

◀ 外研社翻译研究文库 ▶

多元下的统一? 当代翻译研究潮流

UNITY IN DIVERSITY?

Current Trends in Translation Studies

Lynne Bowker
(爱尔兰) Michael Cronin 编
Dorothy Kenny
Jennifer Pearson



外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

◀ 外研社翻译研究文库 ▶

多元下的统一？ 当代翻译研究潮流

UNITY IN DIVERSITY?

Current Trends in Translation Studies

Lynne Bowker
Michael Cronin
Dorothy Kenny
Jennifer Pearson

(爱尔兰) 编



外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

京权图字: 01 - 2006 - 1837

© St Jerome Publishing 1998

All Rights Reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the Publisher or a license permitting restricted copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA), 90 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1P 9HE. In North America, registered users may contact the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC): 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers MA 01923, USA.

First published by St. Jerome Publishing Ltd. Manchester, United Kingdom

This edition is authorized for sale in the People's Republic of China only, excluding Hong Kong SAR, Macao SAR and Taiwan, and may not be bought for export therefrom.

版权所有。未经许可不得以任何方式,在世界任何地区,以任何文字,作全部和局部之翻印、仿制或转载。

本书由英国圣哲罗姆出版有限公司授权外语教学与研究出版社出版影印版。此版本仅限在中华人民共和国境内(不包括香港、澳门特别行政区及台湾省)销售,不得出口。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

多元下的统一? 当代翻译研究潮流 = Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies / (爱尔兰)鲍克(Bowker, L.)等编. — 北京:外语教学与研究出版社, 2007.1

(外研社翻译研究文库)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5600 - 6194 - 8

I. 多… II. 鲍… III. 翻译理论—文集—英文 IV. H059 - 53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2006) 第 154346 号

出 版 人: 李朋义

责任编辑: 文雪琴

封面设计: 袁 璐

出版发行: 外语教学与研究出版社

社 址: 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)

网 址: <http://www.fltrp.com>

印 刷: 北京市鑫霸印务有限公司

开 本: 650×980 1/16

印 张: 13.75

版 次: 2007 年 1 月第 1 版 2007 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978 - 7 - 5600 - 6194 - 8

定 价: 21.90 元

* * *

如有印刷、装订质量问题出版社负责调换

制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励

版权保护办公室举报电话: (010)88817519

外研社翻译研究文库

专家委员会

(按姓氏笔画排列)

王东风	王克非	王宏印	毛思慧
文 军	方梦之	申 丹	申雨平
冯庆华	冯志伟	吕 俊	朱志瑜
朱纯深	庄绎传	刘士聪	许 钧
孙艺风	孙致礼	李亚舒	李德凤
李德超	杨自俭	连淑能	汪榕培
张柏然	张美芳	陈宏薇	陈国华
陈德彰	范守义	柯 平	郭建中
黄忠廉	黄振定	辜正坤	程镇球
谢天振	廖七一	谭载喜	潘文国
穆 雷			

外研社翻译研究文库*

现有书目:

About Translation P. Newmark

《论翻译》

A Practical Guide for Translators G. Samuelsson-Brown

《译者实用指南》

Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface A. Chesterman & E. Wagner

《理论对译者有用吗? 象牙塔与语言工作面之间的对话》

Corpora in Translator Education F. Zanettin et al.

《语料库与译者培养》

Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies S. Granger

《基于语料库的语言对比和翻译研究》

Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II, Historical and Ideological Issues T. Hermans

《跨文化侵越——翻译学研究模式 (II): 历史与意识形态问题》

Electronic Tools for Translators F. Austerlühl

《译者的电子工具》

Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I, Textual and Cognitive Aspects M. Olohan

《超越文化断裂——翻译学研究模式 (I): 文本与认知的译学研究》

Method in Translation History A. Pym

《翻译史研究方法》

Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis (Second Edition) C. Nord

《翻译的文本分析模式: 理论、方法及教学应用》(第二版)

The Translator's Turn D. Robinson

《译者登场》

Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies J. S. Holmes

《译稿杀青! 文学翻译与翻译研究文集》

* 本文库采用开放式结构, 今后还将陆续添加其他有影响的翻译研究著作。

Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context
A. Lefevere

《文学翻译: 比较文学背景下的理论与实践》

Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained D. Robinson

《翻译与帝国: 后殖民理论解读》

Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained P. Fawcett

《翻译与语言: 语言学理论解读》

Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis M. G. Rose

《翻译与文学批评: 翻译作为分析手段》

Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness

R. Ellis & L. Oakley-Brown

《翻译与民族: 英格兰的文化政治》

Translation and Norms C. Schäffner

《翻译与规范》

Translation, Power, Subversion R. Álvarez & M. Vidal

《翻译, 权力, 颠覆》

Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives G. Anderman & M. Rogers

《今日翻译: 趋向与视角》

Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies L. Bowker et al.

《多元下的统一? 当代翻译研究潮流》

Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche D. Robinson

《西方翻译理论: 从希罗多德到尼采》

《多元下的统一？当代翻译研究潮流》是1996年5月在爱尔兰都柏林城市大学举行的一次国际翻译研究研讨会的论文集。大会以“多元下的统一”为主题。四位编者都是都柏林城市大学语言应用与跨文化研究学院教师。合集共分五个单元，除了第一单元外，文章数量分配比较平均，反映编者尽量照顾到多元化中的平衡。文章都不长，很明显是编者对篇幅有一定的限制，文章可能都是经过压缩而成的。

自70年代开始，文学翻译研究的成果打破了语言学在翻译领域的一统天下，为翻译研究注入了新的血液，使它逐渐发展成横跨多个领域的综合学科。到了八九十年代，翻译研究已形成了学派林立、异彩纷呈的局面。流行一时的“文化转向”的说法，不过是强调文化研究在翻译领域突破性的发展，并不意味着所有学派、学者都转向文化研究（事实上也不可能）。语言学的翻译研究并没有停顿，特别是功能语言学的语篇分析在翻译上的应用在近年来进展很快。在翻译研究发生文化转向的同时，哲学、社会学、人类学、文化研究等领域也出现了所谓“翻译转向”，更多领域的学者加入了翻译研究的行列，壮大了翻译研究的队伍，使翻译成为名副其实的跨学科领域；但同时也使翻译和其他领域的界限模糊起来。多元化是当代翻译研究最突出的特点。另一个特点是文本题材范围的扩大，尤其是在欧洲，由于欧盟的需要；实用翻译和口译研究占有相当大的比例。这与英美传统上侧重文学翻译的取向有所不同。这两点都具体地反映在这本文集里了。

翻译上的文化转向是由文学研究的文化转向带动的。文学理论经历了俄国形式主义和新批评的“文本主义”之后，逐渐向文本外缘扩展，如：读者反映美学、多元系统、后殖民主义、女性主义（后二者范围更广泛，几乎涉及文科所有领域）等。在国际文化研究的大气候下，翻译研究的途径和模式也呈现出多元化的趋势。目前活跃的就有关：翻译研究学派（包括操控学派）、语篇分析（包括功能语言学派）、功能主义（目的论）、解构主义、传统语言学派、综合学派（斯奈尔－霍恩比提倡，但实践者不多见）、心理学（有声思维 think-aloud protocols）、语料库语言学、机器辅助翻译以及

后殖民主义、女性主义等（后殖民主义和女性主义比较特殊，因为它具有自身的非学术的立场和目标，与中立的、纯学术研究不同）。

在如此广阔的领域要成为全面掌握并运用各个学派理论的通才学者几乎不可能；翻译学者当中也自然出现了“专业化”的趋势。这样，翻译研究的多元化和学者的分工会不会使翻译学者失去共同的语言呢？是否还有一个统一的翻译研究的存在呢？如何将不同学派和理论统一在翻译研究这面旗帜之下呢？爱尔兰都柏林城市大学研讨会的主办者就是带着这些问题提出了大会的主题“多元下的统一”。

文集里直接回应大会主题的论文不多（有几篇讨论小范围内的多元和统一问题），合起来却呈现出翻译研究的多元化现状和统一的目标。文集涉及很多在中国不多见的选题（有些题目在中国根本没有）和研究方法；有些文章虽然讨论操作层面的细节或是个案研究，但都有很高的理论价值。无论从理论上还是研究方法上，本书都提供了很好的范例，适合研究生教学使用，每篇文章都能够当作文写作范文来读。

第一单元“翻译的本质”内两篇文章处理截然不同的问题。一篇题目虽为《非统一与多元》，但讨论的并不是大会要求的主题，也不是翻译的本质，而是对女性主义翻译和研究的内部“非统一”和“多元化”的回顾。文章引述了几位女性主义批评家的翻译批评；从中可以看到一些女性主义的翻译观、女性主义译者的理论立场与翻译实践之间的矛盾。文中引用的三个概念有助于理解女性主义的理论：身份政治、位置因素和历史维度（此三点亦可用于非女性翻译研究）。这是一篇综述性、批判性文章，作者的女性主义思想并不甚明显，但从引文当中可见一些激进的观点。另一篇《翻译、自传、双语》通过两部自传的分析，揭示双语作者的写作与翻译的相似之处，也折射出翻译的某些特性。

探求“翻译的本质”是所有翻译研究所追求的最终目标。第二单元的几篇文章的结论远远超出“民族翻译”的限制。这一节讨论的都是“小语种”或少数民族语言的翻译，涉及苏格兰、匈牙利、印度、日本、爱尔兰等民族。其中有古希腊悲剧翻译的现实性及其传播、舞台剧的翻译、作家与译者的合作、少数民族语言（Brown & Sherlock），翻译在新的文学文类流传中的作用（Sohár），翻译在印度这个多语社会中的功能以及权力关系（St-Pierre），日本的“边缘”（非正统）翻译概念，如“改编”、“模仿”、“伪译”等，及其被接受的程度（Wakabayashi），以及爱尔兰屏幕翻译（配音与字幕）所涉及的政治、经济、民族主义（历史、文化），甚至读者年龄、性别等

一系列问题 (O'Connell)。虽然题材、经验各异,但影响翻译的过程和接受的因素却显示出我们所熟悉的共同点。特别值得注意的是在这些研究中现代翻译理论的应用 (Wakabayashi) 和严谨的论说方式 (O'Connell)。

翻译是全人类翻译行为的总和,我们往往能从个别的经验中发现普遍规律。匈牙利科幻小说依靠翻译、改写,甚至“伪翻译”得以发展,和中国民国时期文学翻译极其相似;相信其他文化也会有类似的现象。追踪这些“翻译”的背景、演变和发展,解释它们的前因后果,是我们要做的工作。日本的一些边缘概念也是目前各国学者共同关心的问题之一;我们可以通过测试读者接受的方法,进一步理清翻译与非翻译的界限,从中探求“翻译的本质”。爱尔兰屏幕翻译研究的结果推翻了一些通常被认为“理所当然”的观点,出乎意料;但还须在不同文化中(比如中国)进一步考察、验证。这些研究成果都说明,虽然翻译在不同的文化、不同的时期,以不同的面貌出现,其中有些经验甚至是独特的(如印度的多种方言不同的功能、“区内”翻译、“区际”翻译、“国际”翻译、“过滤语言”(转译的中介语言)、“母语”的界定问题等),但仍具有一定的普遍性,而这种普遍性是在其他文化中不易发现的。异国翻译的独特之处往往能纠正我们对翻译的误解或偏见。各种经验的互相启发、印证与补充,对我们最终追求的“翻译的本质”具有重要的意义。

第三单元的四篇文章统称“描写翻译研究”,其实前两单元的所有文章都是描写性的 (descriptive)。第一篇关于六名字幕译者的实验的论文堪称将理论应用到实证研究的典范。字幕翻译受到屏幕画面和播放速度的限制,与一般文字翻译不同,译者有时要作必要的剪辑。通过试验,作者发现了六位译者在每行字幕长度、行数等技术层面的三点重要的分歧,并运用韩礼德的功能语言学分析哪些内容翻译了、哪些压缩了、哪些删节了、各译者在这几方面有哪些不同等。从作者的分析中,我们可以看到通过客观描写所发现的规律,不但在理论上能有建树,对实践同样能起指导作用。作者最后提出的进一步研究的建议也很有启发性:读者如何理解这些不同版本?读者看到的不同版本是否为同一故事?如果是,那么就说明要么语言在电视节目中仅仅是次要的因素,要么译本语言的这些相异之处不属于语言的关键成分;此外,如果研究同一电视节目不同语言的版本也有助于了解翻译的制作与接受。

语料库是语言和翻译研究中必不可少的工具。语料库语言学在翻译理论和实践上的应用也越来越为人重视。第三单元的后三篇文章都讨论语料

库的建立与应用。翻译研究除了需要“双语对照语料库”(源语文本和目标语译本)之外,还要有“双语平行语料库”(同类型的非翻译文本)和“单语比较语料库”(同类型的翻译文本和非翻译文本)。

“平行语料库”能通过对比,帮助我们发现源语和目标语同类型文本的“惯例”(text conventions),为译者实践和翻译教学提供参考(Schäffner, Peters & Picchi)。文本类型在翻译语料库中至关重要;Schäffner 文章中的两个图表都包括文本类型,颇有新意。翻译中经常出现的可能是:译文既不同于源语文本“惯例”,又不同于目标语“惯例”。这说明翻译远比想象中的复杂。Schäffner 文章最后提到的“回顾性”观点和“前瞻性”观点也是区分传统翻译源语取向研究与现代目的语取向研究的一种方法。语料库不仅对学者研究有意义,而且也是译者的重要参考工具。译者能从“平行语料库”中找到现成的自然“对等”词语,而比较语料库能为译者和研究者提供某些词语现存的译法(Peters & Picchi)。这几篇文章中关于翻译语料库的综述部分对语料库的建立和研究很有参考价值。需要指出的是,翻译语料库目前主要用于实用类文本翻译,文学类还有待研究。

第四单元五篇文章都论述机器翻译或机器辅助翻译。机器翻译近年来重要的进展集中在翻译工具方面,其中最令人瞩目的是“翻译记忆”(translation memories)。“翻译记忆”是一种结合机器与人工的翻译工具,就是由机器储存下人工翻译的结果,为以后的同类翻译提供一个简化了的途径或参考。如今国际上很多大型企业都备有这样的“翻译记忆”以应付大量的翻译需求和降低翻译成本。这里的几篇文章介绍了“翻译记忆”的制作原则(O'Brien),机器辅助翻译面临的问题与挑战(Heyn),“翻译记忆”的使用客户调查(Merkel)。目前机器翻译的发展面临的一个问题是人工译员对机器翻译的态度。学者呼吁人工译员在机器翻译的研究中起更重要的作用(Schäler),同时翻译理论家也应与机器翻译理论家共同合作(Bennett)。

最后是口译。这里我们看到的是口译研究的发展回顾与展望(Pöschhacker)和两篇实证研究。传统口译理论认为,译者从外语译成母语才能达到最理想的效果,这似乎已成定论。但学者通过十二名学员的实验证明,从母语译成外语和从外语译成母语要解决的是不同的问题(Tommola & Helevä)。但是学员的技术水平和专业人员有所不同,这篇文章的结论是否正确,还应对专业译员进行实验才能确定。另一篇研究口译的服务对象对译者的要求(听众反映)的文章提出,听众的标准倾向语义的清晰,而

不是流利程度 (Vuorikoski)。这些研究都对译者训练具有重要意义。

结合中国翻译研究现状来看,文集中五个主题的研究在中国都不甚发达,女性主义有一些理论介绍,但具体的文本研究方面比较弱(广东外语外贸大学几个研究生做过研究,可惜没有发表出来)。总体上说,实证研究太少,而所谓理论研究又太多,但不够深入;另外就是传统规定性的(prescriptive)研究仍有市场(文集中规定性的文章一篇都没有)。中国的机器翻译无论在理论还是实践上都进展很慢,连评介国外新发展的文章都很少;这大概是因为一般文科学者缺乏信息技术所致,而计算语言学的滞后也可能是原因之一。“翻译记忆”的应用研究也很少见;这个题材很适合硕士生研究,既需要理论,又有实践意义。口译研究在中国多集中在口译训练上,理论文章并不多。另外,大学里的口译教师多为从业人员,他们的实践经验和技能远远超过理论水平。因此,翻译语料库和口译的理论研究在国内还属新兴领域,大有可为。

大会的主题为“多元下的统一”,而论文集的标题却加上了个问号。这给我提出了进一步思考的问题:“多元”或“统一”能给翻译研究带来什么结果?到底翻译研究要否统一?能否统一?怎样统一?文集中两篇文章回答了第一个问题(Flotow; Pöchhacker):在女性主义和口译研究中,多元化有百益而无一害。文集本身已体现了多元性,包括多元的研究方法,都为我们提供了范例和描写模式。

另一个是翻译研究如何统一的问题。现代翻译研究的多元性已不需证明。但中国有一些学者却始终热衷于将翻译研究限制在译本制作一个方面,把其他文化研究或(比较)文学等的研究统统排斥在外;他们每每津津于毫无新意的、规定性的翻译标准(严格地说,这根本不是研究);如果成风气的话,它只会将翻译研究领回多年徘徊的老路上去,无益发展。翻译研究与其他学科的关系错综复杂,它包含多种学科,也被其他学科所包含。如果一定要划出界限的话,我认为应该分清现代的描写性研究与传统的规定性研究,这样可以减少很多争论。

“多元”只是侧重面不同(翻译过程、翻译结果、译本制作等)、方法不同、文本类型不同、描写模式不同,而这些都“统一”在追求翻译的本质这一共同目标之下。

朱志瑜

香港理工大学中文及双语学系翻译教授、博士生导师

Introduction

Translation studies as a discipline has grown enormously in the last two decades. Each year sees new translation programmes, new journals, new translation titles added to the burgeoning list of publications in the area. Conferences on translation topics are organized around the globe and attract keen, committed audiences. Contributions to the discipline come from the fields of machine translation, history, literature, philosophy, linguistics, terminology, interpreting, screen translation, translation pedagogy, software localization and lexicography. This list is indicative rather than exhaustive. There is evidently great diversity in translation studies but is there much unity? Have the different branches of translation studies become so specialized that they can no longer talk to each other? Would translation studies be strengthened or weakened by the search for or the existence of unifying principles?

It could be argued that translation studies is simply going the way of other disciplines in a world where in the sciences alone there are estimated to be 90,000 specialisms. The path of development is the path of meiosis, with fragmentation the inevitable consequence of disciplinary expansion. Fragmentation indeed is celebrated by many postmodern critics as a triumph over the totalizing theories of modernity, theories that erased difference in the name of unity and sacrificed the peripheral to the centripetal coercion of 'master' theories. Translation, which involves language and culture contact, border crossings, power brokering, is certainly an activity that is sensitive to the pressures of culture, politics and place and to the persistent danger of erasure and invisibility. The historical experience of translators has certainly been a strength in making translation theorists aware of how what is deemed to be marginal may in fact be central to the construction of a language, culture or society. For this very reason, it is important that in our discipline we do not practise our own forms of exclusion.

In this volume we have brought together translation theoreticians from the fields of machine translation, interpreting, feminist theory, computer-assisted translation, advertising, literature, linguistics, screen translation and translation pedagogy to counter the tendency to partition or exclude in translation studies. It is important that machine translation specialists and literary translators be found between the covers of the same book if only because the nomadic journeying of concepts is often the key to intellectual discovery and renewal. Celebrating our differences does not entail denigrating the commonality of our concerns. Too often the discipline of translation studies can fetishize difference at the expense of memory. Linguistics was embraced with enthusiasm in the 1960s

and early 1970s and then abandoned with similar gusto in the 1980s, despite the fact that the discipline of linguistics itself has changed radically in those years and still has much to teach us. Systems theory was championed and then pilloried and yet the full insights of systems theory have still to be properly applied to translation studies. Machine translation was hailed as the translation Messiah and then became the butt of a thousand jokes repeated ad nauseam about howlers found in MT output. Yet machine translation is a very different activity from that practised in the early 1960s, a fact that is forgotten or conveniently ignored. The blind embrace of theoretical fashion can lead to much theoretical redundancy as the same observations appear endlessly in different terminological guises. Theory should be as much an act of memory as an act of invention and we should be loath to cast aside disciplines that are suddenly deemed to be useless or irrelevant.

If it is important to remember the past, the future too should not be forgotten. New technologies, for example, are having a decisive impact on the nature of the translation profession and we must remain aware of developments that are changing and will continue to change in very real ways the working practices of translators.

Harlequin, not Jerome, could in our time be considered the emblematic figure of translation studies. Information theory, linguistics, systems theory, gender theory, semiotics, and cognitive psychology are some of the disciplines that have been appropriated by translation theoreticians to provide the perfect theoretical 'fit' for translation studies. Is the interdisciplinary whole greater than the sum of the disciplinary parts or do we have juxtaposition without shape, colours without form?

It is striking that though we talk to each other more and more, even if frequently within rather than across translation specialisms, we seem to talk on the whole to ourselves. Countless conferences, articles, and books on history, sociology, anthropology, politics, new technologies, and philosophy in the late twentieth century simply ignore the question of language and translation. And yet in an era of globalization, migration, mass tourism, multilingual federal structures, postcolonial debate and exponential progress in information technology, translation studies is arguably at the very heart of our attempts to comprehend the developments in the late modern age. The articles in this volume illustrate the capacity of translation studies to deal with a very diverse range of phenomena, a capacity that was already evident in the Translation Studies Conference organized by Dublin City University in 1996, a conference that originally prompted the idea of a volume of articles on the theme of unity in diversity. The volume is as much about questions as answers and one recurring question is: does translation studies have a number of core distinguishing features that set it apart as a discipline in its own right?

Would greater disciplinary integration be a gain or a loss? Or is translation studies merely experiencing an epistemological crisis of confidence that has afflicted most areas of human enquiry since the 1960s? *Translation Studies: Unity in Diversity?* examines these questions and others in articles from many different areas of translation studies. The articles draw attention to the complex nature of the translation transaction and indeed reveal a number of cases of previously unexplored aspects of the phenomenon of translation. The collection deliberately brings together areas of translation studies that are often addressed in separate volumes and arenas in order to suggest areas of common interest beyond the necessary boundaries of specialization. The merits of unity and the virtues of diversity are debated from theoretical, practical and professional perspectives.

Theory is rarely a stranger to orthodoxy and translation theory is no exception. The articles in the first section of this volume challenge assumptions that are made about the nature of translation. Gender and translation, the consequences of translation for self-construction and the position of translation in the cultural and economic dynamics of globalization are considered in addition to specific speculation on the pertinence of translation to late twentieth-century experience.

Luise von Flotow, in 'Dis-unity and Diversity: Feminist Approaches to Translation Studies, details the impressive growth in recent years of feminist scholarship in the area of translation studies. She then charts the lines of antagonism and tension that separate the different feminist theoreticians, particularly centring around the questions of history, identity and positionality. The article argues that theoretical unity is of questionable value and that for feminist theoreticians of translation, diversity is not simply a consequence of the complexity of the object observed but is a desirable outcome of any theoretical endeavour. Susan Ingram examines the autobiographical writings of Alice Kaplan and Eva Hoffman from the standpoint of the bilingual author for whom writing is an act of translation. The contrasting experiences of Kaplan and Hoffman are analyzed in the context of translation as either dispossession or emancipation, a form of humiliating alienation and displacement or a powerful means of personal and cultural enrichment. Walter Benjamin's reading of 'the Kafka situation' and the writings of Deleuze and Guattari on 'minor' literatures are integrated into a theory of authorial identity that is crucially dependent on the figure of translation.

Translation in national context is the theme which links the five articles by Brown and Sherlock, Sohár, St-Pierre, Wakabayashi and O'Connell. While these authors are all writing from quite diverse cultural perspectives, dealing with different languages (Scots, Welsh, Irish, Hungarian, Japanese and the many languages of India) and different translation processes, the question of context recurs in all of the articles.

The context or environment in which a translation is to be received will determine which translation process is most appropriate. It may be more appropriate to adapt texts to the social, cultural and political climate of the target culture, as described by Brown and Sherlock in their account of the challenges they faced in translating the ancient Greek myth of Antigone into contemporary Scots and Welsh. Or perhaps in cases where a particular genre does not exist in a culture, it is better to create fictitious translations of works, i.e. texts masquerading as translations and which have no source text, rather than genuine translations as has happened in the case of science fiction in Hungary. The Indian experience of translation shows the extent to which relations of power between languages are reinforced by certain translation policy decisions. In other cases, it may be that knowledge of the source language is a prerequisite for the understanding of the target text, a notion explored in Wakabayashi's fascinating overview of marginal forms of translation in Japan. In the case of Ireland, assumptions made about the target audience have crucial consequences for screen translation policies. Indeed, whichever process translators choose, whether to adapt, to transpose, to create or to translate in the more conventional manner, their choice is determined by their understanding of the expectations and capabilities of their audience.

Brown and Sherlock discuss aspects of the nature of translation and proceed, on the basis of that discussion, to consider the nature of the Scots and Welsh languages. They discuss the nature of the process in which myth, specifically Greek myth, may be translated into another culture. The authors argue that the process usually called 'adaptation' is actually one of translation of a significant mythic structure from the premises of one cultural frame to another in a way analogous to the translation of text from one language to another. They also discuss the ways in which Welsh and Scots are capable of dealing with the material of the Antigone play as written by Brown within a Scots cultural frame. Finally, they raise some tentative hypotheses about modern Scots and Welsh as languages. Anikó Sohár examines how science fiction and fantasy novels are developed and established in Hungary through translation and pseudo-translation. Paul St-Pierre draws on the plurilingual reality of modern India to argue that translation principles are not immutable, ahistorical universals but are grounded in the specific linguistic, historical and political experiences of a country. The notion that one should, for example, only translate into one's mother tongue is both impractical and culturally harmful in the Indian context. He explores the translation relationships between the different Indian languages and the role of English as a filter language. St-Pierre alludes to the notion of 'transcreation' to demonstrate how translation into English can often be a way of reinforcing rather than weakening different language identities in India. Judy Wakaba-

yashi's article focuses on two non-prototypical methods of rendering foreign texts into a form comprehensible to Japanese readers. The first method, *kambun kundoku*, uses grammatical indicators and marks indicating word order so as to allow Japanese readers direct access to Chinese texts. Another practice common throughout Japanese literary history has been adaptation, with both traditional Chinese tales and European works being adapted to varying degrees, often by famous writers who have used adaptations as a stimulus for their own creative activities. She examines the degree of acceptance in Japan of these practices as translation, and the nature of the relationship between the source and 'target' texts in these instances. Eithne O'Connell examines the choices and constraints that are operative in screen translation. She emphasizes the distinct nature of dubbing and subtitling and challenges traditional explanations that are put forward to explain the choice of dubbing over subtitling. O'Connell stresses the importance of language politics and language planning in screen translation decisions, particularly with respect to minority languages. She also draws attention to factors of age, literacy levels and gender that can influence the choice of dubbing or subtitling.

Theoretical work in translation studies, as in any other discipline, is powerfully informed by appropriate descriptive studies. Irena Kovacic points up the complexity of subtitling and the often significant variation in subtitling choices from one subtitler to another. Using a set of textual parameters and Halliday's model of linguistic functions she examines the nature of differences in the work of six different subtitlers. Her article highlights the significance of language register and ideational function in the analysis of subtitles and speculates as to the impact of subtitling difference on audience reception. Christina Schäffner's contribution to this volume reveals an interest in using real L1 and L2 texts in discussions of translation. This time the focus is on the translation classroom, but Schäffner suggests that newly emerging text types will lead to a questioning across the board in translation theory of fundamental concepts such as parallel text and text type. Peters and Picchi describe procedures that have been developed at the Istituto di Linguistica Computazionale, Pisa, to construct and query bilingual corpora and to extract significant data for translation purposes and contrastive textual studies. They treat both parallel corpora, i.e. collections of source texts and their translations into a target language, and bilingual comparable corpora, collections of L1 and L2 texts, that, although they were produced in comparable L1 and L2 contexts, do not actually bear any translation relationship to one another. Sara Laviosa's article describes the use of a monolingual English comparable corpus to identify features that differentiate translated text from text originally written in English. She focuses in particular on the hypothesis that simplification is characteristic of translated text. What Laviosa

and Peters and Picchi have in common is an interest in establishing rigorous procedures for the empirical investigation of translation.

Computer-Aided Translation and Machine Translation have undergone considerable changes over the last decade and no adequate account of contemporary research in translation studies can afford to ignore these areas. One recent development, the advent of translation memories, relies on the cooperation of humans and computers: humans do the translations; computers store and recycle the same translations. In her article, Sharon O'Brien explains the basic principles of translation memories and text alignment systems and their use in the software localization industry, one of the biggest users of such systems. O'Brien's article is followed by a contribution from one of the leading industrial experts in Computer-Aided Translation (CAT), Matthias Heyn. Heyn broadens the debate on translation memories with a detailed discussion of the technology involved, the users it serves, and its psychological and financial impact on translators. He argues that the relatively simple interfaces that translation memory (TM) systems come with belie the complex internal functioning of such systems, and he debunks the notion that it is just the software sector that uses TM systems, stressing that user profiles are changing, and broadening, all the time. The growth of application areas for this technology in turn means that the core functionality of TM systems has to be extended to cope with the diversity of user needs, and Heyn provides a much more fine-grained classification of these needs than have been seen in previous discussion. Magnus Merkel, in his contribution, offers a detailed analysis of the responses of technical translators, project leaders and translation customers to the issue of variation and consistency. He does this specifically in relation to the use of translation memories and other CAT tools. Merkel finds that translators on the whole are positive in their attitude towards translation tools and value consistency in technical translation. However, he finds evidence of considerable variation in what translators deem to be the 'best' translation of particular segments and wonders whether translators will always be willing to accept the translations suggested by TM based programs. Customers also expressed certain reservations about excessive reliance on translation memories that had not been properly verified. More generally, among technical translators themselves there was a strong awareness of the importance of functional contexts in dictating translation choices.

Human Translation and CAT have not always been seen as compatible, and Reinhard Schäler would argue that many human translators still have (misguided) misgivings about the role computers are playing in the translation process. Schäler argues that traditional translators have a system of values and references that can make them ill-disposed towards CAT. Translation realities, however, mean that CAT is being used more