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Abstract. On one hand, some theoretic frameworks in the field of Translation Studies base their approach on a textual analysis, claiming the productivity (or even the necessity) of taking into account culture-specific textual conventions (as some functionalist approaches, cf. Reiss; Nord). On the other hand, the practice of translation is eventually summoned as an example in the field of discourse analysis, as a form of showing the relevance of the factor “speech community membership” and its effects on textual conventions. In spite of the apparently natural convergence of the works in the two areas, there seems to be little dialog between them, and their works seem to be carried on in parallel, without there being an effective interaction. There is sometimes even an categorical refuse in keeping any dialog, arguing that Linguistics did not ask yet the questions that are of interest to Translation Studies, while the relative youth of the field may contribute to the somewhat negligent way that Linguistics treat the subject “Translation”. Considering specifically the question of textual genres and generic taxonomies, the present work intends to verify to which extent there is any dialog between Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies (more specifically between Discourse Analysis and the functionalist frameworks cited above), as well as the convergences of the works and the possible benefits of an effective dialog between the two fields, a dialog that can be favored by the emphasis given by many theoretic frameworks from Translation Studies in the textual aspects of translation (i.e. in the fact that a translation is a translated text, a textual production in the target language). As we shall see, although the interests on textual genres have began at the same period in both fields, there seems to be little interaction between the ways the subject matter is treated by these fields, even though the questions raised on both of them are very similar.

1. Purposes of the work

Since translation is essentially a linguistic phenomenon, there seem to be a lot of possible points of contact between Translation Studies (TS) and Linguistics. These possible points of contact include textual questions, as approached by Discourse Analysis (DA) and some models in translation theory such as the functionalist models of Katharina Reiss and Christiane Nord.

In the intersection of interests of these two areas, i.e. Translation Studies and Linguistics or, more specifically, between these two models and Discourse Analysis, lies the question of textual genres. On one hand, this question has a fundamental importance in DA, and we sometimes find references to translation practice (usually with reference to culture specificity or discourse communities discussion) in the field. On the other hand, the models of Reiss and Nord both make explicit and systematic use of the notions of textual types and genres, fundamental concepts for the analysis of textual genres on DA.

In spite of the possible convergence of the two areas, the real interface between them seems to be very small. Rather than an actual dialogue between these two fields, what we have is a parallel development of the discussion about textual genres. In what follows, we will try to
demonstrate that some insights from each area could be useful to the other. Of course, each area has its own specific interests and approaches, but we would like to assume a (partial) notion of commensurability here. In other words, each area could benefit from some insights of the other, even if they are not completely commensurable. We will present a brief (and therefore not completely fair) presentation of the models of Reiss and Nord. We will then advance to some commentaries on the works that are relevant to the discussion about textual genres in the area of DA, mainly those of M. Bakhtin (2000), J.M. Swales (1990) and J.P. Bronckart (2003). Finally, we will try to establish a comparison between the state of affairs of these two fields, attempting to show that things occur in parallel when they can profit from each other.

2. Functionalist Models: Reiss and Nord

We have chosen the functionalist models of Reiss and Nord both for their relevance in translation studies as well-known practice-oriented models of translation theory and for their explicit use of the notions of text types and textual genres in their frameworks. In addition, we will highlight the importance of their textual typologies (especially in Reiss’ model). As we have mentioned above, Nord’s model is functionalist in the sense that it is part of the theoretic trend context of German Functionalism in TS. Reiss’ model, on the other hand, is functionalist in the broader sense in that it is function-oriented. Nevertheless, Reiss’ works are of fundamental relevance to the development of German Functionalism, and we can state that Nord’s functionalism is doubtlessly connected to it in genetic terms.

2.1. Reiss’ model

The first works of Katharina Reiss on translation theory date back to the 60’s, beginning with the proposal of her function-oriented model of translation analysis. Her model is based on a notion of functional invariance in translation, i.e. a translation should a priori maintain the same function of its source text (ST). Reiss’ model is one of the first models to work with a top-down strategy rather than one that is bottom-up. In other words, it is one of the first models to work with a global-oriented approach that not only considers specific occurrences of one or another problem but also works with a broader view of the translation process based on the notion of a global function of the source text to be reproduced in the target text (TT). This, in turn, guides the translator’s choices. To Reiss, a textual typology is a non-negotiable condition to a theory that intends to account fully for the translated texts functionality.

The possible functions a text may assume are segmented on a typology of text types and genres. The categorization of texts begins with a threefold division of greater text-types established from Bühler’s communication model (K. Bühler 1934):

In analogy to Bühler’s model of the linguistic signs (1934, 1965), which establishes the three Basic functions of the linguistic sign (representative, expressive and appellative), we have identified the three basic functions of texts that are derived from the communicative intention of the text’s author (Reiss 1971, 1976, 1978) and which we use to characterize the different textual categories. (K. Reiss and H. Vermeer 1984: 178, our translation).

In Reiss’ model, the three textual categories are: 1) informative “text to transfer news, knowledge, opinions, etc. – in sum, to inform” (K. Reiss and H. Vermeer 1984: 179); 2) expressive “mainly to transmit contents organized in an artistic fashion, consciously organizing
the content according to aesthetic criteria” (K. Reiss and H. Vermeer 1984: 179); and 3) operative “to transmit contents of persuasive character to induce the text’s receiver to act in the sense intended by the text’s sender (or his client) – intention which corresponds to the appellative function of the language” (K. Reiss and H. Vermeer 1984: 179).

It is worth noting that the criterion for the establishment of these text types is essentially functional. Reiss still discusses two other functions pointed out by Jakobson: the phatic and poetic functions. However, she concludes that they can be left aside since they can be present in the others without changing the text function.

Translation strategies will be directly derived from these three textual types through a three-phased model of textual analysis. The first step of analysis (1) concerns the establishment of the textual type. The second step (2) involves the establishment of the textual variety (genre). The third step (3) involves the analysis of style.

Step 1) deals with the classification of the text into one of the three textual categories mentioned above according to its function. Step 2) is related to the classification of the text in a given textual genre. Reiss does not propose an exhaustive list of textual genres, nor does she propose well-defined criteria to this classification: She does, however, remark that discourse community and temporal aspects (social and historic aspects) play a main role on this stage. She defines this step as “the classification of a given text according to specifically structured socio-cultural patterns of communication belonging to specific language communities” (K. Reiss 1971: 165). In step 3) the translator analyzes the stylistic features of the text and identifies what makes it unique, i.e. its particularities and idiosyncrasies despite being bound to a specific textual genre and type.

The classification of a text into a given textual type guides the translator’s overall method and strategies. This occurs according to the function of the ST to be reproduced in the Target Language (TL). The identification of the text as belonging to a given genre affects the structure of the text in a more local way. As Reiss points out “the text type determines the general method of translating. The text variety demands consideration for language and text structure conventions.” (K. Reiss 1971: 166).

However, not every case is that well behaved, and Reiss is aware of this. The situation mentioned above refers to the so-called “normal” cases of translation characterized by the intention of reproducing the ST function in the TT (Target Text). There are cases, however, in which we may not be interested in keeping the ST function. Furthermore, there may be some cases in which we find it difficult to identify the text-type membership of a given text clearly. Reiss refers to the first as “problematic cases” and the second as “special cases”.

An example of a “problematic case” would involve the translation of a text during a language class. Here, what is at stake would not be the reproduction of the ST function but rather the production of a text that explicitly demonstrates language knowledge.3 Reiss’ solution to this case would be to adopt a translation typology and use it instead of the textual typology established above. This would produce a “foreign function” in the translation, i.e. textual patterns that are potentially alien to the target culture.

The “special cases” would include ones in which the text is hybrid by nature, i.e. presenting or oscillating between two or more text-functions. An example would be the presence of ideological elements in a journalistic text, i.e. the (secondary?) presence of the operative function in an informative text. In this case, we would simply try to reproduce the hybrid nature of the ST or, if cultural or linguistic questions prevented us from maintaining both functions in the TT, at least keep the primary function of the text and leave the secondary function aside (K. Reiss 1971: 170).
2.1.1. A brief criticism on Reiss’ model

Reiss’ model is intended as a general framework for the treatment of translation problems in a systematic way, and our commentaries bear this fact in mind. As we have already mentioned, the model has the merit of being one of the first to employ a systematic approach to problem solving in translation. Still, as a general model, it has to be able to facilitate a helpful translation strategy for each offer of information (ST).

Reiss very elegantly handles the so-called “normal cases”, systematically deriving translation strategies by crisscrossing textual types and genres while leaving the door open for textual idiosyncrasies. However, her solutions concerning “special cases” and “problematic cases” seem a little *ad hoc*. First, the “special cases” have little special about them. Instead, they seem to reflect a very common situation of daily textual practice. The exception (if any) seems to lie in the case of texts with “pure” textual functions. In this case, deriving translation strategies directly from textual types would entail blurring the possibility of different strategies in the domain of the same text type. As such, we would employ the very same translation strategies for, say, a text with user instructions and an advertisement if we consider both to be operative texts (i.e. if we consider that both texts are intended to produce a response from the reader). The strategies governing these two kinds of texts will certainly be very different. They will not merely concern the question of text-structure given by the recognition of genre-specific patterns for form and language use. The situation gets even more problematic if we consider hybrid cases, as pointed out by J. Azenha JR (1999: 50, our translation):

> if we take the model proposed by Reiss to its last consequences we will have to place in the same compartment designated to informative texts, for example, texts that in the percentual evaluation of their primary, secondary and tertiary functions will show very divergent indices for its main function.

Reiss’ threefold taxonomy works well only with texts that belong prototypically to a certain text type. She does not give us any procedure to work with texts whose main function is undetermined or hard at least to determine. Furthermore, if we take Reiss’ model seriously, the differences between a deviant and a prototypical text (and the multiple degrees in between) are completely lost as long as they remain in the domain of the same textual type. Of course, we can interpret this undetermined state within the category of idiosyncrasies. However, the model would then lose most of its explanatory appeal since we would include a great number of categories that are clearly non-idiosyncratic or even regular (such as jokes on the crisscrossing of two textual functions, e.g. political jokes).

As far as “problematic cases” are concerned, the situation is pretty much the same. The cases involving function change are not that uncommon. In fact, generalizing these cases as “normal” situations in translation (functional invariance being the exception and not the rule) leads to the creation of theories such as the Skopos Theory by K. Reiss and H. Vermeer (1984) (see Nord’s model, below).

The focus of Reiss’ model is clearly the threefold division of text types. Textual genres are not omitted, of course, but the author is somewhat brief in her treatment of them. This situation contrasts that of M. Bakhtin (2000), where textual genres are the unquestionable focus. Like Reiss, Bakhtin does not provide explicit criteria to the establishment of textual genres, but the subject occupies a great part of the bakhtinian reflection. To Bakhtin, genres are “relatively stable types of utterances” (M. Bakhtin 2000: 279) encoding every form of linguistic communication. However, their stability and norms are not as strong as syntactic or morphologic rules. In addition, genres are much more flexible and provide some room for
individual preferences. Yet even these preferences are determined bearing in mind the standard forms of the genre. The style is “inseparably linked to the utterance and to the typical forms of utterances” (M. Bakhtin 2000: 283). In contrast to Reiss perspective, Bakhtin’s point of view has the advantage of linking the notions of textual genres and individual style, with each one being defined in relation to the other. As a consequence, we can easily derive the notion of individual style from the ideas of prototypicality, thereby making the notion of the non-prototypical text helpful rather than problematic.

Curiously, the discussion presented by Bakhtin does not appear in Reiss’ work, nor does her threefold taxonomy of text types seem to cause any impact in the discussion of text typologies in DA. This is noteworthy in that Reiss’ work is considered a pioneer effort on the subject.

2.2. Nord’s model

The model of C. Nord (2005) is an application model of Vermeer’s and Reiss’ Skopos Theory (Reiss & Vermeer 1984). It is interesting for our purposes not only because of its genetic connection with Reiss’ model but also because it is presented first and foremost as “a model of text analysis” applied to translation.

Unlike its ancestor, Skopos Theory does not base itself on the functional invariance between ST and TT. Instead, its fundamental insight is that the function of the TT can be (and often is) different from that of the ST, depending on the initiator’s needs and the purposes of the translation as specified in the translation brief. Nevertheless, the approach still remains essentially functionalist, with the basic difference that in Skopos Theory:

- it is not the source text as such, or its effect on the ST receiver, or the function assigned to it by the author, that operates the translation process, as is postulated by equivalence-based translation theory,
- but the intended function or skopos of the target text as determined by the initiator’s needs. (C. Nord 2005: 10)

From its very beginnings, this approach avoids the need of dealing with the “problematic cases”. Since there is no imperative of functional invariance and the translator’s strategies are not derived directly from the ST function, any “foreign function” a text might have presents no problem. At least this is true in all other cases that must be dealt with by the theory. Nord’s model also comprises an analysis of the role played by each actor on the translation process. We will not deal with this analysis here. Instead, we will focus specifically on the question of textual analysis as it is proposed by the author.

By keeping the same categorization proposed by Reiss, Nord does not abandon the notion of textual types. As we have observed, “problematic cases” are avoided by Reiss, and we still have no solution to “special cases”. The strategy adopted by Nord consists of decentralizing the notion of textual type, giving greater emphasis to the notion of textual genres and sketching a solution to prototypes in this level. Textual genres, in turn, are not classified in an exhaustive list but rather analyzed in terms of certain parameters that should guide the translator’s decision-making process.

These parameters are divided into extra-textual and intra-textual factors. Extra-textual factors concern non-linguistic contexts or situational factors. They include sender, sender’s intention, receiver, medium, place, time, motive and function. Sender and receiver establish the actors involved in the text’s production and reception, while the factors medium, place, time and motive try to capture the context of this textual production and reception. It is worth noting that Nord treats text function as an extra-textual factor since it is “the communicative function, or
combination of communicative functions, which a text fulfills in its concrete situation of production/reception” and is derived from the other textual factors (C. Nord 2005: 77-78). In contrast to Reiss, “the function of target text (TT) is not arrived at automatically from the analysis of the source text (ST), but it must be pragmatically defined by the purpose of the TT” (C. Nord 2005: 77).

Intra-textual factors include subject matter, content, presupposition, composition, lexis, sentence structure, suprasegmental features and non-verbal elements. Subject matter, content and presupposition concern the content of the text, the overall idea, the ideas explicitly presented and the ideas implied within. Conversely, composition, lexis, sentence structure cover the structural linguistic properties of the text. Suprasegmental features (e.g. italics) and non-verbal elements (e.g. pictures) cover those properties that are not properly linguistic ones. The crisscrossing of these factors is more directly related to the identification of the text as belonging to a given genre.

All these factors could be captured by a set of WH- questions based on the New Rhetoric Formula, which is used by Nord as a guideline to the textual analysis. The questions are as follows:

- **Who** transmits
  - to whom
  - what for
  - by which medium
  - where
  - when
  - why
  - a text
  - with what function?

- **On what subject matter** does he/she say
  - what
  - (what not)
  - in what order
  - using which non verbal-elements
  - in which words
  - in what kind of sentences
  - in which tone
  - to what effect?

As we can see, the set of questions on the left is intended to capture the extra-textual factors, while the set of questions on the right should capture intra-textual factors. These questions can help the translator in ST analysis as well as in the prospective analysis of the TT. The analysis of these factors should also provide us with information about the textual genre of the ST (and, hence, of the TT) as well as the degree of the text’s prototypicality as an example of the textual genre as a whole. This last bit of information should be derived from the predictability of occurrence with certain features in a given genre. In other words, the more predictable a feature is, the more conventional the text’s effect will be (C. Nord 2005: 150). Function is still the central notion in Nord’s model, although ST function does not (necessarily) determine translation strategies. These will be arrived at by means of the prospective (i.e. intended) function of the TT as established in the translation brief. The TT function is determined by/ determines (prospectively) the interaction of the textual factors outlined above.

### 3. Discourse analysis

One of the most polemic points of Reiss’ model is her threefold division of textual types since they seem to be too static to handle real-world textual categories and also experience some difficulties with borderline-cases. Nord skips this discussion, avoiding a categorical classification of textual genres and reducing the role of textual types in her model. Part of the criticism faced by Reiss’ model may even be a direct result of the option to adopt a textual taxonomy, whatever it may be.
In terms of the discussion about the possibility/productivity of textual typologies, we find a similar discussion in the domain of DA, with positions varying from the most radical ones (such as that of L.A. Marcuschi: 2005) that strongly disagree with taxonomical and formal positionings to those that stress the pedagogical importance of text typologies (such as B. Schneuwly and J. Dolz: 2004). Although Nord does not present a textual typology, her position does not seem to be a negative one (like Marcuschi’s), but more like that of J.P. Bronckart (2003). Bronckhart does not present a textual typology either, but this is not out of the belief that the effort is useless. Quite to the contrary, he (like Nord) presents a list of parameters to ensure objectivity in the delimitation of textual genres. In fact, all these positions favoring textual typologies share the common trait that they touch upon pedagogical concerns. Reiss, and especially Nord, are concerned with translator training, and their models are presented as potentially helpful to classroom situations. Thus, the textual genres are presented as crucial concepts both in regular education and translator training.

Even more interestingly, the understanding of translating as an actual textual production in and of its own, as emphasized by many contemporary theories, may favor initiatives such as Nord’s, in which she presents her model, first and foremost, as one of text analysis. In this context, it should come as no surprise that the Nord’s parameters coincide extensively with those employed by Bronckart. For purposes of comparison, we present below a schema of the variables employed by Bronckart in his analysis of textual genres, referring the reader to the textual factors employed by Nord above:

| LANGUAGE ACTION          | REPRESENTATIONS OF THE AGENT/PERSO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective parameters:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sender, eventual co-sender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Space/time of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sociosubjective parameters:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frame of social interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enunciator’s role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Addressees’s role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other representations of situation and knowledge available to the person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENRE’S NEBULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explicit classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indexations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forms of Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attributed value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPIRICAL TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Genre example)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Conditions of production of a new text
As we can see, many of the factors considered by Nord coincide with those considered by Bronckart. In the first part, we notice variables that should determine the context and the agents involved in the communication. These correspond to Nord’s extra-textual factors, while the second part considers those variables more directly responsible for the shape of the text (Nord’s intra-textual factors). Both authors assert that these parameters should guide text analysis and facilitate the identification of a text as belonging to a given genre. They also coincide in showing a clear interest in establishing the conditions of text production and reception. This interest is considered one of the greatest improvements of Nord’s model over that of Reiss. Of course, the comparison presented here is very brief, and a work comparing Bronckart’s and Nord’s approaches more specifically might prove very interesting. However, we will leave this discussion to another occasion.

To Nord, since formal characteristics are multifunctional (i.e. many functions may correspond to a single formal characteristic, depending on the communicative situation), “communicative function is not only the fundamental constitutive feature of texts but it also determines the strategies of text production”. A text is considered “a product of the author’s intention”, and it “remains provisional until it is actually received. It is the reception that completes the communicative situation and defines the function of the text” (C. Nord 2005: 18-19). Even recognizing the text as “a product of the author’s intention”, Nord rejects the possibility of interpreting communicative intention as a central criterion since “the best of intentions does not guarantee that the result will conform to the intended purpose” (C. Nord 2005: 53). This choice contrasts with that of J.M. Swales (1990), who assumes that communicative intention is a privileged criterion for establishing textual genres.

Swales considers the question about criteria for genre classification in a more detailed fashion than Nord, who seems somewhat hasty in her choice of communicative function as the fundamental feature. It is not also not completely clear what she understands as “fundamental constitutive feature”, i.e. whether function alone is enough for determining genre or, if not, what the role of the other features would be? (Is it a necessary condition for genre membership, etc.). On the other hand, Swales presents a long discussion on this matter, discussing recent proposals in DA and in other different areas. Considering the great variability of forms a text may have while still remaining within the domain of the same textual genre, Swales points out certain difficulties in defining genre membership by a single criterion or even by a set of necessary and sufficient conditions. He considers the wittgensteinian solution of *family resemblances*, also discussing the notion of prototypicality. He concludes that no single criterion or set of necessary and sufficient conditions is capable of giving a full account of genre membership. Beyond this, he also points out a small abuse of the notion of family resemblance, which might virtually establish a family relation between any two members of any given sets.8 Thus, following Armstrong (Armstrong et Alii, in J.M. Swales 1990), Swales adopts a compromise between the categorialistic view and the notion of family resemblance, assuming that, even if we are not able to define membership in a category through necessary and sufficient conditions, some properties may be more relevant than others in determining category membership. This coincides with the case of communicative intention and would, thus, play a more central role in the identification of genre membership.

However, Swales does not consider the possibility of adopting communicative function over communicative intention as his privileged criterion. We could present objections both to the choice of communicative intention and communicative function as privileged criteria. For function, would a text that is intended to be one of persuasion but fails to meet its goals then be considered as belonging to another textual genre? Since the argument presented by Nord is that, “The best of intentions does not guarantee that the result will conform to the intended purpose,” would we then have one category for successful advertisements and another for unsuccessful advertisements? On the other hand, a text can fulfill a specific function without having its actual
intention recognized by the reader, as in the case of veiled insinuations to influence the reader in a supposedly informative text.

Of course, we do not intend to solve the matter here. What we would like to do is point out some convergences in the two authors’ work, demonstrating that a dialog between them could be very profitable even though this dialog may not actually occur. Moreover, genres in translation could be a very productive source of insights to DA since translators have to deal more directly with culture-specific questions and reflect about the changes generated by switching languages and discourse communities in the production of the TT. Translation Studies, in turn, could profit from the discussion about the subject in DA since this is one of the most widely discussed topics in the field. It is interesting to highlight the fact that the works of Swales and Nord are very close, temporally speaking. The first version of Nord’s *Text Analysis in Translation*, still in German, dates back to 1988. It was translated to English in a 1991 edition and revised in 2005. Swales’ work *Genre Analysis*, in turn, is first published in 1990, only two years after the first publication of Nord’s initial work in German and a year before the publication of the English version.

4. Conclusion

If, on one hand, there seem to be convergences between the developments of the question of textual genres in Translation Studies and Discourse Analysis, on the other hand, it seems that these two areas always evolve in parallel. The question seems far from a solution in both DA and TS, and both areas still generate conceptual problems, vague definitions and a certain amount of confusion in trying to define the behavior of textual genres. Still, the advantages of establishing a textual typology seem to outweigh the disadvantages. Moreover, if as some DA theorists state “[Textual genres] are socio-discursive entities and forms of social action unavoidable in any communicative situation” (L.A. Marcuschi 2002: 19), Reiss will have been right when she stated the impossibility of separating the practice of translation from the notion of textual types. On the other hand, if Reiss is right, DA is to blame for leaving translation aside since it is a textual phenomenon in its own right and, therefore, subject to the same relations of textual genres constraints as any other text. The only difference is that it has its own peculiarities that must be taken into account in any theory concerning textual genres.
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1 This is a position we are adopting in this work: translation is essentially a linguistic phenomenon. This does not mean that it can be fully explained with reference only to the linguistic system involved. As the study of language itself, translation involves a variety of other aspects beyond the linguistic ones, although they will be linguistically encoded out of necessity.

2 Nord’s model is, in fact, functionalist in the strictest sense (i.e. belongs to the theoretic trend of German Functionalism), while Reiss’ model is functionalist in a broader sense (that of having functional concerns).

3 This is, of course, not the only possibility of the translation-in-class situation: a translation in a language class could very well demand reflections about a more “natural” way of expressing oneself in the TL.

4 The initiator in the Skopos Theory is the responsible for the translation’s demand. For spatial reasons, we will not present the Skopos Theory in detail. For a presentation of the theory, see K. REISS and H. VERMEER (1984).

5 The question of prototypicality in the functionalist framework is dealt with by Mary Snell-Hornby and Mia Vannerem (H. VANNEREM and M. SNELL-HORNY (1986). They work with the wittgensteinian notion of family resemblance as well as the treatment given to prototypicality by Rosch and Lakoff.

6 Motive refers to the reason why the text has been written. For example, a speech may have been written for reading during the celebration of a city’s birthday.

7 The origins of this formula can be traced back to the 2nd century B.C, with the stoic Hemagoras of Temnos. It has suffered many changes through time to conform to modern rhetoric and its applicability to translation has been discussed by K. REISS and H. VERMEER (1984), K. BÜHLER (1984) and HÖNIG (1986) (Cf. NORD 2005: 41).

8 See A. WIERZBICKA (1986) for a discussion of the problems of indiscriminate use of this notion.