literature which attempts to classify the notion of





equivalence in a multitude of ways, and the question is no longer how equivalence might be achieved but, increasingly, what kind of equivalence can be achieved and in what contexts. This in itself is a noticeable improvement on the traditionally static view of equivalence, but it still assumes the primacy of the source text and it still implies that a translation is merely a text striving to meet the standards of another text.

## 2.2 Developments which support a move towards corpus-based research

The attempt to extend and classify the notion of equivalence has brought with it a need to explore not only the source text as the model to be adhered to but also the target language, and the specific target language text type, in order to give meaning to such categories as stylistic equivalence and functional equivalence. If the idea is not simply to reproduce the formal structures of the source text but also to give some thought, and sometimes priority, to how similar meanings and functions are typically expressed in the target language, then the need to study authentic instances of similar discourse in the two languages becomes obvious.

There have been other developments which have played a more direct role in preparing the ground for corpus work. One such development is the decline of what we might call the semantic view of the relationship between source and target texts. For a long time, discourse on translation was dominated by the idea that meaning, or messages, exist as such and can, indeed should, be transferred from source to target texts in much the same way as one might transfer wine from one glass to another. The traditional dichotomy of translating word-for-word or sense-for-sense is a product of this view of meaning. At about the same time that the notion of equivalence began to be reassessed, or perhaps a little earlier, new ideas began to develop about the nature of meaning in translation. Firth (1968:91) was among the first to suggest that, difficult though as it may appear, an approach which connects structures and systems of language to structures and systems in the context of situation (as opposed to structures and systems of thought) is more manageable and “more easily related to problems of translation.” Similarly, Haas (1986:104) stresses that, in practice, correspondence in meaning amounts to correspondence in use and asserts that “unless we can succeed in thus explaining translation, the mystery of bare and neutral fact will continue to haunt us.” Two expressions are equivalent in meaning if and only if “there is a correspondence between their uses” (ibid.). The importance of this change in orientation, from a conceptual to a situational perspective and from meaning to usage, is that it supports the push towards descriptive studies in general and corpus-based studies in particular. Conceptual and semantic studies (in the traditional sense) can be based on introspection. Studies which take the context into consideration, and even more so, studies which attempt to investigate usage, are, by definition, only feasible if access is available to real data, and, in the case of usage, to substantial amounts of it.

Apart from the decline of the semantic view of translation, another, and very exciting,