

CONTEMPORARY WESTERN  
TRANSLATION THEORY REVIEW

# 当代西方翻译理论导读

赵颖◎主编



西南交通大学出版社  
[Http://press.swjtu.edu.cn](http://press.swjtu.edu.cn)

# 当代西方翻译理论导读

副主编：李素慧 郑中求

编委：杜家怡 王敏 张嘉晨 李晓玲



西南交通大学出版社

[Http://press.swjtu.edu.cn](http://press.swjtu.edu.cn)

---

图书在版编目 (C I P) 数据

当代西方翻译理论导读 / 赵颖主编. —成都: 西南交通大学出版社, 2010.5

ISBN 978-7-5643-0630-4

I. ①当… II. ①赵… III. ①翻译理论—西方国家  
IV. ①H059

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 060093 号

---

当代西方翻译理论导读

主编 赵 颖

责任编辑	邓 岚
封面设计	品诚文化传播有限公司
出版发行	西南交通大学出版社 (成都二环路北一段 111 号)
发行部电话	028-87600564 87600533
邮 编	610031
网 址	<a href="http://press.swjtu.edu.cn">http://press.swjtu.edu.cn</a>
印 刷	成都蓉军广告印务有限责任公司
成品尺寸	145 mm×210 mm
印 张	13
字 数	394 千字
版 次	2010 年 5 月第 1 版
印 次	2010 年 5 月第 1 次
书 号	ISBN 978-7-5643-0630-4
定 价	26.00 元

图书如有印装质量问题 本社负责退换  
版权所有 盗版必究 举报电话: 028-87600562



## 前言

《当代西方翻译理论导读》精选了 14 位自 20 世纪 70 年代以来最具代表性和影响力的当代西方翻译理论家的作品,旨在帮助学习者了解并掌握当代西方翻译研究领域的代表性流派及其主要观点,加深对翻译实践、翻译现象的认识,提高翻译理论素养。

《当代西方翻译理论导读》具有以下特点:

(1) 所选翻译理论家具有代表性和典型性。本书选择的这 14 位翻译理论家代表了 30 多年来西方翻译理论所取得的突出成就。具体说来,奈达和纽马克代表了语言学流派的理论特点,伊塔玛·伊文-佐哈尔和图里为我们铺展了描述翻译学派的贡献,霍姆斯对整个翻译学科的建立功不可没,赖斯和诺德将目的论和翻译理论相结合,巴斯内特和勒菲弗尔为我们从事翻译研究扩展了文化研究的新转向,斯坦纳将海德格尔的阐释学引进了翻译研究,提莫志克是后殖民翻译研究的杰出代表,韦奴蒂的异化翻译理论使他在整个翻译界声名鹊起,德里达和本雅明的翻译理论将解构主义和翻译连在一起。可以说,这 14 位翻译理论家的作品节选可以让我们对整个翻译理论的发展变化有个概览式的了解。

但是,系统地阅读所有作家的作品对大多数人来说,可能都是



一个不小的工程,因而节选著名理论家的作品就有了必要。同时,为了降低阅读难度,适当地讲解也必不可少,这便引出了本书的第二个特点。

(2)本书为每位理论家配有作者简介,介绍了他们的生平和主要理论贡献。同时,本书为每一个所选章节提供了理论导读,用汉语简单陈述了该节所要探讨的主要问题。这一方面降低了阅读难度,另一方面也为读者提供了直接汲取原作营养的机会。此外,每一章节后面附带的进一步阅读书目,也可以让读者按图索骥地展开进一步的阅读。

本书由7位老师编写,具体分工如下:杜家怡和王敏负责奈达和纽马克作品的编写,各约3.2万字;李素慧负责佐哈尔、巴斯奈特和勒菲弗尔作品的编写,约7.7万字;李晓玲负责图里作品的编写,约3万字;郑中求负责霍姆斯、赖斯和诺德作品的编写,约7.3万字;张嘉晨负责韦努蒂作品的编写,约2.9万字;赵颖负责斯坦纳、提莫志克、德里达和本雅明作品的编写,约11万字。赵颖同时负责全部书稿的最后审阅和定稿。河南工业大学的乔颖老师审核修改了部分书稿,在此表示感谢!

由于编者水平有限,经验不足,编写时间仓促,错误和不妥之处在所难免,敬请读者批评指正。

编 者

2009年12月

## 目 录

尤金·奈达 .....	( 1 )
彼得·纽马克 .....	( 22 )
伊塔玛·埃文-佐哈尔 .....	( 69 )
吉迪恩·图里 .....	( 84 )
詹姆斯·霍姆斯 .....	( 116 )
凯瑟琳娜·赖斯 .....	( 142 )
克里斯汀·诺德 .....	( 166 )
乔治·斯坦纳 .....	( 194 )
苏珊·巴斯奈特 .....	( 212 )
安德烈·勒菲弗尔 .....	( 249 )
劳伦斯·韦努蒂 .....	( 280 )
玛丽亚·提莫志克 .....	( 311 )
瓦尔特·本雅明 .....	( 363 )
雅克·德里达 .....	( 384 )



## 尤金·奈达

### [作者简介]

奈达(Eugene A. Nida, 1914—), 美国语言学家、翻译家和翻译理论家。其翻译理论是西方现代翻译理论研究领域的突出代表之一, 在我国翻译研究界以及语言学界享有较高声誉。

奈达于 1914 年 11 月出生在美国中南部的俄克拉何马市, 五岁随父母迁至加州。中学开始学习拉丁语, 进入洛杉矶加州大学后专修外语, 主攻希腊语, 兼学拉丁语、德语和法语, 阅读了大量古希腊和罗马的文学典籍, 这为他后来的研究工作打下了坚实的基础。后来, 他在南加利福尼亚大学继续深造, 1939 年通过研究希腊语《圣经·新约》获硕士学位。1941 年, 他进入密执安大学攻读博士学位, 主修描写语言学、人类文化学、古英语等, 在弗莱斯(Charles C. Fries) 和布龙菲尔德(Leonard Bloomfield) 等著名教授的指导下, 于 1943 年获得语言学博士学位。同年, 奈达进入美国圣经公会工作, 后被正式聘为该公会的专职语言专家, 并于 1946 年起担任《圣经》翻译部的执行秘书。

奈达在美国, 乃至世界翻译界都有着广泛的影响。他发表了

论文 250 余篇,单独或合作出版了 40 多部书,堪称译坛的“长青学者(Evergreen Scholar)”。纵观其翻译思想,谭载喜教授(1999)将其分为三个阶段:①描写语言学;②交际理论;③社会符号学。此外,上海外语教育出版社在《语言与文化——翻译中的语境》(2001)一书的出版前言中,将奈达的翻译理论按照他的翻译研究途径从语言学到社会语言学,分成三个时期:①语言学;②等效理论;③多学科角度。

在描写语言学阶段,即 20 世纪 40 年代至 60 年代初,其研究重点是语言的句法现象和词法现象,即以分析词语和句子结构为主题,主要作品有《论词法》(*Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*)(1946),《英语句法概要》(*A Synopsis of English Syntax*)(1960)等。在这些著作中,“奈达试图通过对语言句法、词法和语言翻译问题的描写,阐明语言的结构性质,使人们对外国语言以及翻译的基本问题有所认识”(谭载喜,1999:XVI)。

从 20 世纪 60 年代中期到 70 年代中期为第二个阶段。在这一阶段奈达突破了长久以来人们觉得翻译只是经验之谈的看法,提出翻译是一门科学,并把通讯论和信息论运用于翻译研究中,认为翻译就是交际。另外,这一阶段的一个突出特点是“动态对等”理论的提出,以及对翻译过程的分析和对意义的分类,代表作有《翻译科学探索》(*Toward a Science of Translating*)(1964),《翻译理论与实践》(*The Theory and Practice of Translation*)(1969)。在这一阶段,奈达逐渐确定了自己翻译领域的权威地位。

从 20 世纪 80 年代初至今为第三个阶段,是从多学科角度研究翻译。进入 80 年代以后,奈达对他的翻译理论进行了一系列的修改和补充,在原来的交际学翻译理论基础上,增添了其他的理论和模式,比如社会符号学、语言和文化的关系、语境问题、科学与技



术/艺术,等等。在这个时期其代表作有《跨文化的意义传递》(*Meaning Across Cultures*)(1981),《符号、意义和翻译》(*Sign, Sense, and Translation*)(1983),《从一种语言到另一种语言》(*From One Language to Another*)(1986),《从社会语言学看跨语交际》(*The Sociolinguistics of Interlingua Communication*)(1999),《语言与文化——翻译中的语境》(*Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating*)(2001)等。

## [理论导读]

本书所选章节来自奈达博士翻译理论发展鼎盛时期的代表作《翻译理论与实践》、《翻译科学探索》中关于翻译的本质和“动态对等”的论述以及他后来在《语言与文化——翻译中的语境》中对“功能对等”的论述。从这三个方面,我们既可以看到奈达的经典翻译思想,又可以了解到他的一些新的观点。

《从动态对等到功能对等——奈达对等翻译观简述》(张雪芳, 2008)一文对奈达的“对等观”作了较为详细的论述。因此,在这里对文中重点部分做了摘录,以供读者参考。奈达从交际学角度出发,认为翻译就是“在接受语中用近似、自然的对等语再现源语信息,首先是语义上的对等,其次是文体上的对等”。从这一定义可以看出,翻译的首要目的应该是“再现源语信息”。要再现源语信息,译者必须作更多语法上和词汇上的调整。译者应该追寻的是“对等语”,而不是“同一语”。但这种对等不应该是生硬或晦涩的。好的翻译读起来应该不像是翻译,译文应尽量避免翻译腔,应达到“自然”且“近似”的对等。从他给翻译下的定义中可以看出,奈达把“语义”放在首要位置,其次才是“文体”。



奈达认为,有两类基本的对等,即“形式对等”和“动态对等”。形式对等关注的是信息本身,包括信息的形式和内容。在这类翻译中,接受语中的信息应该尽可能地与源语中的不同成分保持一致。而最能代表这种结构对等的翻译应该是“释译”,要求译者尽可能地再现原作的形式和内容。这类翻译通常附有大量注释,以使译文读者更好地理解译文,让读者得以更好地理解源语文化的习俗、思维方式和表达方式。形式对等的翻译是以源语为取向的,目的是要尽可能地保留原文语言信息和语言形式。与之相反,在动态对等翻译中,译者关注的并非源语信息和译语信息之间的一一对应,而是一种动态的关系,即译语接受者和译语信息之间的关系应该与原文读者和原文信息之间的关系基本相同。动态对等翻译旨在达到完全自然的表达。奈达进一步将动态对等翻译描述为“源语信息最切近、自然的对等物”。其中,“对等物”指向源语信息,“自然”指向译语信息,而“最切近”则将译文和原文在“最大限度的近似的的基础上”结合起来。然而,在实现动态对等的过程,译者不可避免会面对语言和文化方面的影响,因此动态对等的程度也受一定限制。动态对等强调的是对等的反应而非对等的形式。翻译的主要服务对象是译文读者,要评判译文质量,不仅要比较译文与原文的形式和内容,最主要是比较译文读者和原文读者的反应,或译文与原文产生的效果是否一致。而对等的反应也成为三个评判译文质量的基本标准之一,反应的相似程度则取决于原文与译文间的文化差距。

从他的翻译标准中也可以看出,他已经注意到,译文的评价必须和读者的反应相结合。但是,怎样才能衡量译者的反应,怎样比较译文读者的反应是否与原文读者反应一致呢?这实施起来比较困难。这从理论上讲值得借鉴和效仿,但从译文和原文读者群体



方面来看,由于各自所处的地理位置、历史、文化背景、教育层次的不同,要达到类似的反应并非易事。

1986年,在与冉·德·瓦尔德合著的《从一种语言到另一种语言》一书中,奈达提出“功能对等”这一概念。同时,他也解释了“功能对等”与“动态对等”这两个概念之间并无实质性差异。他认为以前提出的“动态对等”只强调译文与原文在内容上的一致优先于形式上的一致,有失偏颇,容易给人一种印象,认为内容和形式矛盾。动态对等常常被误解,而采用“功能对等”这一术语旨在突出翻译的交际功能,从而消除这种误解。“功能对等”要求译文与原文不但在信息内容上对等,而且尽可能在形式上也要求对等。相比之下,“功能对等”比“动态对等”更具说服力。

在《语言与文化——翻译中的语境》一书中,奈达也设专章讨论功能对等。他阐述了自己变换说法的原因:一些人误认为“动态对等”只强调译文效果,因此,为了消除这种误解,也为了强调“功能”这一概念,开始改用“功能对等”这一表达来描述翻译的充分程度。他认为,要达到功能对等,需要满足六条原则。奈达这样谈到,为了在翻译过程中达到一种令人满意的功能等效,一些支配着调整的种类及程度的原则便是必不可少的。如果一种或多或少字面上的对应在所指意义和联想上均系功能对等,那么就不必再作形式上的调整了。

### 参考书目:

1. 谭载喜. 新编奈达论翻译. 北京:中国对外翻译出版公司,1999.
2. 张雪芳. 从动态对等到功能对等——奈达对等翻译观简述. 安徽文学,2008(11).
3. 贾秀海. 奈达的功能对等论. 东北财经大学学报,2008(4).



4. 李田心. 关于奈达翻译标准的含义及翻译. 外语与翻译, 2006(1).
5. Eugene A Nida. *Toward A Science of Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.
6. Eugene A Nida & Charles R Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.
7. Eugene A Nida. *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.
8. Jeremy Munday. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

## [ 所选章节 ]

# THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TRANSLATION

## Chapter Two

### The Nature of Translating

Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style. But this relatively simple statement requires careful evaluation of several seemingly contradictory elements.

### Reproducing the Message

Translating must aim primarily at “reproducing the message”. To do anything else is essentially false to one’s task as a translator. But to reproduce the message one must make a good many grammatical and



lexical adjustments. For example, the Hebrew idiom “bowels of mercies” cannot be literally rendered into English if one really wants to communicate the message of the source language, for though we have the words “bowels” and “mercy” in English, we simply do not employ this combination. A meaningful equivalent is “tender compassion”, and it is precisely in this manner that many translations attempt to reproduce the significance of this source — language expression.

### **Equivalence Rather Than Identity**

The translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity. In a sense this is just another way of emphasizing the reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form of the utterance, but it reinforces the need for radical alteration of a phrase such as “it came to pass”, which may be quite meaningless. In fact, it is often misunderstood. Since in Greek *egeneto*, “it happened”, is often only a “transitional word” to mark the beginning of a new episode, it is sometimes best not reproduced. In other instances, one may use some more natural transitions, e. g. , “and then”, “now”, “later”.

...

### **A Natural Equivalent**

The best translation does not sound like a translation. Quite naturally one cannot and should not make the Bible sound as if it happened in the next town ten years ago, for the historical context of the Scriptures is important, and one cannot remake the Pharisees and Sadducees into present-day religious parties, nor does one want to, for

one respects too much the historical setting of the incarnation. In other words, a good translation of the Bible must not be a “cultural translation”. Rather, it is a “linguistic translation.” Nevertheless, this does not mean that it should exhibit in its grammatical and stylistic forms any trace of awkwardness or strangeness. That is to say, it should studiously avoid “translationese” — formal fidelity, with resulting unfaithfulness to the content and the impact of the message.

### **The Closest Equivalent**

A conscientious translator will want the closest natural equivalent. It has been argued, for example, that in present-day English a natural equivalent of “demon-possessed” would be “mentally distressed”. This might be regarded by some as a natural equivalent, but it is certainly not the “closest equivalent”. Moreover, “mentally distressed” is a cultural reinterpretation which does not take seriously the cultural outlook of the people of Biblical times.

### **The Priority of Meaning**

As has already been indicated in the definition of translating, meaning must be given priority, for it is the content of the message which is of prime importance for Bible translating. This means that certain rather radical departures from the formal structure are not only legitimate but may even be highly desirable. For example, the NEB has rendered John 1:1 as “what God was, the Word was”. This seems very different from the traditional “the Word was God”, but it is an entirely legitimate translation, since it specifies unambiguously the predicate



function of the term "God". To make this attributive function of the predicate noun quite clear, and thus to avoid the prevalent error of reversing the order, i. e. , "God was the Word" ( an interpretation which has been followed by some of the heretical sects in the history of Christendom ), the NEB committee has departed from the form in order to make the content unambiguously clear.

### **The Significance of Style**

Though style is secondary to content, it is nevertheless important. One should not translate poetry as though it were prose, nor expository material as though it were straight narrative. For example, the fast-moving, brisk style of Mark is quite different from the much more polished and structured style of Luke. Similarly, the First Epistle of Peter has some of the most elaborately organized sentence structure of the New Testament, while the Second Epistle of Peter is almost the exact opposite.

It is usually quite impossible to represent some of the stylistic subtleties of the original, e. g. , plays on words (such as the meanings of certain Old Testament names: Isaac, Abraham, Sarah, Cain, and Abel), acrostic poems ( i. e. , poems in which successive lines or groups of lines begin with successive letters of the alphabet ), rhythmic units ( e. g. , phrases and lines of poetry ). In many instances, one can indicate something about these stylistic peculiarities of the original by means of marginal notes, which will assist the reader to understand why the text reads as it does. This is particularly essential in the case of plays on words, where the meaning of a passage so often depends upon knowing

the double meaning or the allusion.

In trying to reproduce the style of the original one must beware, however, of producing something which is not functionally equivalent. For example, Mark employs typical Semitic Greek in the use of the conjunction *kai*, “and”, to begin many sentences. This is perfectly appropriate Semitized Koine Greek, in that it accurately reflects the corresponding use of the Hebrew conjunction *waw*. In the RSV, however, most of these conjunctions are reproduced literally, with the result that 26 sentences in Mark I begin with “And”, producing a kind of style completely contrary to good English usage. In fact, it gives the impression of being “childish.” This is, of course, not the case with the original Greek text of Mark. This means that reproducing style, even on a formal level, may not result in an equivalence, and it is functional equivalence which is required, whether on the level of content or on the level of style.

As may be clearly noted from the discussion of the definition of translating, one is constantly faced by a series of polar distinctions which force him to choose content as opposed to form, meaning as opposed to style, equivalence as opposed to identity, the closest equivalence as opposed to any equivalence, and naturalness as opposed to formal correspondence. In order to choose meaningfully between these opposing sets of defining features, it is necessary to set up certain fundamental criteria for guidance in the process. That is to say, one must establish a set of priorities, which can define translating from different perspectives: the perspectives of form and of comprehensibility.





## TOWARD A SCIENCE OF TRANSLATING

### Chapter Eight Principles of Correspondence

#### Two Basic Orientations in Translating

Since “there are, properly speaking, no such things as identical equivalents” (Belloc, 1913 a and b, p. 37), one must in translating seek to find the closest possible equivalent. However, there are fundamentally two different types of equivalence: one which may be called formal and another which is primarily dynamic.

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness.

The type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a “gloss translation”, in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original. Such a translation might be a rendering of some Medieval French text into English, intended for students of certain aspects of early French literature not requiring a knowledge of the original language of the text. Their needs call for a