

国外翻译研究丛书之二十九

DICTIONARY OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

翻译学词典

MARK SHUTTLEWORTH & MOIRA COWIE



上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

国外翻译研究丛书之二十九

DICTIONARY OF
TRANSLATION STUDIES

翻 译 学 词 典

Mark Shuttleworth & Moira Cowie



外教社

上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

翻译学词典 / 马克 (Mark, S.), 莫伊拉 (Moira, C.) 著.

—上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2004

(国外翻译研究丛书)

书名原文: Dictionary of Translation Studies

ISBN 7-81095-063-0

I. 翻… II. ①马…②莫… III. 翻译 一词典—英文

IV. H059-61

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2003)第112419号

图字: 09-2003-534号

出版发行: 上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电话: 021-65425300 (总机), 35051812 (发行部)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 刘 璟

印 刷: 常熟市华顺印刷有限公司

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 880×1230 1/32 印张 8.25 字数 275 千字

版 次: 2004年4月第1版 2004年4月第1次印刷

印 数: 5 000册

书 号: ISBN 7-81095-063-0 / H · 020

定 价: 14.20 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题, 可向本社调换

出版说明

近年来,国内翻译研究取得了很大进展,有关翻译研究的丛书也出了多套。不过,长期以来,国内引进的原版翻译著作匮乏,不少研究都是根据二手资料;另外,学习翻译专业的研究生人数越来越多,这种状况若继续存在,将十分不利于学科的发展和翻译人才的培养。鉴于此,上海外语教育出版社约请了多名国内翻译研究著名学者分别开列出最值得引进的国外翻译研究论著的书目,并对这些书目进行整理、排序,最终确定了准备引进的正式书单。该丛书涉及的论著时间跨度大,既有经典,也有新论;内容的覆盖面也相当广泛,既有翻译本体的研究,也有跨学科的研究。这套丛书的引进将会满足翻译专业研究生教学原版参考书和翻译理论研究的需要。

上海外语教育出版社谨以此丛书献给我国的翻译学界。

“国外翻译研究丛书”专家委员会

主任委员 季羨林 王宗炎 刘重德

副主任委员(以姓氏笔画为序)

申 丹 吕 俊 刘靖之 许 钧 庄智象 李文俊
汪榕培 金圣华 金 隄 林茂荪 罗新璋 罗选民
杨自俭 张 今 张柏然 郭建中 程镇球 谭载喜

委员(以姓氏笔画为序)

王克非 王 宁 王宏印 王东风 方梦之 毛荣贵
刘士聪 刘树森 刘和平 刘宓庆 冯庆华 朱纯深
朱志瑜 孙致礼 孙艺风 孙迎春 李亚舒 汪义群
连淑能 范守义 陈宏薇 林克难 罗进德 罗国林
邱懋如 郑体武 杨晓荣 张美芳 张南峰 柯 平
柯文礼 郭著章 高 健 黄 任 黄振定 黄忠廉
崔永禄 傅勇林 辜正坤 谢天振 蔡新乐 廖七一
穆 雷

秘书 孙 玉

借鉴和创造 (代序)

上海外语教育出版社自成立以来一直是我国外语教育最优秀的后勤部和侦调部。因为它不但为我国各个层次(尤其本科与研究生层次)的外语教育提供了多种高水平的教材、教参和工具书,而且还出版了多学科、多语种和多系列的中文版和外文版的学术著作,比如“现代语言学丛书”、“牛津应用语言学丛书”、“美国文学史论译丛”、“外国文学史丛书”、“剑桥文学指南丛书”、“当代英语语言学丛书”以及列入国家及教育部规划的人文社科重点项目的外国语言文学、文化等方面的图书等。为了适应我国现代化建设和教育改革的需要,还出版了一批国际金融、对外贸易、涉外保险、国际经济法、国际新闻和管理科学等方面的教材与专著。这些著作在外语的学科建设与学术研究以及复合型人才培养等方面都在发挥着强有力的侦察、调研和指导作用。这是外语界有口皆碑的。

随着中外文化交流的纵深发展以及我国现代化建设对人才的需求,对比语言学和翻译学近些年来在我国有了较快的发展,最突出的证据就是①外语类硕士博士点上研究对比与翻译方向的学生在逐年迅速增多,而且我们的高校已经有了翻译学院和翻译系(当然还太少)。②外语专业的学生考中文、法律等其他人文社科专业的硕士、博士以及反方向的走向已经起步。这种跨学科的人才已成为人才资源竞争的最主要对象,因此发展趋势定会看好。上海外语教育出版社为适应这种高层次人才培养和新学科建设的需要,不但积极出版国内关于对比研究和翻译研究的专著和论文集,最近又推出了原版“国外翻译研究丛书”,

这套丛书时间跨度从古代到现代,所选书目皆为译学发展史上有里程碑作用的名家名著,堪称译学经典。他们计划分批出版,以满足读者的需求。

这套丛书的出版首先可以解决国内翻译教学原版参考书多年匮乏的困难,真可以说是我国翻译教学与理论研究的及时雨。我想学习和关心这个学科的师生和其他人士定会对这套书的引进为之欢呼,为之祝贺。

这套丛书的价值还在于能大大促进我国翻译学科建设的发展。译学学科的发展依赖于研究者在三个方面的深入研究和结合。一是对本国译学的继承性研究;二是对外国译学的借鉴性研究;三是对翻译实践和翻译教学中新问题的探索性研究。只有这三者研究深入并结合好了,才可能从经验与技巧逐步升华为具有科学性的译学理论。这三个方面的研究,改革开放以来,在我国已取得了很显著的成就,这是有目共睹的。翻译学在我国已于20世纪80年代末有了独立学科的初级形态,90年代又有了新的发展,对学科的独立性以及理论体系的结构与功能有了更多的探讨。依照学科建设的规律和研究现状,我们尚需在上述三个方面加大研究力度,而这套丛书就是借鉴性研究的主要资源。从这个角度讲,这套丛书的引进也是我国文化基本建设的重要工程之一。

在新的世纪,文化(包括各类科学技术)会多方面快速深入人类的日常生活,各国之间的交流会空前深广,因此翻译的功能会逐步扩大,实用性翻译人才的需求量定会空前增加。这就要求我们除了做好高层次研究型人才的培养以外,还应十分重视实用性人才的培养和应用译学的研究。我想出版社一定会关注和引导译学建设的理论研究与应用的发展趋势。

杨自俭

青岛海洋大学六三居室

2001年3月28日

出版前言

翻译学作为一门学科,始终处于不断的发展和变化过程中。它既沟通、连接了许多不同的学术课题,使其互通有无;又自成一体,吐故纳新,吸取百家精华,使得各种学科的理论、假设因此拥有实践的战场。而翻译学最终的理论创新和收获又反过来可为其他各学科所共享。譬如,翻译研究就一直不断地从文学、哲学、人类学、语言学等跨度较大的学科中汲取知识,获得灵感和研究方法,反之亦然。

本书作者通过对各个国家翻译作品以及其中出现的翻译概念和方法的精心研究与区分,采撷了共 300 余条翻译术语,试图从研究翻译词汇的角度,客观、全面地向读者介绍该领域内的学术发现、争议和存在的问题。

书中不仅引进了翻译的许多重要的术语和概念,还向读者介绍了翻译行为的类别,以及众多的翻译学派及其研究方法等。书中核心词汇的主要来源如下:一、由具有高度适应性和再生性的词缀构成的词汇,如由后缀-eme 构成的 architranseme 和 repertoreme 等;二、由多个可辨析的字根联合构成语义明确的新合成词,如 minimax, polysystem 和 translatology 等;三、也是数量最多的一类,由常用词汇在原含义基础之上,被赋予新的、科技性的含义,如 abusive translation, compensation, identity, loyalty, mapping, overt translation, protest, target language, thick translation, third code, unbounded translation 和 voids 等。此外,鉴于 re-和 trans-这两种前缀与翻译的性质有着明显、密切的语义关系,它们在书中高频率的出现,就不足为怪了。如 recodification, recomposition, re-creation, reformulation, restatement 和 rewriting 等,以及如 transcend-

ence, transfer, transfusion, transmission, transmutation 和 transplantation 等。

本书的编写具有独到之处：一、非翻译专业词汇的出现率被控制在最低，以使专业词汇获得充分解释的空间；即使非翻译专业词汇出现在某一词条的释义中，也决不会单独罗列。二、着意收录近三四十年内翻译研究文献中出现的术语，同时也收录在此之前那些用法已经固定下来、被广泛使用的词汇，譬如由翻译家 Dryden, Schleiermacher 和 Walter Benjamin 等发明的词汇。三、为了全面回顾翻译研究的发展历史，本书格外收录了一些非英语的翻译词条（主要来自于法国和德国等著名翻译学者的作品），以便读者能够了解非英语国家学者为这一领域贡献的某些重要观点和想法并从中得到启示。四、耳听八方，收集各类观点；鉴于翻译研究本身就是一个仁者见仁、智者见智的过程，本书竭力以公正的态度，不刻意偏袒或倾向于某一特定的翻译派别，将翻译研究的横向发展向读者作一介绍。值得注意的是，书中出现的词条，由于没有上下文的铺垫，在观点或内容上，可能彼此互相矛盾、相互对立。如 exegetical fidelity 反映了《圣经》译者坚决忠实于原文，认为原文包含的唯一正确的意义必须在的文中得到保留和传递；而 information offer 和 metatext 却认为不仅原作者的意图，更重要的是语言的特性、翻译原作的目的以及语读者的民族性、偏爱和信仰影响了读者对原文意义的理解。五、本书对同一现象或类似现象的不同的描述方法进行了区分，如分析 third code、third language 与 translationese 之间的异同；并对某些翻译术语概念上的混乱予以澄清，如对描述 corpora 的不同类型的词汇进行一一解释。六、本书的篇幅决定了它对翻译研究中的论题只能敬而远之，不予着墨，如 literary translation、the translation of names 及 the impossibility of translation 等不被列入词条；也会冷落一些重要的翻译人物，如 George Steiner 和 Georges Mounin，因为他们作品中出现的名词可能并不符合收录要求。

此外，书中每一条术语均出自其最初出现的翻译文献的上下文中，并附以清晰、详尽、丰富的诠释。重要术语还格外收录了与此术语在用法及具体操作等方面相关的见解和评论。所有词条一律提供必要检索，以备读者进一步查阅，书后并细录所有

参考书目。

相信本书对英语专业研究生、本科生、高校英语教师以及广大的英语翻译爱好者来说,都必不可少,助益多多。

Introduction

Translation Studies – A discipline and its terminology

The 1990s are an exciting time for Translation Studies. Worldwide, the study of translation-based topics is assuming an increasingly high profile. International conferences are being organized, PhDs are being written, and new MA programmes are being set up all the time; in Great Britain alone, for example, at the time of writing postgraduate programmes in various aspects of Translation Studies are being offered by at least ten universities. Similarly, new textbooks and monographs are being produced at such a rate that it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep abreast of all the developments in thinking about translation. Furthermore, the whole endeavour has been characterized by a sheer determination to move forward in what can be meaningfully, usefully and – perhaps most importantly – non-trivially said about the practices of translation and the characteristics of translations. There is a positive feeling in the air that, while our grasp of certain matters connected with translation remains somewhat hazy, we are gradually increasing our knowledge and understanding of this intriguing yet highly complex subject.

However, Translation Studies as a discipline is in many ways still in a state of flux. Translation can be seen as a point of intersection between many different academic subjects; it is an area in which many other disciplines have legitimately expressed an interest, and conversely one which has provided its own experts with insights which can profitably be shared elsewhere. There is for example a considerable exchange of knowledge, insights and methodologies between Translation Studies and fields as diverse as literary studies, philosophy, anthropology and linguistics; indeed, such is the level of intellectual cross-fertilization that some writers have suggested that the field should be known as an *interdiscipline* (see Snell-Hornby 1991, 1994). Similarly, there are a number of equally legitimate reasons which scholars have had for pursuing an interest in Translation

Studies. For example, some are motivated by highly practical concerns, such as the need to provide future translators or interpreters with training which is of the highest possible quality, the desire to raise the professional profile of translators and interpreters, or the wish to develop increasingly powerful machine translation systems; others, on the other hand, simply seek to provide ever more accurate and comprehensive explanations for certain phenomena in the world about us, without being primarily concerned with the possible practical applications which may accrue. Thus goals and objectives can vary considerably within the discipline. Of course, Translation Studies has been enriched by dint of possessing such a multi-faceted nature. However, at the same time this very nature has meant that there is still considerable lack of agreement on the irreducible minimum of concepts which should form the foundation on which to build; added to this is the fact that Translation Studies is a relatively new discipline which is in many ways still "finding its feet". The result of such a situation has often been that different branches of the discipline have at times experimented with widely differing methodologies, some of which have been imported wholesale from other areas of academic study, and not all of which, unfortunately, have been entirely germane to the study of translation. This is perhaps particularly true of certain approaches adopted from various branches of linguistics.

The impact that this situation has had on the evolving terminology of Translation Studies has of course been considerable. Along with their methodologies, whole terminologies designed as the descriptive apparatus for completely different areas have been taken over by the discipline. A particular instance of this is the way in which a number of writers interested in investigating translation from a linguistic angle have in the past adopted terms coined in linguistics, often optimistically assuming that these terms and the notions which lie behind them are equally valuable in the investigation of translation. However, there have of course been many occasions where terms have been borrowed and successfully adapted to their new environment; in this way the terminology of Translation Studies has been enriched by imports from disciplines as varied as linguistics, literary theory and even mathematics and biology. Finally – and probably most significantly from the point of view of the long-term health of the discipline as a whole – there has also been a huge amount of "native" terminology, or in other words terms which have

been coined in order to describe concepts and phenomena specifically relevant to the study of translation.

This last category of terms – which is the area on which the *Dictionary* is almost exclusively focused – can be said to derive from a number of sources. First of all, many terms have been coined using what one might call “standard terminological morphemes”. For example, a number of terms contain that highly productive suffix *-eme* (for example *architranseme* and *repertoreme*). Similarly, other terms have been formulated by using recognizable roots to create a semantically transparent compound (such as *minimax*, *polysystem* and *translatology*). However, such coinings are probably in a minority, as most of the terms in the *Dictionary* are quite simply “normal” English words which are being used in a new, technical sense. Indeed, the English language (among others) has been rifled for ideas which might cast new light on some aspect of translation. *Abusive translation*, *compensation*, *identity*, *loyalty*, *mapping*, *overt translation*, *protest*, *target language*, *thick translation*, *third code*, *unbounded translation* and *voids* are all examples of such terms. In this connection words containing the prefixes *re-* (e.g. *recodification*, *recomposition*, *re-creation*, *reformulation*, *restatement* and *rewriting*) and *trans-* (e.g. *transcendence*, *transfer*, *transfusion*, *transmission*, *transmutation* and *transplantation*) have (quite understandably, given the nature of translation) found a particularly widespread application.

In each case, the meaning (or one of the meanings) of the word in question is figuratively extended so as to encompass the translational phenomenon to which it refers. Moreover, some of these uses (such as *mapping*, *target language* and *transfusion*) are clearly metaphorical in that they invite comparison between (some aspect of) translation and some other real-world phenomenon. Clearly, as Nida points out when talking about *models* of the translation process, our choice of *terms* must above all be dictated by “their practical usefulness and their explanatory power” (1969:489). Of course, most terms – including those listed above – succeed in reflecting important aspects of translation. However, there is surely a sense in which the terms which we choose to coin will influence the way in which we view translation. Many words could be used as translation terms but for some reason are not. Indeed it would be possible to argue that a large proportion of the words in any standard English dictionary are at least potentially applicable to translation; however, it is purely a matter of speculation

whether Translation Studies would have been channelled in a significantly different direction had another, parallel set of terms been selected. We must therefore conclude – as Nida does in the case of models – that, while terms are “essential aids to comprehension”, they must not be allowed to “dictate the nature of what they are supposed to explicate” (1969:488).

However, if the terminology affects the way thinking develops, its precise shape can also in some ways be said to provide a kind of profile of the way the discipline of Translation Studies as a whole has been evolving. Thus, for example, a considerable number of terms have arisen to describe types of translation which represent various stages between the extremes of *literal* and *free* translation (e.g. *interlinear translation*, *word-for-word translation*, *metaphrase*, *idiomatic translation* and *imitation*), while a large number of (generally speaking more recent) terms bear witness to the remarkable parallel evolution of the idea of distinguishing translation according to the extent to which the function of the original can or needs to be reproduced in the translation (e.g. *covert translation*, *secondary translation*, *observational receiver* and *documentary translation*). In this way, many of the issues which have occupied centre stage in the discipline over the last few decades are reflected in the sheer number of synonymous or related terms which refer to them. Detractors might wish to argue that this situation represents a conceptual log-jam in which a small number of concepts are endlessly reworded and relabelled without anything being brought into sharper focus. On the other hand, it could also be taken as evidence that people working in different parts of the world – and often in different languages and traditions – have frequently shared concerns and preoccupations which have been remarkably similar. While those who hold such a view would argue that translation is infuriatingly difficult to pin down with a single theory, always keeping one step ahead of one’s attempts to categorize it in some way, they might also hope to see the terminology undergo a process of crystallization as various clearly defined approaches and commonly accepted insights gradually emerge.

Aims of the Dictionary

It is against this background that the *Dictionary* has been written. For

this reason one of its aims is – within the limitations of a reference work of such dimensions – to provide an overview of some of the issues, insights and debates in Translation Studies, inasmuch as these are reflected in the discipline's terminology. What this means in practical terms is investigated below.

Firstly, as stated in the previous section non-Translation Studies terms have been kept to a minimum in order to be able to devote as much space as possible to terminology specific to the study of translation. This means that while such terms are sometimes given a brief gloss in the discussion of a translation term, they rarely themselves form the subject of a separate entry.

Secondly, as a kind of "snapshot" of the discipline, the *Dictionary* tends to concentrate on work produced within the last three or four decades. This is not to say that nothing has been included which originates from before this period; however, most of the earlier works which have been consulted (such as those by Dryden, Schleiermacher and Walter Benjamin) are generally considered to be classics.

Thirdly, in order to give the *Dictionary* a broader overview it has been decided to include some important non-English terms. These have mostly been taken from works by the major scholars writing in French or German. However, it should be pointed out that the *Dictionary* is not intended as a multilingual glossary. It is thus not the work to consult if you are wanting to know the German for *pseudotranslation*, for example; similarly, very few entries are included with the main purpose of explaining interlingual differences in usage. The principle reason for discussing foreign terms is simply to provide monolingual readers of English with access to some of the important approaches which have been developed in these languages by making available in English some of the terms which they have generated.

The fourth point concerns the need to provide a reasonable breadth of perspective on terms, rather than just one point of view. Translation Studies contains many different and often conflicting perceptions, insights and beliefs, and reflecting this, the *Dictionary* does not exclusively follow one single approach. It is therefore possible to find statements in different entries which, taken out of context, seem to contradict each other. For example, terms such as *exegetical fidelity* reflect the conviction of most Bible translators that their source text has a single, correct meaning which has to be retrieved and conveyed, while in the entries on *information offer* or *metatext*, for example,

one finds the opposite view that the meaning of a text is determined not only by the author's original intentions, but also to a large extent by the language in which it is written, the context in which it is meant to be read and indeed the personality, interests and beliefs of the reader (or, of course, translator). A further, natural consequence of trying to provide a balanced overview is that no particular attempt has been made to reconcile differing attitudes to the validity and applicability of such translation strategies as *adaptation* or *literal translation*. However, it is of course impossible to rid oneself of all bias, although the attempt has been made, for example, to avoid using certain terms and stylistic effects (such as *target-oriented*, *traditional*, *pre-scientific* and *prescriptive*, or unnecessary inverted commas) in such a way that they might appear to be conferring either strong approval or strong disapproval on what they are being applied to.

The *Dictionary* is thus designed to follow a basically uncritical, "hands-off" approach. In line with this, it seeks to document the accumulation of knowledge and insights which has occurred over the last few decades, rather than introducing large numbers of new terminological distinctions. The one main exception to this is that on occasion attempts have been made to suggest ways of distinguishing between various terms which refer to a similar phenomenon (such as *third code*, *third language* and *translationese*), or in areas where some confusion seems to exist (such as the terminology used to describe different types of *corpora*). However, there will no doubt be those who argue with the emphases that the *Dictionary* contains or consider that a particular group of terms should not have been given the prominence accorded it. In response to such potential criticism, it should be pointed out that a work of this type inevitably represents a *selection*, and that one can only hope that the criteria used are not too personal, partisan or slanted in any other way.

While the *Dictionary* offers an overview of the discipline in the ways described above, it is essential to remember that it is a dictionary of terms, not topics. Consequently the *Dictionary* has tended to draw mainly from sources which are rich in terminology, regardless of how well established they are considered to be. Reading the *Dictionary* the user might thus get the impression that certain very important figures in the discipline (such as George Steiner and Georges Mounin) are not properly represented. It should be stressed that this is not due to any lack of appreciation for the major contributions

which these writers have made to the discipline: it is simply a result of the fact that their contributions, important as they are, are not terminology-rich. Similarly, many important topics (such as *literary translation*, the *translation of names* or the *impossibility of translation*) have not been included as entries in their own right, although many of the issues which they involve are raised in the discussion of specific terms. Readers can properly expect all prominent authors and major themes to be better represented in encyclopaedias, which essentially deal with topics and not with terms (see for example *An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English- English-Chinese*, published by the Chinese University of Hong Kong, *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (in press) and the de Gruyter encyclopaedia, which is due to appear sometime after the year 2000).

Some theoretical problems

The problems involved in writing a dictionary of this type are considerable. Many of them do not need to be aired in public; however, in order for the user to obtain a fuller understanding of the nature of translation-specific terminology, it will be necessary to discuss two particularly problematic areas.

Firstly, as stated above, there is the question of selection. It is clear that no reference work can hope to be completely exhaustive; in the case of the present *Dictionary*, there were certainly a large number of terms which were considered for inclusion, but were eventually rejected, at least as separate entries. Thus for example, many minor terms have either been omitted entirely, or explained briefly in the context of a more important term (so that *junction* is explained under *texteme*, and *cultural filter* under *covert translation*). Furthermore, there would quite simply not have been room to accommodate all the “normal” English (let alone French or German) words which are constantly being press-ganged into service in Translation Studies. Many words of this type are used in ways which are clear and transparent, and often also informal and *ad hoc*; consequently, no separate entry has been considered necessary for such items as *cover-to-cover translation*, *content-based translation*, *naturalization*, or *reader-oriented translation*, as well as for many of the *re-* and *trans-* words listed above.