外研社翻译研究文库

翻译与规范

TRANSLATION AND NORMS

（德）Christina Schäffner 编

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

翻译与规范

TRANSLATION AND NORMS

(德) Christina Schäffner 编

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS
北京 BEIJING

京权图字：01－2006－1915

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

翻译与规范 = Translation and Norms /（德）谢芙娜(Schäffner, C.)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 978－7－5600－6193－1

Ⅰ. 翻… Ⅱ. 谢… Ⅲ. 翻译—规范—英文 Ⅳ. H059－65

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2006) 第 154343 号

出 版 人：李朋义
责任编辑：周渝毅
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：9.75
版　　次：2007 年 1 月第 1 版 2007 年 1 月第 1 次印刷
书　　号：ISBN 978－7－5600－6193－1
定　　价：15.90 元

* * *

导 读

求同与存异

《翻译与规范》(*Translation and Norms*) 是英国埃斯顿大学(Aston University, Birmingham, UK) 语言与社会科学学院 (School of Languages and Social Sciences) 下属的语言与社会研究所 (Institute for the Study of Language and Society) 编辑的学报 *Current Issues in Language and Society* 第 5 期, 1、2 号 (1998) 另由 Multilingual Matters Ltd. 以单行本的形式出版而成。此学报从 1994 年开办到 2000 年停刊为止, 共出了 7 期。编者谢芙娜 (Christina Schäffner), 莱比锡大学语言学博士, 现任埃斯顿大学德文与翻译研究教授, 曾任"欧洲翻译研究学会"(European Society for Translation Studies) 秘书长。埃斯顿大学语言与社会研究所在 90 年代组织过几次关于翻译研究的专题论坛, 除了出席现场讨论的学者之外, 还邀请了各国专家参加书面讨论。讨论采取的形式是: 先由论者提出论题, 然后自由发言, 未到会者以书面形式发言, 最后由论者总结。本书就是其中一次专题论坛的成果, 其主要论题围绕图里 (Gideon Toury) 和赫曼斯 (Theo Hermans) 关于"翻译规范"的概念展开, 所涉及的问题远远超出了论题规定的范围。这很自然, 人文社会学科研究中的各个课题相互交织, 讨论一个题目必然涉及到其他问题甚至其他领域。从内容来看, 大家对"规范"的认识并不统一, 但对"规范"在翻译研究中的作用和贡献, 意见基本一致。

参与讨论的人太多, 都是国际知名学者, 大多在中国有一定的影响, 这里无法一一介绍。为了更深入地理解本书的论题, 读者应该了解一下"翻译规范"的概念和几位论者此前的著述背景 (如: 图里的 *In Search of a Theory of Translation* 和 *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*、赫曼斯的 "Norms and Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework", *Translation, Power, Subversion* 和 *Translation in Systems*、诺德 (Christiane Nord) 的 "Scopos, Loyalty and Translational Conventions", *Target*. 3 : 1 和切斯特曼 (Andrew Chesterman) 的 "From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms, and Strategies in Translation Studies", *Target*. 5 : 1 和 *Memes of*

Translation）。

“规范”概念是翻译研究发展中出现的现象，是上世纪八九十年代的重要课题之一，它标志着翻译研究的一个转折点。这里首先分析一下翻译研究中几个重要概念的演进和“规范”概念产生的背景，这样，就能看清楚它从何而来，将把翻译研究领向何处。与“规范”概念相关的另一个重要概念“对等”也大约在同一时期受到质疑（本书辩论的焦点之一，两个主要人物图里和赫曼斯对此就持不同意见）。分析了这两个概念的相关（以及“矛盾”）之处，才能更好地理解、应用这些概念。

现代翻译研究要回答的根本问题是：翻译是什么？与实践相关的就是：什么是好的翻译，或理想的翻译？这个问题直接关系到翻译策略、方法、原则和中国传统上最关心的“标准”等一系列问题。对翻译的看法，行内和行外或有不同见解。普通读者一般认为译文（至少在内容上）应等同于原文，中外都是如此。但是学者和部分译者的看法有所不同，因为他们深知翻译中要克服的障碍、译文的得失、甚至翻译的可能性等等。需要指出的是，甚至很多译者自己都认为翻译就是“复制”，不论他们的译文与原文有多大出入。这里提出读者、学者、译者的概念是和书中反复出现的“期待”问题有关；此外，出版者、赞助人等的“期待”也是构成规范的重要内容(出版者与赞助人当中也有内外行之分)。读者要留意的是，“期待”、“对等”、“规范”、“复制”等等一系列概念是翻译观的问题，讨论这些概念实际上是在间接讨论翻译的定义。

关于翻译是什么的问题，学者历来众说纷纭，时至今日所能取得的共识也只有“翻译是派生物（derivative)，这个派生物与它的原文有一定的关系”。接下来的问题是：它们之间是什么关系？传统研究强调或只注意到译文和原文的文本关系。通常描写这个关系所用的术语是“对应”、“对等”、“等值”、“近似”等（这些词反复出现在不同的翻译定义里）。由于人们有“译文与原文对等”的错觉，所以出现过七十子译文（Septuagint）完全相同这样的神话。这样界定翻译必然会将翻译的原则或标准引向“忠实”——译文依附于原文而存在，是从属物——忠实于原文（作者）。中国也是如此，到现在忠实论者仍大有人在，许多学者和译者都在讨论所谓“翻译的标准”（很多教科书里最重要的部分就是谈标准）：归根结底，就是“忠实”。传统上佛经翻译的“质”是形式上的忠实，“信、达、雅”是意义上的忠实，“神似”、“化境”是艺术上的忠实（后来奈达（Eugene Nida）的“动态对等”是语用上的忠实、效果上的忠实）。可以说，传统

翻译的定义在于“求同”：一方面是译文与原文之同，另一方面是翻译的理念(或定义)跨文化、跨时代的共同之处,即普遍性。传统的“等值”、“忠实”或“求同”论者的所谓“翻译标准”是规定性的（prescriptive），缺乏现代学者所提倡的描写（descriptive）基础。由此产生的争论徒劳无益，因为它们不在同一个平台上：一方重实证，一方凭信仰。这种争论既是“存异”与“求同”之争，也是“描写”（is）与“规定”（ought）之争。

其实现代语言学家也注意到了“对等”概念的缺陷，因为实际的翻译单在语言层面也往往与原文不对等。雅各布森(Roman Jakobson)的“对等”就包含了“差别”（equivalence in difference），卡特福德（Catford）描述了在语言转换过程中出现的超出“形式对应”（formal correspondence）的“位移”（shifts）现象，如：句法、词性、单位、语言系统等层面的“位移”。维奈和达波尔奈（Viney & Darbelnet）也观察到几种“间接翻译”（indirect/oblique translation），即“非对等”的翻译（单从量上看，间接翻译远远超过直接翻译）。这些“差别”、“位移”和“间接”可以说是对“对等”的补充与修正，但不是否定。批判“对等”概念最彻底的是斯内尔－霍恩比(Mary Snell-Hornby)，她把对等称为是一种“幻觉”。她认为翻译上的对等不能和数学上的对等相提并论（实际上从没有人这样界定过“对等”），同时，对等概念假设了语言之间的对称关系（而事实上语言是不对称的，后现代主义又加上了“不平等”）。尽管如此，当今很多学者，如贝克（Mona Baker）、诺德、豪斯（Julian House）、玛姆齐尔（Kirsten Malmkjaer），还有本书中的图里等，仍使用“对等”这个概念。他们有的只是沿用这个术语（和“直译”、“意译”一样，“对等”概念虽不精确，使用却很方便），有的重新界定了它的含义。

由于实际上的翻译和传统学者所规定的（prescribed）翻译不尽相同，或无法用所谓“忠实”的标准来衡量，因此也出现过很多争论。比如中国对严复和林纾的翻译一直有不同的见解。那么“翻译是什么”这个问题就可能不是一个固定的、一成不变的标准或定义所能判断的。我们发现不同的文化或同一文化的不同历史时期，乃至同一时期的不同团体或派别，对翻译都有不同的看法和期待，也可以说有不同的定义。这个定义不一定写出来，它是人们心中的一种共识。由于普遍的、求“同”的翻译定义目前还不易得到证实，在寻找翻译普遍性的同时，现代学者认为，与其追求一种暂时无法达到的普遍的“同”，不如退而描写展现在眼前的“异”。翻译发生在目标语文化，为目标语读者所接受，因此它必然受到目标语文

化的各种规范的约束。各文化、各时期对翻译之所以有不同的看法和期待，是因为不同的“翻译规范”（norms）在起作用。按照图里的说法，“规范”不是明文规定，它介于绝对的硬性“规定”（rules）和独特的“个性”（idiosyncrasies）之间；它随着历史的发展因时、因地而异。也就是说，翻译具有明显的社会、文化、时代属性。规范理论把翻译研究从原文取向引入译文取向，从语言中心导向文化中心，从“求同”导向“存异”。这个“异”既指译文与原文之“异”（即不忠实），也指和不同文化、不同时代翻译理念之“异”。“存异”（即承认“异”，接受“异”）是现代翻译研究的一个显著特点。

最先在翻译研究中引入“规范”概念的是图里，虽然他谦虚地指出前人也有过类似说法。随后赫曼斯（主要谈文学翻译）、诺德（主要谈语言学模式）、切斯特曼等人从不同角度进一步区分了不同的规范类型，讨论了它的应用范围。

什么是“规范”？我们用编者谢芙娜的描述：规范是社交过程的产物，是社会行为的（非明文规定的）准则，它能简化人与人之间的交往，使我们的行为有“可预测性”。“可预测性”与赫曼斯强调的“期待”（expectations）有关。规范是一个社会科学概念。在翻译中引入规范这个概念是要把翻译置于社会之中，并把它当作社会活动来研究。图里认为翻译时帮助译者作决定的基础是“翻译规范”，译者的选择实际上是对规范的选择。规范反映的是一个群体的共同价值观或思想，如正确与错误等。规范不一定就是策略，但会导致某种策略的选择，或是对某种策略的合理解释。规范有限制选择的功能，同时也简化了选择程序（有时译者不作他想，或不能作他想）。

但是规范的存在并不表示一种文化或一个历史时期的翻译行为完全一致。一个社会可能有多种规范同时并存，互相竞争；旧有的规范也会被新生的规范所取代。同时，在大社会之下还有小集团，如翻译中的所谓“学派”或出版机构等，各集团内部也可能有各自的规范。规范是社会遵从的行为准则，违反规范意味着要承担后果，这后果可能是受到制裁，如译文不能出版或受到批评等，但也可能引起新规范的产生。规范的运作方式和我们熟悉的多元系统很相似，也可以看作是一个从边缘到中心、从中心到边缘不断运动的过程。图里把“规定——规范——个性”看成一个连续轴（赫曼斯和诺德又加上了“惯例”（conventions），去掉了“个性”；切斯特曼支持，但图里对此有所保留）。他把“个性”也看作（较弱的）规范是因为“个性”也有可能演化并最终取代主流而成为“规范”（切斯特曼大概没看清这一点，

所以反对把“个性”划入规范轴)。这样，看清楚规范的运作方式可以令我们更接近翻译的本质。我们的任务就是通过语料分析，重构某一群体、某个历史时期的翻译规范。规范概念是一个研究工具。通过对各个不同文化、不同时期翻译规范的研究，通过文本和文本以外材料（如译本序、跋等）的分析，通过对反复出现的“规律”(regularities) 的描写，最终发现普遍的翻译法则 (laws)。就是说，从“异”入手，最后达到“同”。这就是图里的构想，但图里自己也承认，重构翻译规范并非易事，语料首先要丰富，其次要有代表性（代表性最难证明)。

图里的“对等”概念的定义和传统规定性的 (prescriptive) 定义不同，它不具备实际语言上单一固定的等值，而是历史的、动态的概念，是某种历史条件下被用来界定翻译的一种关系，而这种关系是由翻译规范决定的。传统上的“对等”是规定性的，是翻译的前提或标准：符合标准的就是翻译，不符合就不是翻译或不是好的翻译。图里把它倒过来说，是描写的 (descriptive)：只要是人们接受为翻译的，就是翻译，它就与原文有一种“对等”关系。简单地说，“对等”只代表译文与原文的一种关系，它随“规范”的变化而变化——即不同文化、不同时期可能有不同的“对等”观念。仅仅发现“对等”不是目的，重要的是弄清楚这种“对等”在翻译中是如何实现的。

和图里相比，赫曼斯在这里有更强烈的后现代意识。他强调各种规范之间的竞争和妥协过程中的“权力关系”，强调译者的能动性——翻译是选择，译者选择某一策略意味着放弃或抵制其他策略。翻译研究不但要分析为什么译者作这样的选择，还要研究他为什么不作其他选择。规范背后的动力是社会的“价值观”，而价值观反映的是一个社会中的权力关系（权力关系是后现代主义研究的重点之一)。

赫曼斯反对在规范理论中使用“对等”的概念（切斯特曼从另一角度支持赫曼斯)，因为“规范”理论突出的是翻译中表现出来的权力关系、价值取向，突出的是“操控”。翻译不是桥梁，不是双向交流；翻译从来就是单向的，反映的是不平等的权力关系。如果翻译受反映价值观的“规范”支配，如果翻译一定要通过目标语文化的价值系统的话，“对等”就不可能成立。翻译中即使存在某些语义上的对等，“异”也是绝对的。而“对等”却恰恰模糊甚至掩盖了这些规范理论所要突出的“异”。赫曼斯指出两点：(一) 翻译在文化交流中起着重要作用，而文化交流从来不是“平等”的（“对等”暗示了原文与译文、源语文化与目标语文化的“平等”关系)；

（二）与其解释翻译中显示出“对等”的性质和程度（图里的提法），不如研究为什么面对翻译中那么多明显的语言、文化以及其他“不对等”，而“对等”概念却如此顽强地占有如此显著的地位。言外之意好像是：“对等”的提出就是为了掩饰翻译的不平等（后殖民主义立场：翻译是殖民主义的工具）。用本文标题中的几个字来解释就是，“对等”仍在求同，与“存异”的“规范”相矛盾。

在“对等”的问题上，切斯特曼代表了一种折中的立场。他提出用“相似”（similarity）来代替“对等”：“相似”就是又同又不同。我认为这种大和稀泥的办法对两者都不利。两种观点并存于学术并无妨碍。从目前的情况看，“对等”已经看不到明显的出路，已经出现了淡化为普通名词（相对于专业术语）的趋势（图里的“对等”已经不是“对等”了），应该给“规范”一个机会。与其在开始阶段妥协，不如放手，让不同观点各自表述，才能充分发挥它们的能量。

赫曼斯的后现代观念还反映在他对“描写翻译研究”（Descriptive Translation Studies）的客观性的怀疑和强调“语义不定”诸方面（这里的“语义不定”不是指语义因上下文而异或语言的模糊性，而是主观诠释的结果），这里我们只谈“客观性”这一点。后现代主义基本上否认图里、切斯特曼等人鼓吹的所谓“客观描写”，认为描写不可能不受到权力关系的支配。翻译研究本身就是对翻译的翻译。如果没有纯粹、干净的翻译的话，也不会有纯粹、干净的描写。观察者无法在观察“观察对象”的同时观察“自己的观察”，如同脑外科专家不能给自己动大脑手术一样。书中讨论“主观性”的部分都与此有关。这也是后现代主义的立场，认为一切研究都牵涉到利益，学者自身也无法保持中立。这里的关键词是“诠释”（interpretation）。简单地说，这个术语在后现代的词典里与“主观”同义。身为操控学派代表人物的赫曼斯认为“操控”实际上就是“诠释”的引申。

切斯特曼、皮姆（Anthony Pym）、吉尔（Daniel Gile）等分别从理论、教学、实践等方面作了补充，比如：“规范”产生过程中的各方冲突与妥协（negotiation），“规范”理论在翻译实践中的应用等等。

规范理论的出现为翻译研究敞开了又一扇大门，开拓了翻译研究的范围，同时也受到来自激进派和传统派两方面的批评。上面提到描写的主观性就是其中之一。如利阿奈丽（Alexandra Lianeri）也强调意识形态的主导作用（这种观点有决定论之嫌，也包含一些自我否定），否认“客观描写”的可能性。也有学者批评图里，认为他倾向否认翻译研究的主观性，如国

际译联副主席布什（Peter Bush）等。但是绝对客观是无法实现的，这可能是所有人文学科的共同之处。从目前情况来看，在翻译研究领域，后现代主义和经验主义调和的可能性很小，但是能够并存。描写翻译理论所能做的只能是正视反对意见的存在，不断修正描写模式，以求发展。来自传统派的批评以纽马克（Peter Newmark）为代表。他仍坚持认为翻译是对真理的追求，是友谊的桥梁；翻译研究仍应从“求同”入手。谈到译文与原文的关系，纽马克用的术语是“近似”（approximation）。实际上“近似”反映的不是对“等值”这个终极目标的放弃，而是面对“等值”的不可能而采取的比较现实的“退而求其次”的态度而已。传统派的批评任何时候都是存在的，上面说过，由于不在同一个平台上，所以不必理会。书中一些不同观点有的是研究角度造成的，比如，有人从专业（profession）角度看翻译，有人把它看作文化思想史，有人考虑的主要是文学翻译，有人还考虑实用翻译；由于出发点不同，翻译内涵广狭不同，结论当然各异。这些“异”，也应该鼓励其发展。总的来说，反对的声音不足以令翻译规范理论却步，反而会促使它向更全面、更成熟、更健康的方向发展。没有批评，就不会有进步。

了解了“规范”概念及“存异”的出发点和本质，有助于理解书中诸多相关问题，也有助于在研究实践中充分利用这个分析工具。至于图里和切斯特曼划分出的几种规范类型（预先规范、初始规范、操作规范、期望规范、专业规范等）虽有参考价值，倒不必拘泥。由于每一个翻译策略都反映某种规范，由于译者的每一个决定都会受到某种规范的制约或影响，因此完全可以根据不同的需要，对规范作不同的划分。

这本书在讨论规范概念的同时，也为翻译研究提出了一些进一步思考的相关问题，有利于深化对翻译的理解。有些问题是做研究时必须考虑的，有些更适合作为博士生的研究题材。如本书编者在序言中提出的问题：如何确定在一个特定时期、一个特定群体当中通行的翻译概念（定义）？这个概念和其他群体、其他时期的翻译概念比较的结果如何？规范的权威（norm authorities）是谁？谁引进新的规范？新规范为什么能被人接受？图里也提到，译者为什么遵守一些规范，而反对另一些规范呢？新规范从何而来？这些问题都会引起我们对和翻译有关的社会、历史、文化的深入思考。

朱志瑜
香港理工大学中文及双语学系教授、博士生导师

Contents

Christina Schäffner: The Concept of Norms in Translation Studies 1

Gideon Toury: A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms' 9

The First Debate 32

Theo Hermans: Translation and Normativity 50

The Second Debate 72

Andrew Chesterman: Description, Explanation, Prediction: A Response to Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans 90

Daniel Gile: Norms in Research on Conference Interpreting: A Response to Theo Hermans and Gideon Toury 98

Anthony Pym: Okay, So How Are Translation Norms Negotiated? A Question for Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans 106

Douglas Robinson: Looking Through Translation: A Response to Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans 113

Sergio Viaggio: The Limitations of the Strictly Socio-Historial Description of Norms: A Response to Theo Hermans and Gideon Toury 122

Gideon Toury: Some of Us Are Finally Talking to Each Other. Would It Mark the Beginning of a True Dialogue? Comments on Responses 129

Theo Hermans: Some Concluding Comments on the Debates and the Responses 133

The Concept of Norms in Translation Studies

Christina Schäffner
Institute for the Study of Language and Society, Aston University, Birmingham B4 7ET

The Concept of Norms

In the long history of translation, such notions as accuracy, correctness, or well-formedness have played an important role in assessing the quality of a translation. Depending on what is understood by translation, these notions have been given different significance. Despite much research over the past 50 years, translation studies has not developed into a homogeneous discipline and there is no agreement on its central concepts. Different approaches exist side by side, each of which focuses on specific aspects, looks at the product or the process of translation from a specific angle, and uses or avoids specific terminology. One of the concepts that has been used differently within translation studies and whose value has been both asserted strongly and called into question, is the concept of norms. Both Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans have contributed substantially to this debate and to the development of the concept of norms in and for translation studies. They are the two main contributors to this *CILS* issue which is based on a seminar on 'Translation and Norms' held at Aston University in February 1998.

Research within translation studies has been concerned with the description of actual translations, with the formulation of general principles, and with practical applications. Norms play a role in all these respects since they are related to assumptions and expectations about correctness and/or appropriateness. Bartsch (1987: xii) defines norms as 'the social reality of correctness notions'. That is, in each community there is a knowledge of what counts as correct or appropriate behaviour, including communicative behaviour. In a society, this knowledge exists in the form of norms. Norms are developed in the process of socialisation. They are conventional, they are shared by members of a community, i.e. they function intersubjectively as models for behaviour, and they also regulate expectations concerning both the behaviour itself and the products of this behaviour.

Bartsch (1987), who applied the norms concept to linguistics, differentiates between product norms and production norms, which, however, are closely related. Product norms regulate what a product must look like in order to be regarded as correct and appropriate. They concern the correctness and the well-formedness of linguistic expressions (i.e. linguistic norms as related to the language system) as well as the correctness of their use (i.e. communicative norms as related to communicative behaviour). Production norms concern the methods and strategies by which a correct product can be achieved (cf. the 'operational norms' in Toury (1995: 58).

Language and language use can be judged as correct from a phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic point of view. There is also a difference between what is possible in a language, regardless of context (described by rules), and what is considered appropriate in a given context (described by conventions or norms). When conventions are enforced with normative power they are considered to be norms. Norms are binding, and their violation usually arouses disapproval of some kind among the community concerned. The force of a norm is built up in the relationships between norm authorities, norm enforcers, norm codifiers, and norm subjects. For example, grammar books and lexicons provide models for correct linguistic forms, language teachers correct wrong or inappropriate communicative behaviour, or teachers of translation judge a text to be a good or a bad translation.

In translation studies, the debate about norms has shifted from linguistic norms to translational norms (cf. Schäffner, in press), mainly thanks to the influential work by Toury and Hermans.

Linguistic Norms in Translation Studies

When a more systematic study of translation began in the second half of the twentieth century, it was very much influenced by (applied) linguistics. Translation was understood as a linguistic phenomenon, as an operation performed on languages. This operation was seen as a process of transcoding between source language (SL) and target language (TL), as illustrated by the following definition:

> Translation may be defined as follows: the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL). (Catford, 1965: 20)

Any difference between SL and TL that became obvious in a translation was attributed to the differences in the two linguistic systems. Consequently, translation studies was conceived as a linguistic discipline. The precise description of the systematic regularities between signs and combinations of signs in the two languages involved was seen as a precondition for the faithful and accurate reproduction of the source-language text. The target-language text was required to be identical to the SL-text in content, style, and effect, and to respect the rules and norms of the TL. Linguistic translation studies, thus, were basically interested in the norms of the language systems. The linguistic units of SL and TL were compared in order to set up mechanisms (in the sense of normative translation principles) for overcoming differences in the language structures encountered in the process of translation. A translation norm in this context was defined as translating a linguistic unit by its generally accepted equivalent (a position which is still held by some scholars today, as evident in the debates).

A huge number of studies into specific linguistic phenomena provided detailed explanations of regularities in SL and TL, and tried to derive rules, or norms, for translation. Topics that were discussed in journal articles or in books were, for example, how to translate German conditionals into Russian, the substitution of word classes in translation, German pre-nominal extended attributes translated into English (all examples taken from the German translation journal *Fremdsprachen* between 1974 and 1980). The starting point was always a specific linguistic structure or phenomenon in the SL for which methods of translation were provided, as a kind of ready-made solution for the practising translator.

Highly influential in this respect have been the seven methods of translation of the *Stylistique comparée* (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958), set up on the basis of a comparison of the lexical and syntactic structures of English and French. A similarly practical and pedagogical purpose underlies Newmark's (1988) seven translation procedures, and Friederich's (1969) techniques of translation for the language pair English and German. All these studies are based on a contrastive analysis of linguistic units and syntactic structures which are seen as correct in the two languages.

Friederich's book *Technik des Übersetzens. Englisch und Deutsch*, first published in 1969 and reprinted several times since then (latest edition 1995) can serve as an illustration of the studies that were conducted within this normative linguistic approach. In 25 chapters, Friederich discusses linguistic translation problems and gives techniques (practically in the sense of rules) for dealing with them. The problems he discusses range from lexical issues to syntactic structures, with a specific focus on differences in the linguistic systems of English and German. All chapters are constructed in a fairly similar way: the translation problem is given, and the various possible solutions are illustrated by a large number of examples, which, however, do not go beyond the sentence level. There are no comments about the context or the genre. The focus is on showing the possibilities that are allowed by the linguistic systems. Therefore, Friederich's presentation is often rather general, which becomes obvious in formulations such as 'in the German language we can ...', or 'the English language allows ...'. Such general statements make his translation procedures highly prescriptive.

The concept of norms is important in two respects in linguistic approaches to translation. On the one hand, they are concerned with the linguistic norms of the two languages, i.e. how to produce utterances and texts that are correct according to the respective rules and norms. On the other hand, the relations and regularities between the two linguistic systems that were discovered on the basis of contrastive analyses were 'translated' into guidelines or rules for the translator, mostly with prescriptive intent (cf. frequently encountered formulations such as 'translators must (not) ..., should ...', etc.). Translation procedures and similar guidelines, however, were formulated in a rather general way and gave the impression that they are applicable throughout. A chosen TL-form may well be correct according to the rules of the language system, but this does not necessarily mean that the text as a whole appropriately fulfils its communicative function in the TL-situation and culture. Since we do not translate words or grammatical forms, but texts with a specific communicative function, the limitations of a narrow linguistic approach soon became obvious. Thus, a logical development was that in the 1970s, the insights and approaches of textlinguistics, a new (sub-)discipline of (applied) linguistics, were adopted in translation studies. Thus, regularities of the text itself, of the genre, and of the context were given more consideration.

Norms and Conventions in Text-linguistic Approaches

Textlinguistics defines the text as the basic unit of communication and, therefore, as the primary object of research. For translation studies this means that the text itself is considered to be the unit of translation. Translation is no longer defined as transcoding linguistic signs, but as retextualising the SL-text. The focus has changed from reproducing meanings to producing texts, as illustrated in Neubert's definition of translation as 'source-text induced target-text production' (Neubert, 1985: 18).

The basic assumption of textlinguistic approaches to translation is that SL- and TL-text do not only differ in their sentence structures, which are determined by the respective linguistic systems, but also in regularities beyond the sentence boundaries. In other words, text norms need to be added to the norms of the linguistic systems (Neubert & Shreve, 1992: 22ff.). Based on identified regularities, texts can be categorised into text-types, genres, text-classes. Text-typological, or genre conventions, are culture-specific and can change over time, which makes genres relevant for translation studies. As a result of a systematic comparison and description of genres in SL and TL, prototypes of text types, or genre profiles, can be set up. Such profiles can serve as models for the retextualisation of the SL-text according to the TL conventions. In other words, knowledge of cross-cultural similarities and/or differences in genre conventions is crucial to the translator in order to produce appropriate TL-texts.

In this context, the notion of norms becomes relevant again, in the sense of knowledge of genre regularities, i.e. knowledge of how to produce a text as an exemplar of a genre (or text type) according to the norms. It also involves expectations about the structure of a particular text. With reference to texts and genres, many scholars prefer to speak of conventions instead of norms (e.g. Reiß & Vermeer, 1991: 178), with the argument that norms are usually associated with rules, and non-adherence to them results in sanctions. Conventions, however, are not binding, but only embody preferences.

In recent years, an increasing number of studies have investigated genre conventions, both at macro- and micro-level, from a translational perspective (e.g. Göpferich, 1995, and the contributions in Trosborg, 1997). Genre profiles are useful for translation practice and translator training, but also limited. On the one hand, not all genres are highly conventionalised and, therefore, more readily predictable as to their structure. And on the other hand, a large portion of texts contain both constant and variable elements, which textlinguistic translation studies must be aware of in their attempt to discover text type-specific translation regularities, as Wilss (1996: 21) points out. Hatim and Mason (1997) explicitly include departures from norms into their model text typology. They argue that unmarked texts correspond to the norm, i.e. they operate within the constraints of a recognisable genre. Departures from norms are usually motivated, e.g. by stylistic reasons, and translators need to be able to recognise such deviations and to deal with them (Hatim & Mason, 1997: 54).

The Concept of Equivalence

Both linguistic and text-linguistic approaches are very much concerned with devising optimal methods of translation and with providing guidelines for translators. For both approaches, translation involves a specific relationship between the source (language) text and the target (language) text. This relationship is typically labelled *equivalence*, although there have been several definitions of this notion — where it is not rejected outright (e.g. by Holz-Mänttäri, 1984, cf. also Halverson, 1997).

When the target text is expected to be a faithful reproduction of the source text, then equivalence is defined as identity (of meaning and/or form), not necessarily in the strict sense of interchangeability and complete reversibility, but more often in the sense of equal value or correspondence (cf. Snell-Hornby, 1988: 13ff.). Types of equivalence were suggested in order to specify the relationship between SL-text and TL-text, for example Nida's formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964), or Koller's denotative, connotative, text-normative, pragmatic, and formal-aesthetic equivalence (cf. Koller, 1979: 215f). It has been (and still is) argued that translation needs to be set apart from other kinds of derived texts, as reflected in the opposition of translation (proper) and adaptation (e.g. Koller, 1979), semantic translation and communicative translation (Newmark, 1981), overt and covert translation (House, 1977), and that the label 'translation' should be reserved for those cases where an equivalence relation obtains.

There is still much controversy on this point, and this is also apparent in the debates presented in this issue. Functionalist approaches see equivalence as one possible relationship among others (e.g. Reiss & Vermeer, 1991). Descriptive translation studies, of which both Toury and Hermans are representative, see translation as the result of a socially contexted behavioural type of activity (Toury, 1980), or as implying 'a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose' (Hermans, 1985: 11). Toury shifted the focus of attention by saying that a translation is every text that is regarded and accepted as a translation by a given community. For him, equivalence is only a label that is affixed to a translational relation that is assumed to exist between two texts (Toury, 1980: 39, 65). This reversal of perspective opened the way to a reassessment of the notion of equivalence, since now we can ask for the type of translational relation that exists in a certain case, and for the reasons that one specific type exists and not another. The crucial instrument to help answer these questions is the concept of norms, i.e. translational norms.

Translational Norms

Norms function in a community as standards or models of correct or appropriate behaviour and of correct or appropriate behavioural products. Whereas linguistic and text-linguistic (and also to a certain extent functionalist) approaches focus on the product (i.e. the target text) and on the linguistic norms and genre conventions that determine (the production of) this product, Toury defines norms as being central to the act and the event of translating. Norms are 'a category for descriptive analysis of translation phenomena' (Toury, 1980: 57), or more specifically, norms are 'the translation of general values or ideas shared by a certain community — as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate — into specific performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations' (Toury, 1980: 51). Translational behaviour is contextualised as social behaviour, and translational norms are understood as internalised behavioural constraints which embody the values shared by a community. All decisions in the translation process are thus primarily governed by such norms, and not (dominantly or exclusively) by the two language systems involved.

Toury (1980: 53ff.) described three kinds of norms: (1) preliminary norms, which decide the overall translation strategy and the choice of texts to be translated, (2) initial norms, which govern the translator's decision to adhere primarily to the source text or to the target culture, and (3) operational norms, which control the actual decisions made during the act of translation. If it is accepted that norms are central to translating, then their nature and their function need to be explained more systematically. This involves questions such as: how can we establish which particular general concept of translation prevailed in a particular community at a particular time? How does this concept compare to general concepts of translation that were valid at another time and/or in other communities? Who are the norm authorities? Who introduced changes in dominant norms, and why were they accepted? Since translating is situated in time and space, any answer to such questions implies a careful description of the situation and the culture in which such norms obtain. As Halverson (1997: 216) observes, 'the consequence of adopting a norm-based theory of translation is that the object of study for historical-descriptive approaches becomes regularities of translation behavior (norms) and the situational/cultural features which may account for these regularities'.

In the two main contributions to this CILS issue, Toury and Hermans — although opting for different styles of presentation and argumentation — provide examples of translation (or translator's) behaviour which they explain in terms of norms or conventions. In discussing an historical case, Adrianus de Buck's 1653 translation of Boethius, Hermans uses the concept of norms to inquire into the translator's choices. He argues that the choices which a translator makes simultaneously highlight the excluded alternatives, and that in this way light can be shed on the interplay between the translator's responses to expectations, constraints and pressures in a social context. Toury reflects on the expectations about the nature and role of translation within a society, and thus on the expectations about preferred options, by giving as an example three different Hebrew versions of Hemingway's short story 'The Killers'.

Translational norms prevail at a certain period and within a particular society, and they determine the selection, the production and the reception of translations. Based on the work by Toury and Hermans, Chesterman (1993, 1997) differentiates between expectancy norms and professional norms. Expectancy norms refer to what the target language community expects a translation to look like 'regarding grammaticality, acceptability, appropriateness, style, textuality, preferred conventions of form or discourse and the like' (Chesterman, 1993: 17). Professional norms govern the accepted methods and strategies of the translation process, and they can be subdivided into three major types: accountability norms, communication norms, relation norms.

Bartsch (1987: 176) speaks of norms as consisting of two parts: norm content and normative force. The norm content is a socially shared notion of what is correct, and, as Hermans argues in his position paper, norms and conventions are intimately tied up with values. Dominant values in a society reflect the power relationships in that society. This has as a consequence that translation can never be value-free. Translations as cultural and historical phenomena are characterised by opaqueness, and by lack of transparency or neutrality. In contrast to Toury, Hermans argues against retaining the notion of equivalence in our discourse on translation — a problem that formed a substantial part in the debates.

As said above, the notion of equivalence has played an important role in the perception and presentation of translation. Pym (1995) makes a useful distinction