



山东大学威海分校翻译研究所

# 翻译研究在线

translation studies online



首 页	翻译研究所介绍	科研队伍	研究成果	新闻动态	翻译学词典研究论文集	翻译学交流论坛
-----	---------	------	------	------	------------	---------

## 3 礼貌原则在商务信函中的应用

发表时间： 2008-12-22 10:49:35 点击次数： 89 次 作者： 翻译研究在线

### 礼貌原则在商务信函中的应用

### The Application of Politeness Principle to Business Correspondence

摘要：英国学者G. N. Leech的礼貌原则不仅适用于口头语言，同样适用于书面语体。本文以该理论为依据，结合商务信函的特点，通过具体的实例分析了礼貌原则在商务信函中的运用和表现，认为，礼貌原则在现今商务信函中发挥着举足轻重的作用。

关键词：礼貌；礼貌原则；商务信函

Abstract: The Politeness Principle, which was proposed by the English scholar G. N. Leech, cannot be only applied to verbal language, but also to formal style. Based on this theory, together with the characteristics of business correspondence, this paper analyzes the application of politeness principle to business correspondence through specific examples. A conclusion is drawn that politeness principle plays an important role in modern business correspondence.

Key words: polite; politeness principle; business correspondence

日常生活中，礼貌无处不在无时不在，并且在社会关系中发挥着重大的调节作用。礼貌是人类文明的标志，是人类社会活动的一条重要准绳。

迄今，许多西方学者诸如Lakoff (1973), Brown & Levinson (1978/ 1987), Leech (1983), Blum-Kulka (1990) 都对语言使用中礼貌, 礼貌原则, 面子, 威胁面子的言语行为等进行过有影响的讨论。在这些礼貌现象的研究当中，最具影响力

【站内搜索】

请输入关键词：

-请选择类别-

搜索

虚位以待  
欢迎合作

的当推英国学者G. Leech的礼貌原则(Politeness Principles)以及P. Brown和S. C. Levinson的面子保全论 (Face-saving Theory)。

当今社会随着对外交流的不断扩大, 国际商务往来也在向纵深方向发展, 而作为其主要交流形式之一的商务信函越来越受到人们的广泛关注。作为联系客商的工具, 一则好的商务信函除词汇、语法上准确无误外, 在语气的选择与使用上也是十分讲究的, 一般都注重礼貌的传达, 只有如此方可博得对方的好感。虽然语用学中对礼貌现象的研究多以口头语言为主, 但其理论基础同样适用于书面语体。商务信函作为一种具有特定商务语境的书面语言形式, 礼貌的表现十分显著。笔者拟就此现象探讨一下礼貌原则在商务信函翻译中的应用。

## 1. 礼貌和礼貌原则

### 1.1 礼貌的定义

中国现代汉语中的“礼貌”源于古代的“礼”。据《说文解字注》:

“礼, 履也。所以事神致福也。从示, 从丰。”由此看出, “礼”的本义是“事神致福”, 是一种祭祀行为。然而, 现代意义上的“礼貌”与古代的“礼”有着很大的差别。根据《现代汉语词典》的解释: 礼貌, 言语动作谦虚恭敬的表现。礼貌已不再作为维护现行社会等差的行为准则, 而是作为不分差别, 供人们效仿的行为规范。如“礼貌语言”、“礼貌待人”等便是关于言语行为, 待人接物等行为的某种规范。

转而看一下英语当中的礼貌。英语中的礼貌研究可以追溯到15至17世纪, 根据《牛津英语词源辞典》: “一个讲礼貌的人需具文雅, 诚恳的礼貌品质 (of refined courteous manners)”。

《牛津高阶英汉双解词典》(第四版) 中对 *polite* (礼貌的) 这个词是这样定义的: having or showing that one has good manners and consideration for other people. 由此可以看出无论是汉语还是英语当中的礼貌, “尊敬”、“敬意”都是其基本要素之一。

### 1.2 Leech 礼貌原则综述

礼貌原则一直被视为语用学的一个重要内容。1967年美国语言哲学家格莱斯提出了著名的“合作原则”。他把说话者和听话者在会话中共同遵守的准则概括为量的准则、质的准则、关系准则以及方式准则。这一原则提出之后, 许多学者对此进行了深入的研究, 发现其本身存在着某些缺陷, 因为格莱斯提出的各条准则无论如何也难以囊括言语交际中所有的话语策略。在此情况下, 礼貌、礼貌策略自然成了与语言使用、语言理解密切联系的因素。

R. Lakoff (1973) 曾试图将礼貌与合作原则整合起来, 提出了“语用能力规则”(rules of pragmatic competence), 即礼貌策略。包括三个规则: (1) 别强求对方; (2) 给对方留有余地; (3) 让对方感觉友好。(Jaszczolt. 2005: 26)

20世纪80年代, 英国语言学家Leech在“合作原则”的基础上, 从修辞学、语体学的角度出发, 提出了著名的“礼貌原则”。这一准则又可细分为六大准则, 即:

- A. 得体准则(Tact Maxim): 减少表达有损于他人的观点
  - (a) 尽量少让别人吃亏;
  - (b) 尽量多使别人受益。
- B. 慷慨准则(Generosity Maxim): 减少表达利己的观点
  - (a) 尽量少让自己受益;
  - (b) 尽量多让自己吃亏。
- C. 赞誉准则(Approbation Maxim): 减少表达对他人的贬低
  - (a) 尽量少贬低别人;
  - (b) 尽量多赞誉别人。
- D. 谦逊准则(Modesty Maxim): 减少对自己的赞誉
  - (a) 尽量少赞誉自己;
  - (b) 尽量多贬低自己。
- E. 一致准则(Agreement Maxim): 减少自己与别人在观点上的不一致
  - (a) 尽量减少双方的分歧;
  - (b) 尽量增加双方的一致。
- F. 同情准则(Sympathy Maxim): 减少自己与他在感情上的对立
  - (a) 尽量减少双方的反感;
  - (b) 尽量增加双方的同情。(何自然, 冉永平. 2002:123-4)

简言之, Leech礼貌原则的核心内容就是尽量使自己吃亏, 而使别人获益, 以便取得对方好感, 从而使交际顺利进行, 并使自己从中获得更大的利益。礼貌原则可以看作是合作原则的补充, 而Leech则更进一步认为礼貌原则“拯救”了合作原则。就某种程度而言, 较之合作原则, 礼貌原则具有更广泛的适用范围。

## 2. 商务信函的特点

商务信函是商贸活动中的一种重要通讯方式, 其内容常常是一种

业务安排、一项协议、一个合同的证件, 等等。商务信函属于比较拘谨正式的公文体, 行文端正、用字洗练, 一般遵守商业英语的写作原则, 即七“C”原则: correctness (正确)、conciseness (简练)、clearness (清楚)、completeness (完整)、concreteness (具体)、courtesy (礼貌)、consideration (体谅)。(王治奎. 2002: 265) 由此, 笔者总结出商务信函具有如下特点: (1) 准确完整。商务信函涉及到买卖双方的权利、义务和利害关系, 必须准确。内容上要力求完整具体, 以便及时得到对方迅速准确的反应。同时, 由于这种信函实际上已具备某种法律效力, 一旦发出对双方都将具有约束力, 如果不完整周详很可能引起不必要的纠纷。(2) 清晰简洁。商务信函要写得清楚明白, 避免模糊艰涩, 同时又要言简意赅, 避免罗嗦及不必要的重复。(3) 礼貌体谅。礼貌是书写商务信函的基本原则。写信避免居高临下、命令和粗鲁, 顾及对方的要求、愿望和情感等, 着重“正面地”、“肯定地”谈问题, 尽量避免“否定地”谈问题。

## 3. 礼貌原则在商务信函中的应用

在上面的篇章中已经详细阐明了Leech的礼貌原则, 分为六大

准则：策略（得体）准则、慷慨准则、赞誉准则、谦逊准则、一致准则、同情准则。这些准则解释了为什么有的交际语言比较礼貌，有的不那么礼貌。当然这并不意味着最礼貌的形式总是最合适的，因此在商务信函的写作翻译中我们也要这样对待。

(1) 策略准则和慷慨准则。这两项准则常用于指令和承诺，对于咨询信息、发盘还盘、商议付款条件、索取免费产品以及就赔付方式进行交涉等方面比较适用。如：

Should you desire, we would be pleased to send you catalogs together with export prices and estimated shipping costs for these items. (若贵方需要，本公司将乐意寄上目录以及这些项目的出口价格以及预估的运输费。)

We should be obliged if you would let us have some names and addresses of likely importers of good standing from your customers, together with brief credit reports on them. (如蒙告知你们客户中你们认为可靠的进口商号的名称和地址，并附来他们的资信简报，将十分感谢。)

以上两则例子从不同侧面体现了尽量令对方受益、自己吃亏的礼貌精神。如，“Should you desire, we would be pleased to... (若贵方需要，本公司将乐意...)”以及“We should be obliged if you... (如蒙...将十分感谢)”这可以视作是典型的“you-attitude”(对方态度)的书写方式。它从对方立场出发看待事情，淡化了以第一人称写作的主观立场，使对方最大限度受益。

(2) 赞誉准则和谦逊准则。这两项准则要求尽量减小对别人的贬损，夸大对别人的赞扬以及缩小对自己的赞扬，夸大对自己的贬损。在商务信函中这两项准则常见于试探合作意向、商谈合作细节，或是感谢信当中。如：

We were pleased to know from your letter of 24<sup>th</sup> October of your interest in our products and enclose the catalogue and pricelist asked for. Also enclosed you will find details of our conditions of sale and term of payment. (奉读10月24日来函，欣悉你们对我们的产品有兴趣。兹附上你们所要求的商品目录和价目表，并附上我们的售货条件和付款方式。)

(3) 一致准则。根据这一原则，贸易双方应尽量扩大一致，减少分歧。因此，这一准则对于我们写作关于投诉、谴责这一类型的书信回函很有帮助。

We have gone into the matter and we are prepared to make you a reasonable compensation, but not the amount you claimed, because we cannot see why the loss should be 50% more than the actual value of the goods.

写信人在指出对方索赔金额数目不合理之前首先表明愿意承担相应责任，目的在于尽量消除谈判的障碍，从而扩展了双方的一致，确保了合作的顺利进行。

(4) 同情准则。与一致准则相似，同情准则也要求尽力缩小自身对他人的感情对立，增加自己对他人的同情。如：

At any rate, we deeply regret to learn from you about this unfortunate incident and should it be necessary we shall be pleased to take the matter up on your behalf with the shipping company concerned.

以上这一事例真切表达了贸易一方对遭受损失一方的慰问及希望给予对方帮助之意，充分体现了同情准则的要求。

以上截取的这一些商务信函的例子都具备了成功沟通的条件，而且所反映出的礼貌现象也恰是Leech礼貌原则具体体现。

#### 4. 结语

基于上文分析，Leech的礼貌原则不仅是对语用学的重大贡献，而且对商务信函的书写及翻译具有重要的意义。一封礼貌的商务信函重视对方观点、尊重对方权利、迎合对方心理，因而能产生令人愉快的感觉，从而促成和扩大商贸往来。据此笔者认为，在具体的商务信函的写作中应重视礼貌原则的应用，以期达到最佳商业效果。

#### 参考文献

- [1] Hickey, Leo. (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
- [2] Jaszczolt, K. M.. *Semantics and Pragmatics---Meaning In Language and Discourse*. Peking University Press, 2005.
- [3] Leech, G. N.. *Principles of Politeness*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.
- [4] 何兆熊. 新编语用学概要[M]. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.
- [5] 何自然, 冉永平. 语用学概论(修订本)[M]. 长沙: 湖南教育出版社, 2002.
- [6] 金立. 合作与会话---合作原则及其应用研究[M]. 北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2005.
- [7] 姜望琪. 语用学---理论及应用[M]. 北京大学出版社, 2000.
- [8] 林旭涛. 浅析语用礼貌在对外经贸英语函电中的运用[J]. 广州广播电视大学学报. 2005, (2): 51-5.
- [9] 李露营, 李天梅. 外贸函电中的合作原则和礼貌原则[J]. 渝西学院学报(社会科学版). 2004, (1): 62-4.
- [10] 梅桂能. 当代外贸信函英语的礼貌原则[J]. 中国科技翻译. 2004, (1): 29-31.
- [11] 王治奎(主编). 大学汉英翻译教程[M]. 山东大学出版社, 1997.
- [12] 章云燕. 浅谈Leech的礼貌原则在商业书信上的运用[J]. 泰山乡镇企业职工大学学报. 2005, (2): 27-8.
- [13] 张迪, 张爱华(主编). 实用英语教你写---商务信函[M]. 北京航空航天大学出版社, 2004.

**Abstract:** Translation is essentially a cultural phenomenon. In the cross-cultural communication, domestication and foreignization are two translation strategies and have their own merits and values of application. The two principles are not incompatible; instead they should be applied in a flexible way.

**Keywords:** Domestication, Foreignization, Cross-cultural communication

## 1. Introduction: translation and culture

Translation involves two different languages and cultures; it is not only an inter-lingual activity, but also a cross-cultural communication event. In the past two decades, there has been a clear shift of focus in translation studies, a moving away from looking at translation as linguistic phenomena to looking at translation as cultural phenomena. Holz-Manttari uses “intercultural cooperation” to refer to translation; R Daniel Shaw coins the word “transculturation” to replace translation; Andre Lefevere views translation as “acculturation”. Furthermore, Lance Hewson and Jacky Martin (1991:131-135), while considering the translator as “cultural operator”, claim that “cultural equation should be an essential part of translation theory and practice alike”. From those points of views, it is safe enough for Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere to argue that translation studies is taking a historic “cultural turn”. (Gentzler, 1993:185).

In the translation process, culture influences translation strategies a translator may employ and then a very important and knotty problem arises, that is, how to deal with cultural messages a foreign text contains, or how does translator handle the cultural elements involved in cultural translation? What are the suitable methods? Should he take a source language culture-oriented approach, or conversely, a target language oriented-approach? These questions bring us to the so-called “which-culture to-attach-to-contradiction” (Dang, 1997:33), which in turn, leads to the debate between domesticating believers and foreignizing backers.

## 2. Domestication and foreignization

Domesticating translation and foreignizing translation are the terms brought up by an American scholar Lawrence Venuti to describe the two different translation strategies. He puts forth the corresponding terms of “domestication” and “foreignization” in his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* in 1995. The former refers to the translation in which a transparent, fluent style is adopted in order to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for target language readers, while the latter designates the type of translation in which a target text deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the foreignness of the original.

The roots of the terms can be traced back to the German philosopher Schleiermacher's who talked about the different methods of translating in a lecture that there are only two different methods of translation “either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and bring the reader to him, or he can leave the reader in peace as much as possible and bring the writer to him”. (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997:43)

Venuti Lawrence comments that Schleiermacher allows the translator to choose between a domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing method, an ethnodeviant pressure on target language cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.”(Venuti, 1995: 305-306).

There are different viewpoints on domestication and foreignization. An influential representative of domestication is Dr. Eugene Nida who focuses on the communicative function of translation. In his translation theory he emphasizes the equivalent, which consists of stylistic equivalence, social-cultural equivalence and linguistic equivalence. (Nida, 1964). Nida advocated “dynamic equivalence” defined “in terms of the degree to which the receptors of the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language” (Nida, 1964). He tries to find the equivalent effect in TL readers’ response. Guided by dynamic equivalence theory, he judges the “hearty handshake ” translated from “holly kiss” as a perfect equivalence. And he thinks the renditions from “it is as significant as a game of cricket” and “to grow like mushrooms” into “这事如同吃饭一样重要” and “雨后春笋” are successful. But as the readers’ conditions vary, such as the educational level, economic conditions and purposes of reading, the responses must be various. The result must be: a thousand readers will produce a thousand Hamlets in reading the same version of “Hamlet”.

Venuti himself strongly suggests that the foreignizing translation should be preferred. By making a thorough research into the history of western translation practice, he criticizes the target language culture oriented tendency characterized by fluent domestication in the Anglo-American translation practice. He argued that foreignizing translation is of great value in preserving the foreignness and otherness of the foreign culture. Venuti firmly believes that a translated text should be the site where a different culture emerges, where a reader gets a glimpse of a cultural otherness, and resistancy. A translation strategy based on an aesthetic of discontinuity can best preserve that difference, that otherness, by reminding the reader of the gains and losses in the translation process and the unbridgeable gaps between cultures. Venuti emphasizes that foreignizing translation restrains the ethnocentric violence on the foreign text and in today’s world, this strategic cultural intervention is particularly desirable in order to resist the hegemony of English-language culture and to fight against the phenomenon of inequality in cultural exchange. Hence, “foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations.” (Venuti, 1995: 20)

At home , Lu Xun(鲁迅,1881-1936), the great modernist innovator in Chinese fiction and well-known proponent of foreignizing translation, argues that:

“只求易懂，不如创作，或者改做，将事改为中国事，人也化为中国人。如果还是翻译，那么，首先的目的，就在博览外国的作品，不但移情，也要益智，至少是知道何时何地，有这等事，和旅行外国是很相像的：它必须有异国情调，就是所谓洋气。”（《鲁迅全集·且介亭杂文二集》）

He promoted literal translation and foreignization at that time and tried to retain the foreignness of foreign works, in order to introduce new thoughts and ideas into China. Though sometimes his translation was difficult to read and understand.

The representative of the method of domestication in translation is Qian Zhongshu who puts forward the famous norm in evaluating translation, that is, hua jing, or perfection , in his *Lin Shu's Translation*, these lines was read:

“文学翻译的最高标准是‘化’，把作品从一国文字转成另一国文字，即能不因语文习惯的差异而露出生硬牵强的痕迹，又能完全保存原用的风味，那就算得入于‘化境’。十七世纪有人赞美这种造诣的翻译，比为原作的‘投胎转世’，躯壳换了一个，而精神姿致依然故我。换句话说，译文对原作应该忠实得以至于读起来不像译本。因为作品在原文里决不会读起来像经过翻译似的。”（《林纾的翻译》）

In the 1990s, the dialogues about domestication and foreignization had reached the climax in China's translation arena. In the year 2002, domestication and foreignization were still the focus of discussion. Professor Yang Zijian (2002) and his coauthor make a research on the origins and definitions of the two terms in Chinese and English; Professor Wang Dongfeng's advocacy of foreignization in handling cultural differences fits into the tendency of global cultural blending (郭建中, 2003: 213); Professor Sun Zhili (2002) predicts the tendency of the theoretical development of the two strategies, pointing out that foreignization tends to be dominant in China's literary translation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; Professor Guo Jianzhong (2003) makes a detailed analysis of the concepts of adaptation and alienation in his academic paper *A Cultural Approach to Translation*, drawing a conclusion that adaptation and alienation will coexist forever.

### 3. Translation strategy

Then come to the question: What translation strategy is employed by the translator to deal with cultural differences? And what factors determine the translator's choice of translation strategy?

Those who advocate foreignization think that translation, as a means of cultural inter-communication, should let TL readers know foreign cultures and customs, and this is also the readers' purpose of reading translated texts, otherwise it is no more than “chewing food for others”. Furthermore, obtaining the characteristics of source language can fertilize target cultures and TL communicating methods, which is one of the purposes of translating. A translated text is not “faithful” if it fails to convey the phenomena of SL world. The opposite side, based on SL culture orientation, holds that this translating is overcoming barriers not only in languages, but also in cultures. The task of translators is to avoid cultural clashing. Domestication can be used to help TL readers comprehend much better, removing all barriers in reading in order to achieve the objective of inter-cultural communication.

Domestication and foreignization, which is to choose remains a debatable issue in translation studies. In fact, domestication and foreignization have their own merits and values of application considering the following variant factors: purposes of the author, types of texts, aims of translation, readers' levels and requirements, and even strong and weak cultures. The two methods have their advantages and disadvantages in translating different texts meant for various levels of readers for different purposes of authors and readers. They are complementary and non-contradictory.

In some instances, the translator should adapt foreignization method. Facts speak louder than words. The following are some good examples of proverbs translation. Let us compare the following versions:

Praise is not pudding.

赞美不能当布丁吃.

赞美不能当饭吃.

In the country of the blind the one-eyed man is king.



盲人国中,独眼称雄.

山中无老虎,猴子称霸王.

At first sight, we may think the first versions of the two examples are foreign, and other versions familiar, but we have to admit that the first version of both examples offer us a new expression and new cultural images: "布丁", "盲人国". Furthermore, as the development of cross-cultural communication, today's Chinese readers can accept these cultural terms and some of them even know their meanings well. On the contrary, if the translator translates them like the second versions, we only know "饭", and know nothing about the foreign culture, how can we communicate with the west? How can we learn something new from the west? Here the translator should use the foreignization method.

However, in some cases, the translator should adapt domestication. If it is very difficult for the reader to know the implication of the meaning through the foreignization method, then domestication is necessary. As we know, the two cultures have some cultural images in common, such as "dragon" and "龙", but their symbolic meanings are different. In English, the "dragon" symbolizes something evil, sinister and ferocious, while in China "龙" represents "strength" "dignity" and "wealth" etc. It is obvious that they are far from each other in meaning and if the translator uses foreignization blindly in this case, the consequence is awfully conceivable. Compare the following example.

Everyman has a fool in his sleeve.

人人都有糊涂的时候.

人人袖管里都装个傻瓜.

For Chinese readers, both "fool" and "sleeve" are not strange, for in China we also have these two cultural terms. But they cannot convey such meaning, and the reader cannot deduce this proverb's meaning this way. Therefore, the translator has to omit the cultural images and translate its meaning as shown in version 1.

Every dog has his day.

人人都有得意的时候.

每一条狗都有它的出头之日.

In Chinese culture, the dog is something nidering and ornery, while in the west it does not convey this derogative meaning, and people often use it to refer to a person. If the proverb is translated as version 2, the common reader will misunderstand its meaning. However, because Chinese Culture and English Culture are so different, they have more different than common. Consequently, in most cases, foreignization should be more appropriate.

Besides the cases discussed above, occasionally it is better for the translator to combine these two methods. He can preserve the foreign cultural images and points out its denotation. Take the following proverb as an example: To carry coals to Newcastle. Here, if it is translated as 多此一举 or 运煤到纽卡索, nether is a perfect translation. In this case, the best choice it is translate it as 运煤到纽卡索,多此一举. (Zhang Peiji, Yu Yungen, 2000:162) In this way, it not only preserves the original vivid image, but also makes the meaning clearer.

Foreignization aims for cultural transfer, whereas domestication tends to be the very

reverse of this transference. However, it should be admitted that no translation is the product of absolute domestication or foreignization. No matter what efforts a translator makes, the translated text is always the combination of the two strategies. If the translator employs one method absolutely at anytime, his translation will not be considered "excellent translation". Suppose he puts everything from the western culture to idiomatic Chinese words and images, he may violate the purpose of translation, lower the quality of his translation, mislead the reader or even lose the readers. For example, if the translator translates "God" from the west as "皇帝" in a literary work, the reader may thought in the west they also have "皇帝" and so we Chinese people can never know the west people have "上帝".

It has been proved that the two principles are not incompatible; instead they should be applied in a flexible way since translation is a complex work determined by different factors.

#### 4. Conclusion

In fact, cultural communication and transplanted can be done in several ways or approaches, which are useful and practicable in different aspects. According to Vermeer's skopos theory (Snell-Hornby, 2001), the translator can adopt domestication and foreignization with reference to a complete analysis of all kinds of factors. There is no difference of good or bad between domestication and foreignization, but the difference in proportion.

The controversy over strategies of domestication and foreignization can't be settled down by considering which is correct or incorrect, and which is better or worse. Overemphasizing domestication or foreignization is unscientific and one-sided. The two strategies have their respective features and applicable values. We should take a dynamic view to determine which strategy we should use in a translation. Neither domesticating strategy nor foreignizing strategy will replace each other. A good translator should use domestication and foreignization properly.

#### Bibliography

- [1] Venuti, L. (ed). *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of Translation* [M]. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- [2] 冀一志. 从跨文化角度看习语翻译[M]. 北京:外语教学与研究出版社, 1994.
- [3] 孙致礼. 中国的文学翻译: 从归化趋向异化[J]. 中国翻译, 2002(1).
- [4] 郭建中. 翻译中的文化因素: 异化与归化[J]. 外国语, 1998(2).
- [5] 王东风. 归化与异化: 矛与盾的交锋[J]. 中国翻译, 2002(9).
- [6] 刘英凯. 归化— 翻译的歧路[J]. 现代外语, 1987, (2).

---

上两条同类文章:

- [2 《译学辞典》的特色与不足](#)

翻译研究在线 translation studies online 版权所有 2005

[关于我们](#) - [联系方法](#) - [客户服务](#)

[联系信箱: dedecn@163.com](mailto:dedecn@163.com)