国外翻译研究丛书之四

THE PRAGMATICS OF TRANSLATION

语用学与翻译

Edited by Leo Hickey

外教社

上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

The Pragmatics of Translation

Edited by

Leo Hickey

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Philadelphia • Toronto • Sydney • Johannesburg

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

语用学与翻译 /（英）希基（Hickey，L.）编. —影印本. —上海：上海外语教育出版社，2001
（国外翻译研究丛书）
书名原文：The Pragmatics of Translation
ISBN 7-81080-122-8

Ⅰ. 语…　Ⅱ. 希…　Ⅲ. 语用学-关系-翻译-研究-文集-英文　Ⅳ. H059-53

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2001）第13177号

图字：09-2001-024 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），65422031（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：刘华初

印　　刷：常熟市印刷八厂
经　　销：新华书店上海发行所
开　　本：880×1230　1/32　印张 8　字数 287 千字
版　　次：2001 年 4 月第 1 版　2001 年 8 月第 2 次印刷
印　　数：5 000 册

书　　号：ISBN 7-81080-122-8 / H・052
定　　价：14.50 元

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

The Pragmatics of Translation/Edited by Leo Hickey

Includes bibliographical references and index
1. Translating and interpreting. 2. Pragmatics. I. Hickey, Leo. II. Series
P306.2.P7 1998
418'.02–dc21 98-21842

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-405-9 (hbk)
ISBN 1-85359-404-0 (pbk)

Multilingual Matters Ltd

UK: Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon BS21 7HH.
USA: 325 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA.
Canada: OISE, 712 Gordon Baker Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M2H 3R7.
Australia: P.O. Box 586, Artamon, NSW, Australia.
South Africa: PO Box 1080, Northcliffe 2115, Johannesburg, South Africa.

The original edition was published by Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, UK.
This edition is for the Chinese market only.
本书由多语种图书出版有限公司授权上海外语教育出版社出版。
仅供在中华人民共和国境内销售。

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

借鉴和创造

（代序）

上海外语教育出版社从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

在过去的半个世纪中，许多学者对翻译理论和翻译实践展开了较为系统的深入研究，并发表了不少有关论著。近些年来，一些学者在他们的研究中已开始注意运用符号学、语言学、社会学、文化学、心理学等学科的知识来多方位地探讨翻译问题，从而赋予翻译研究新的深度和广度。

利奥·希基汇编的论文集《语用学与翻译》是苏珊·巴斯内特(Susan Bassnett)和埃德温·根茨勒(Edwin Gentzler)主编的"翻译专题研究丛书"之一。本书从语用学这一全新的视角展开对翻译研究的探索，令人顿觉耳目一新。

语用学是语言学中历史并不很长的分支领域。然而由于这一学科所研究的是实际使用中的语言以及语言与语言使用者之间的关系(或称符号与符号解释者之间的关系)，它已跨越出传统的语言学理论框架，开始对语言进行动态的，同时也是更具有实际价值的研究。

事实上，翻译创造的全过程中，翻译者和翻译的实际运作均不同程度地受到诸多语用因素的制约和影响。譬如，对于言语行为(speech act)的各种语境和方式、合作原则(the cooperative principle)和礼貌原则(the politeness principle)、语义前提(semantic presupposition)和语用前提(pragmatic presupposition)、已知信息和新信息等等因素的考虑，能帮助译者在译文的整体把握和细节处理上作出可取的选择。用利奥·希基的话来说，就是获得译文与原文之间的"语用对等"(pragmatic equivalence)，从而在最大限度上使译文的读者获得与原文读者同等的理解和感受。

《语用学与翻译》共收录 13 篇颇有见地的论文，编排成全书的 13

章。撰稿人都是在翻译理论、语言学、符号学等学科领域著述甚丰的教授、学者，他们从不同侧面论述了语用学原则在各类文本翻译中的实际应用。这部学术著作不仅富有创新观点，而且提供了不少生动确切的例证，对于我国翻译理论研究者、翻译实践人员，从事语言学与应用语言学教学、研究的高等院校师生以及其他相关学科的研究者均有很大借鉴和参考价值。

Notes on Contributors

Peter Fawcett is a Lecturer in French at Bradford University. He has written on translation theory and practice and, as a practitioner, has translated a number of books.

Ernst-August Gutt has taught in universities in Germany and Ethiopia. He has published widely on translation including *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context* (1991).

Basil Hatim is a Professor of Arabic Translation and Linguistics at Heriot-Watt University. His major publications, including *Discourse and the Translator* (1990), have been written in collaboration with Ian Mason.

Sándor Hervey was, until his untimely death in 1997 shortly after completing his chapter for this volume, a Reader in Linguistics at the University of St Andrews. Among his publications are *Axiomatic Semantics* (1979) and *Semiotic Perspectives* (1982).

Leo Hickey is a Research Professor at the University of Salford. He has translated many books from Spanish and his publications on pragmatics include *Curso de pragmaestilística* (1987).

Ian Higgins is a Senior Lecturer in French at the University of St Andrews. Apart from his many literary translations from French, he is co-author, with Sándor Hervey, of *Thinking Translation.*

Juliane House is Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Hamburg. She is author of *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment* (1981) and *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited* (1997).

Frank Knowles is Professor of Language at Aston University. As well as his translations from, and studies of, the Slavonic languages, he has published widely on linguistic and pragmatic issues in Russian.

Kirsten Malmkjær is Assistant Director of Research in the University of Cambridge Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics. She has published on translation and has edited *The Linguistics Encyclopedia* (1991).

Ian Mason is Professor of Interpreting and Translating at Heriot-Watt University. Among his publications is *The Translator as Communicator* (1997), written in collaboration with Basil Hatim.

Bill Richardson is a Lecturer in Spanish at Dublin City University. He has made a special study of deixis in literary translation, especially in the works of Federico García Lorca.

Christina Schäffner is a Lecturer in German and Co-Director of the Institute for the Study of Language and Society at Aston University. She has edited several volumes on language including her co-edition with Helen Kelly-Holmes of *Cultural Functions of Translation*.

Palma Zlateva is an Assistant Professor of English and American Studies at the St Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia. Her publications include her edition of *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives* (1993).

Contents

Introduction

LEO HICKEY

For as long as individuals have communicated with one another through the mediation of someone else, there has probably been a realisation that mediators do something more complex and more interesting than simply substitute their own words, one by one, for the originals. Since the early 1950s (Nida, 1952), however, there has been an upsurge in serious studies of translation, both in its theoretical, historical, didactic and professional dimensions and in its practice at the point when translators do something in response to their own reading of a text and which leads to the production of a second text. In particular, it is now understood that translators do not simply 'say' in one language what somebody or some piece of writing has 'said' in another. Whatever translation is in its entirety, it seems to involve semiotic, linguistic, textual, lexical, social, sociological, cultural and psychological aspects or elements, all of which are being studied nowadays as determining factors in whatever the translator does. It is also becoming clear that, as in any other form of rewriting (see Gentzler, 1993: ix and Lefevere, 1992), this implies manipulation and relates directly to ideology, power, value systems and perceptions of reality.

One of the many questions that recur, explicitly or implicitly, in these investigations is whether there is some objective entity, linguistic, semantic or psychological, expressed in or by an 'original', which can then be captured by a different text, the translation. In other words, is there something in, behind, underneath or belonging to a piece of writing in one language which can be extrapolated and safely packaged in another? After all, at first sight something seems to survive and pass more or less intact from one text to another in the process and the product of translation; we may therefore ask whether or how this actually happens and what that something may be. Certain aspects of language, such as words and grammar, appear to disappear or change completely in translation and yet the 'meaning', what might be termed the semantic import, usually survives the process quite well.

Beyond these first impressions, what is it, then, if anything, that is actually translated, transferred, between one text and another? Is it some part, ingredient or linguistic element of the text itself, or is it something less direct about the text, such as a particular reader's reaction or interpretation of it? And what happens to those elements which are not transferred? Are they irrelevant, surplus to requirements, treated as of no importance and simply ignored? Is translation some kind of science, pure or applied, prescriptive or descriptive, or is it a practical art or craft, which cannot be discussed until after the event, analogously to a conversation about the beauty of a sunset or a bird in flight? If the notion that something remains unscathed in the process of translation is too extreme, then perhaps there may be aspects of the original and the translation which, if not identical, are at least equivalent to one another. For some time now the notion of equivalence, or rather equivalences, has been debated with varying degrees of enthusiasm and conviction (see Bassnett, 1991: 23–9). It may also be that translation is merely an approximate, imprecise, procedure, and that any text has so many dimensions that equivalence on one may be incompatible with equivalence on some others. For example, linguistic equivalence (an extreme case of which would be word-for-word translation) may conflict with dynamic equivalence (stimulating an effect in the reader of the translation similar to that caused in the reader of the original), in the sense that if the linguistic surface of both texts is similar, the effect on their readers may necessarily be very different, and vice versa. And does translation deal with what the original author intended or simply what is expressed by the text?

Among the many approaches to research on translation which are yielding useful insights nowadays, Translation Studies has been in particular favour since the mid 1960s (see Bassnett, 1991: 6). Translation Studies concentrates on describing and analysing the procedure or processes, rather than commenting on the product itself and asking how well or badly any particular translation has been done. This non-prescriptive approach, among others, is interested in how translation is actually done, examining the methods that have been used throughout history and asking how texts fit into the receiving cultures.

Much work is also being carried out on the teaching of translation, with or without some kind of theoretical or academic underpinning. Universities and similar institutions educate graduates who go on to earn their living as translators. Some courses use translation merely as a methodological tool for language-teaching, without claiming to train translators, while others provide training in all aspects of the translator's work including practice in various registers, gathering and storing terminology, compiling data bases, documentation, IT etc. Closely related to teaching is assessment or evaluation, quality assurance or revision of translation, as part of the process itself or carried out on the product. It is done on various levels, from the practitioner's own impressionistic assessment of a first draft or a teacher's equally subjective, but perhaps more experience-based, comments on a student's piece of work to more academic attempts to develop systematic methods for the evaluation of professional work (House, 1976).

The profession of the translator, with its problems and practical considerations, is sporadically, though seldom systematically, treated in journals and newsletters. The practice of the profession under pressure, working to deadlines, satisfying different types of client, using dictionaries of all kinds, whether monolingual or multilingual, general or technical, hard-copy or computer-based, by in-house or freelance practitioners, making use of expert or other informants (often the clients themselves) is occasionally discussed, usually on an anecdotic level.

Despite much research and even calls for general theories and systems to explain or describe the translation process (Baker, 1993: 248), most work on the subject continues to address specific problems and individual elements or aspects of translation, including comparisons of brief texts with their originals. These studies range from the treatment of such detailed points as puns or culture-specific terms to advice on how to handle legal documents between systems which have neither terminology nor legal entities in common; they may rely on intuitive reactions to the 'readability' of a particular translation or on academic investigations of contrastive structural linguistics. The volume of work being done and the multiplicity of approaches used suggests that the study of translation is actively attempting to emerge from its infancy.

Much the same may be said of pragmatics. Since 1938, when Charles Morris defined semiotics as the use of signs governed by syntactic, semantic and pragmatic rules, but more particularly since 1959, when Rudolf Carnap explained that pragmatics refers to the relationships between signs and their users, the discipline has been developed with enthusiasm by philosophers and linguists alike. It entered an especially meaningful phase in 1962 when J. L. Austin's contribution to the subject was published under the title *How to Do Things with Words* (Austin, 1962), which showed that, when using language, people do not just talk or write to one another but rather they perform actions, they do things, usually in contexts that combine linguistic and nonlinguistic elements, part of the context in which they communicate consisting of the knowledge, beliefs and assumptions of all concerned.