Bassnett-McGuire, S *Translation Studies: Revised Edition*, London, Routledge, 1991. First Edition 1980.

Translation Studies remains the best brief, clear introduction to translation studies. It is an excellent book to recommend to someone who wants to know what Translation Studies is about. It has three chapters covering in breadth but concisely (1) Central Issues, (2) History of Translation Theory, and (3) Specific Problems of Literary Translation. It presents a balanced account of a range of views and is, with its select, annotated bibliography, an excellent guide to further reading. It should, in my opinion, be a set text for any introductory course in translation theory/studies.

The book does lack, however, a chapter on the concerns of practising career translators, the majority of whom do not focus on literary translation. They tend to be concerned with a variety of text types, with rates for the job, working practices, machine aids and so on, (see Sager, 1984, and issues of *Professional Translator and Interpreter*). Nor does it address the question of translators' training. It is a pity that these gaps have not been filled in the revised edition, because if they had, the book might reach a wider audience whose horizons would be broadened by it, as would the horizons of those whom it reaches at present, were they to become more aware of the concerns of professional translators. On the other hand, more text might mean a higher price which might, of course, have the effect of restricting the readership. As it stands, the book is reasonably priced in Britain at £7.99.

The revised edition is revised only in the sense of having been given its own preface and a select bibliography (unfortunately not annotated) of work in Translation Studies 1980-1990. The new Preface proclaims that Translation Studies is now firmly established as a discipline in its own right. It has become more self-assured, less Eurocentric, and happy to accommodate a variety of directions of research. A number of the discipline's current concerns are briefly discussed: the Tel Aviv group's work on how translated texts are absorbed into cultures; the interest in translators' prefaces in general and their metaphors for translation in particular – the Brazilian metaphor of translation as cannibalism is picked out as especially significant; the translation of women's writing; Derrida's post-structuralist views on translation; intercultural transfer –

linguistic, historical and socio-political – through translation; and so on.

It is a pity that the Twentieth Century section of the chapter on the History of Translation Theory (Ch. 2) has not been revised to include these topics in more depth than the preface allows; surely such additional coverage would have been worth an extra pound or so. In spite of this, however, I shall continue to recommend the book to all and sundry.

Kirsten Malmkjær
University of Cambridge

References

Professional Translator and Interpreter: The Journal of the Institute of Translation and Interpreting, and the Translators Association of the Society of Authors, 318a Finchley Road, London NW3 5HT, UK. Correspondent in Brazil: Nicholas Davies, Rua Conselheiro Paulino, 57 Bairro de Fátima, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Sager, J.C. (1984), 'Reflections on the didactic implications of an extended theory of translation' in W. Wilss and G. Thome (eds), *Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 333-43.

Basnett, S & Lefevere, A (eds) *Translation, History and Culture.* **London: Pinter Publishers, 1990.**

This is an outstanding book in more than one respect. It is, like many volumes on the subject, a collection of papers by lecturers and researchers from various universities in Europe, the United States and Canada. However, unlike many such anthologies it has a unity of purpose and follows a similar set of theoretical presuppositions. These are given by the editors, Susan Basnett & André Lefevere, both well-known translation scholars and authors, respectively, of the widely used introductory *Translation Studies* and the authoritative *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. This book is the first in a projected series of volumes devoted to various aspects of Translation Studies. The astonishingly high price, £32 for barely 133 pages, is deplorable because the whole book, almost without exception, is very readable and largely accessible for the average undergraduate student and the general reader.

It is perhaps useful to state what Basnett and Lefevere understand to be their field of study. For them, following the pioneering work done in Tel Aviv and the Low Countries under the aegis of Gideon Toury, Translation Studies means the study of *literary* translations, with a specific methodology which is not to be confused with Comparative Literature or Linguistics, the two areas within which translation has traditionally been studied. Not surprisingly they are extremely critical of both approaches which they regard as too narrow. Their attack against the linguistic approach in particular is recurrent and the main argument is that it is too formalist and takes place in a vacuum. They observe that linguistics has used *equivalence* as its central concept when dealing with translation.

They observe that Translation Studies, the "success story of the 1980s ... has moved on from a formalist approach and turned instead to the larger issues of context, history and convention" (p 11). So they reject "the old method of setting one translation alongside another" as much as the "old evaluative norms of 'good' and 'bad', 'faithful' and 'unfaithful' and propose instead "to consider the relative function of the text in each of its two contexts" p 12). Comparative literature is dismissed without further ado: Basnett and Lefevere simply propose to invert the former situation of dependence and to consider it as a "subcategory of Translation Studies" (p 12). There seems to be some inconsistency in insisting on calling the discipline by a general label while at the same time excluding non-literary texts from its research area. One could argue that a truly general discipline of Translation Studies would be better served by a general (socio)linguistic approach, since there seems to be a contradiction in enlarging the field of study and at the same time giving attention to just one text type. If it is true, as they claim, that sentence-based linguistics was unable or unwilling to deal with textual or supratextual translational phenomena, it is no less true that sticking to literary texts alone can be very limiting to a general study of translation.

Obviously the seemingly radical ideas outlined above are realised differentially in the actual texts of the different contributors. These, 13 in number, pay lip service to the overall theoretical tenets, but in practice the old normative stances appear now and then with undiminished force, although under different guises.

In their jointly signed preface the editors summarize very succinctly the set of ideas which will be repeated throughout the book by almost all the authors, even when the actual analyses seems to contradict them:

Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live. (p IX)

The ideas above, which, as the authors themselves admit, come partly from a combination of the specialized works by Toury with Foucault's philosophical and sociological insights, could equally well be applied to the book under review. Most of the contributors are foreigners, writing in a foreign language for a foreign audience, guided by foreign theoretical mentors. One could argue that much of what is said in the essays represents a sort of rewriting for specific purposes, amounts to a manipulation, represents (academic or intellectual) power and could cause or repress innovation. A potentially embarrassing feature is that, with the notable exception of the Czech contribution, the old role division between the thinking West and the following periphery is evident in this volume. The very fact that everyone writes in the language of the major world power is not without significance.

The editors' bold claim that this book "finally begins to do justice to the central role translation has played in Western culture almost from the very beginning (p 1)", will probably be received by many with disbelief or at best discomfort. Their other major claim, that this volume marks a 'cultural turn', a shift from 'text' to 'culture' as the 'translation unit', sounds, on the contrary, highly plausible. In fact, all the essays appear to share this view in one way or another, even if such a turn would perhaps be better described as 'sociological' rather than cultural.

Trying to avoid textual examples has a price: the discourse becomes very abstract; so all the articles seem to repeat tirelessly in slightly different words the same general ideas. On the other hand, equivalence returns by the back door disguised in expressions like

"optimal conditions" of translation, "manipulation" of ST, and sometimes by the front in opinions or judgements like "translators *should be* bicultural", "the translation is a *crib*" [my emphases].

For Basnett and Lefevere translations belong to a larger text type, that which includes texts making an 'image' of another text. They add that "other types would be criticism, historiography, commentary and anthologising". (p 15). The problem with this conception is that it stresses the common points translated texts share with other texts (why not include others?) and neglects their essential difference, namely the fact that they have been created in another linguistic code. One doubts if such a reduction to a common denominator, surprising as it may seem, can lead us too far in the understanding of the mechanisms of translation.

The first essay, by Lefevere himself, has the misleading title of "Translation: Its Genealogy in the West", which induces the reader to think in terms of history when in fact it is a theoretical paper with historical *examples*. These form a small anthology of typical cases, some of them curious, serving to illustrate particular theoretical points, for example, the importance of ideology or of dominant poetics in the target culture to the explanation of the ways some works have been translated. Lefever's main position is summarized on page 26: Language is not the problem. Ideology and poetics are, as are cultural elements that are not immediately clear, or seen as completely 'misplaced' in what would be the target culture version of the text to be translated. One wonders in which sign system ideology and poetics are represented. Indeed, how can one distinguish ideological or poetical features without some sort of linguistic analysis?

"Translation: Text and Pre-Text 'Adequacy' and 'Acceptability' in Crosscultural Communication", by the Bulgarian scholar Palma Zlateva, also has a misleading title. It sounds detached but is in reality a quite passionate attack on the mistakes and deviations of different kinds that she found in Bulgarian translations of English texts. She takes a clear position as regards the translated texts on which she comments and her attitude is more often than not one of censorship. Despite the academic jargon what one sees is the old normative stance against translators, signalled, among other things, by the modals: "she *must* apply" (p31), "the translator *has to* know literature" (p32), "he *should have* rendered at least" (p35). In the end it is not clear what the author understands by 'acceptability', if not her own personal taste, since she dismisses the opinion of reviewers (see p. 32) and seems, surprisingly enough, to equate success with adequacy (see p. 35: "Bulgarians are now reading quite adequate, readable and,

therefore, bestselling translations of *Airport, The Final Diagnosis* and *Hotel.*").

Anne Mette Hjort tackles the philosophical problem of translation. She proposes a rather benign interpretation of Quine's position on translation, finding that his scepticism has ben misread and arguing that his 'sceptical arguments may be usefully mobilized in order to bring the pragmatic (i.e. the political and institutional) dimensions of translation to the fore (p 38). This stance she terms "prudent fallibilism" or "moderate fallibilism" in contradistinction to the merely negative "imprudent scepticism", which simply denies the possibility of translation. The lesson to be learnt from the sceptic, according to Hjort, is negative in nature, namely "that metaphysical categories cannot ground our practices as translators" (p 42).

The concept of a 'correct translation', defined by Hjort as 'one in harmony with public norms and conventions' (p 42), seems to amount to no more than a justification of actual practices. On the other hand, she seems to see greater homogeneity and stability in the dominant norms than is perhaps the case in most societies, when she states that the success of a translation "is determined by the extent to which it accords with certain social, political and linguistic conventions." (p 43)

Maria Tymoczko touches on a rarely treated subject: oral literary translation. She rightly argues that, for most of human history, the majority have lived outside the world of written texts and in consequence translation theory should take into account oral translation. Unfortunately the examples she gives of oral translation are somewhat flawed and smack of the ideological bias that she denounces in others. A typical instance, is 'translations of *Hamlet* for "a group of illiterate elders" in West Africa. Like many examples given by Nida of biblical translation this is a case of translation for so-called "primitive people". One is not informed of the degree of linguistic and cultural competence of the translator in the language in question – indeed very revealing is the fact that not even the name of the language is mentioned.

Drawing theoretical conclusions from such an experiment seems, therefore, at least precipitate. More valid perhaps would be to monitor how translators of these oral cultures do actually work. Much of the "typical features" of the culture in question chosen in order to be audience friendly may not in reality occur in the oral text of native translators. As Borges cleverly remarks, the word *camel* does not appear at all in the *Koran* although one would guess that camel would be an "obligatory lexical item of foreign translators trying to be

"typical". On the other hand, Tymoczko's examples of medieval translations of Welsh oral texts sound much more convincing, even if she does tend to see idiosyncrasies everywhere and somewhat diminishes the role of broader European text patterns.

In "Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds", Mahasweta Sengupta briefly examines the auto-translations made by Tagore from Bengali into English. Sengupta argues that the Indian poet has been "faithful to the TL audience in a way which ultimately undermines the quality of the translated material" (p 56). Although he explains that evoking colonialism and Western stereotypes of Eastern culture, the same can be said about most translations of complex texts. The lack of linguistic evidence reduces the power of Sengupta's arguments, since the reader is told that "none of the lyrical qualities of the originals are carried over into the English translations" but no effort is made to show these lyrical qualities. The author underlines the ideological basis of Tagore's relationship with English literature, his "colonial self", the ideological bias of the dominant Western cultures towards Indian culture, but he fails to provide a sound textual basis for his argument. Surprisingly enough the elementary question, whether Tagore's command of the English language matched that of his native Bengali, is not asked.

Even if one is sympathetic in principle to the author's ideological stand it is difficult not to feel that he failed to examine carefully enough the textual evidence and is prone, like many of the contributors to this volume, to overgeneralization. In short one could say that the politics and the sociology of literature have strangled the linguistics of literature. Ironically Sengupta seems to fall into the same Western trap as Tagore did in his time: he is taking at face value the current ideological bias of some circles of American and West European universities and is playing the role of the acceptable Eastern scholar as much as Tagore played that of the acceptable Eastern poet. And *in the same language too:* it is sufficient to compare his with the other papers to see that the same rhetorical structure, lexical items and register are chosen.

Not infrequently a scholar discovers an important concept in an adjacent area and foresees its potential productivity when applied to his or her own field of study. That is the case of Elzbieta Tabakowska, a Polish researcher, who emphasises the importance to translation studies of Bakhtin's concept of Polyphony which was "first used to analyse Dostoievsky's novels" and which refers to "the inherently dialogic character of the word as an element of natural language".

Contrasting with the general tone of the book she gives many examples to illustrate her points; it is a pity that the concepts used come not from Bakhtin's own work but from the French linguist/logician Ducrot's reworking thereof.

The main trends in recent German translation theory are summarized by Mary Snell-Hornby. She seems particularly well-placed to carry out the task, since in 1988 she published the book *Translation Studies – An Integrated Approach* Amsterdam: Benjamins), where she tries to bring together the insights of the two principal groups of translation researchers active on the German scene. These groups are "the linguistically oriented *Ubersetzungswissenschaft* as represented in particular by the theorists of the Leipzig School, along with Wolfram Wilss and Werner Koller, and the culturally oriented approach of scholars such as Hans J. Vermeer" (p 8). According to her the first has achieved more results at the level of contrastive lexicology while the second has taken the text as its unit and insisted on the function of the target text. An important point made by Snell-Hornby concerns the theoretical differences amongst German and English-speaking researchers; the English word 'equivalence' and the German word 'Aquivalenz' are not equivalent at all. The former comes from everyday language and is currently understood as meaning 'of similar significance', whereas the latter was taken "from either mathematics or formal logic" and "from the outset the element of reversibility was salient".

This is a book which touches central but also very fashionable issues. One of them is feminism and its relationship with translation. Unfortunately the paper "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/ Translation" is written in an almost impenetrable academic (feminist?) jargon, which sounds translated from French. Very old ideas, like free translation or adaptation, that is the subordination of the source text to the needs of the translator and/or the target audience, appear under a feminist or "feminist" guise:

> The feminist translator, affirming her critical difference, her delight in interminable re-reading and re-writing, flaunts the signs of her manipulation of text. *Womanhandling* of the text in translation would involve the replacement of the modest, self-effacing translator. (...) The feminist translator immodestly flaunts her signature in italics, in footnotes – even in a preface.

Rhetoric apart, the above does not differ much from the practice of old translators, (and hence manipulators of text) such as Edward

Fitzgerald or Captain Richard Burton rendering, in a very personal way, respectively Omar Khayam and the *Arabian Nights* into English.

People outside English-speaking countries consume daily a great amount of translated text via the press, TV and the cinema. This sort of translation has as yet not received the attention it certainly deserves. Dirk Delabastita, a Belgian researcher, approaches part of the problem in his "Translation and the Mass Media", where he considers film translation, especially for TV. The paper gives a brief summary of the current research on the subject, with very useful reference to material in French and German, not easily accessible for an English audience, and proposes some lines for further research. It is not, therefore, a paper of results but one of intentions – and these are very good and promising, notwithstanding excessive references to Gideon Toury's writings. The tone is sociological rather than linguistic, and even the thought-provoking examples given are abstract. So, for instance, we come to know that Flemish television employed "the country's foremost Shakespeare translator" instead of its own staff to subtitle the BBC Shakespeare series, but no sample of the translation in question is quoted, let alone discussed.

Very serious research must lie behind Sherry Simon's paper entitled "Translating the Will to Knowledge: Prefaces and Canadian Literary Politics". Although mainly sociological in nature it does call attention to a minor textual genre, that of the Preface, particularly important in translation studies, since, as the author rightly remarks,

> their very presence and frequency at different periods is an indication of the prominence given to the translator: the preface foregrounds the presence of the second hand. (p 111)

"Translation as Appropriation: The case of Milan Kundera's *The Joke*, by Piotr Kuhiwczak, tells the amazing story of a now famous writer chasing a pirate edition of his early book, not simply on grounds of copyright but more because the changes the translator had brought to the text and had made it unrecognizable to its author. Kuhiwczak quotes one of Kundera's interventions, where the translator's textual manipulations are seen to be as damaging as the ban the book suffered in his native country:

> The ideologues in Prague took *The Joke* for a pamphlet against socialism; the foreign publisher took it for a political fantasy that became reality for a few weeks and rewrote it accordingly.

Kuhiwczak not only considers the first translation as inadequate, he also gives the detail of some textual changes the original underwent: omission of paragraphs and even of one section of the book, which constituted one of novel's themes. Most characteristic, though, was the change in time references. These were rather imprecise in the original so the translator "decided to introduce chronology by cutting, 'pasting' and shifting the chapters around" (p125).

Finally, the essay "Culture as Translation", by the Czech scholar Vladimir Macura, stands out from the rest by its sound common sense and subtlety. The author does not censor translators and translations nor does he insist upon the "inevitability" of translators obeying TL norms. He gives an account of the phenomena and tries to explain them with detachment and an ironical scepticism. So, analysing the efforts of the XIXth century English translator John Bowring he does not indulge himself by denouncing English imperialist efforts to subjugate and adulterate a minor culture, instead he points to the very illusions that Bowring himself cultivated in relation to his work and the difficulties he faced with his own audience.

On the other hand, the translated Czech writers are not mythified either, as good people exploited by a foreign dominator. On the contrary he argues that Czech culture of the period was weak and the authors not important from a aesthetic point of view. Translation itself was used by the Czech intelligentsia of the period as a means of appropriating more complex elements from foreign cultures and a means of creating a national cultivated language. He identified a common interest that would have united the English translator and Czech translated authors:

> Bowring's 'translation as culture', the translation which is a model of a culture, coalesced in a happy alliance – though unperceived as such by contemporaries – with 'culture as translation', or 'translation-like culture', i.e. a culture which more or less accepts the structure of translation. (p 67)

From the particular case of Bowring's translations, Macura arrives at the conclusion that translation happens to be an important factor in the evolution of national cultures:

> The development of national cultures is marked by periods when the culture as a whole, or in part, exhibits some typological features of translation, when it takes over

cultural phenomena that have originated elsewhere, and adopts them. (p 70)

This view has the great advantage of not being bound to a particular case. It serves to explain translation as a cultural phenomenon, and it seems valid as much to a Czech translator as to an English or a French in the period of formation in or of crisis their national cultures.

Despite the prefatory claims of a tightly integrated approach by the various contributors this book displays a healthy diversity of viewpoints. Ironic for a collection that stresses that translation is manipulation is the fact that there seems to be a Western / Eastern divide. So rewriting and manipulation of the source text according to the norms of the target text is valued as a positive thing by British, Belgian and Canadian contributors whereas it is sharply criticized by Central and Eastern European and Indian authors. In the middle of the road is the Czech, Macura, who casts an ironic look at both positions. It is not unreasonable to think that the latter has discretely unveiled more translation secrets than all the others.

Walter Carlos Costa
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Hatim, B & Mason, I *Discourse and the Translator* **London: Longman, 1990.**

In their forward to this book, Hatim and Mason point out that their intention is not to teach translators how to translate. They consider (quite rightly) that that would be presumptuous, in particular because they are using translators as their source of "evidence for what we know about translating". Evidently it is also not their intention that *Discourse and the Translator* should be used by teachers of translation to teach translation students and inexperienced translators how to translate. This opens the questions of what precisely their purpose was in producing this book. Their stated aim is to "relate an integrated account of discourse processes to the practical concerns of the translator" and to "provide pointers to areas for further research".

If we begin with the first half of this aim, that of relating discourse to what a translator actually does, we are within the realm of the title of the book, but we immediately run into problems. The

authors appear to have limited their discussion only to those studies which can be fitted securely within the framework of orthodox Hallidayan systemic linguistics[1]. This is to eliminate a great deal of practical work on discourse analysis that might prove of great benefit not only to the theory, but also to the practice of translation.

The second stated aim, that of providing "pointers to areas for further research", is also open to question. At no point in the book are any actual suggestions made as to the "areas for further research" needed. In the forward, Hatim and Mason mention "studies in cross-cultural communication and in contrastive discourse linguistics" as areas in which "much remains to be done". This is not very helpful for the student of translation theory who may have hoped to obtain advice on a possible PhD topic, nor is it very useful for those already active in these "areas" who are undoubtedly well aware of the gaps in their fields. This brings up the question of for whom Hatim and Mason produced this book.

It has been said that all text, written and spoken, is produced with an "ideal receiver" in mind. It would appear that the "ideal receiver" in the minds of Hatim and Mason is a linguist trained in some other area than translation studies who, for some reason, needs or wishes to know what translation theory is all about. As academics with teaching responsibilities, Hatim and Mason may have prepared this book to serve as a text for a course in translation theory for third year undergraduates, or for postgraduates. Even if this is so, however, the book assumes a great deal of previous knowledge of linguistics on the part of the reader, and any course in translation theory for which this book was the main text would have to be supplemented with further detailed readings of many of the studies referred to in the book, as well as readings of many studies which have been (curiously) omitted. In the discussion of context in translation, for example, the important contribution of Vermeer[2] is not mentioned at all. To be fair, this may be because very little of Vermeer's work has been published in English and may need to be translated from the German before it becomes accessible to non-German speakers.

This leads into what may be the main contribution of the book, the idea of the translator as mediator. Far too many people have for far too long held the idea that translation is simply a linguistic exercise, to be used in the teaching of foreign languages. Another commonly held idea is that translators merely copy a text from one language into another, in the same way that a scribe takes dictation, or a secretary transcribes shorthand or practically indecipherable longhand into neat, typewritten text. Professional translators are

constantly running into commissioners of translations who have no patience with the amount of time the professional seems to need to produce a good translation. By pointing out what translators have known all along, that translation is **an act of communication**, Hatim and Mason have performed a much needed service for professionals in the field.

By describing the translator as mediator, placing the translator at the centre between the producer of the source language (SL) text and its target language (TL) receivers, Hatim and Mason have been able to show that translators need to be not just bilingual, but also bicultural. This allows us to perceive why translation studies needs to consider almost all areas of linguistics: pragmatics, semantics, sociolinguistics, the study of grammar, psycholinguistics, discourse analysis, contrastive linguistics, cross-cultural communication, and so on. Hatim and Mason are primarily concerned with translation as a **process**, and with the semantic aspects of translation. The major principles involved in their analysis of the process of translation are: 1) Communicative, concerned with the effects of the communication. The authors thoughts here are closely related to Nida's[3] concept of effect, and firmly within M.A.K. Halliday's ideas of Field, Tenor, and Mode in regard to the use of the text. 2) Pragmatic, concerned with preserving equivalence of intended meaning; and 3) Semiotic, concerned with ensuring equivalence of texts as signs. All of these principles of analysis take as their starting point the rhetorical purpose of the text, and are surrounded by the culture and ideologies of the creator, the translator, and the receiver of the text.

The book is divided into eleven chapters, beginning with a brief review of the traditional issues associated with translation studies, running through a more or less chronological review of linguistic studies that the authors feel are related to translation studies, and ending with the idea of the translator as mediator. It is this broad overview of almost all of linguistics that could possibly be related to translation that leads one to believe the book was meant to be used as a university course text. Here again, the most serious drawback to this is the heavy emphasis on Halliday, and the amount of previous knowledge of linguistics assumed for the readers.

The authors have evidently drawn heavily on their own experience as translators, and the experience of other translators, in producing this book, which is all to the good. However, a distinction needs to be made between translators who are primarily linguists and academics, and translators who are "only" translators. Some of the broad claims made by the authors of usage in foreign languages would

never be made by professional translators, who are much more aware of the danger of making generalisations about usage. For example, the claim that the conventional way of denoting a random number in a given language is always to use the same number (36 in French, 60 in Arabic, pp 135-136) is open to serious question.

Each of the chapters in *Discourse and the Translator* is divided into sections which are clearly marked by uppercase letters in the body of the text. However, not all of the chapters have a summary, and only one contains a section called "issues for translators". Reading through the book, the suspicion arises that this is a collection of republished conference papers. This suspicion grows when, in the final chapter, a reworking of a diagram already presented in chapter 4 is given to support the notion of the translator as mediator. The diagram was first given to show the importance of context to the translator, and to the process of translation. While agreeing that the importance of context cannot be overemphasized, it is irritating that there was not more discussion of the role of the translator in relation to the text. It is in this discussion of the context in which the source text was written that the omission of Vermeer's ideas is particularly felt. It appears that Chapter 4 is an earlier version of the ideas presented in Chapter 11, and that both of these grew out of the wish to incorporate translation within the realm of systemic linguistics. This may be a laudable aim, but the authors might find themselves somewhat constrained in their definitions of the process of translation and the role of the translator if they carry this to its logical extreme and attempt to use only Halliday's terminology to describe translation. This they have so far wisely avoided.

Nonetheless, Halliday permeates this book, and it would aid those unfamiliar with Systemic linguistics to first read up on it before coming to *Discourse and the Translator*. Having said that, it should also be mentioned that the discussion of the Hallidayan notions of "theme" and "rheme" and "functional sentence perspective" presented by Hatim and Mason (pp. 209-213) is exceptionally clear and precise.

Whether or not "theme-rheme" will be very helpful to the translator is debatable. Of much more use both to translators and to teachers of translation is the discussion throughout the book of actual problems faced by translators and ways in which these problems have been solved. The use of actual examples taken from sample texts and their published translations also helps the reader to understand why the concepts Hatim and Mason introduce in each chapter, such as *text type* (Chapter 8) and *collocation* and *coherence* (Chapter 10) are of

importance to translation. Yet again, however, the suspicion arises that this is a collection of papers cobbled into a book, since there is a great deal of repetition in the different chapters, and sometimes examples need to be pulled from several chapters before the relationship between translation studies, or the practice of translation, and a given concept in discourse analysis can be understood as Hatim and Mason intended.

Discourse and the Translator also suffers from an attempt to discuss larger issues, such as the duty of the translator (which Hatim and Mason call "orientation", see pp 16-18) to the creator of the text, the text itself, the readers of the text, the commissioner of the text, and the translator themself, with smaller issues such as how forms of address should be translated. It is unclear at times if these smaller issues are intended as illustrations of the larger issues or as examples of problems arising from attempts to deal with these issues. The book raises many more questions than it answers, but this is not necessarily a drawback. In fact, it might serve as a useful basis for further discussion, which seems to have been one of the aims of the authors.

The book contains a very useful glossary of linguistic terms at the end of the text, on pp 239-244. It is not difficult to predict that this will become the most widely photocopied section of the book. In fact, it might be considered worthwhile to acquire the book solely for the sake of the glossary. The Table of Contents is quite good for previewing each chapter, but the Index is not sufficiently detailed to allow finding anything other than major issues, most of which are already listed in the Table of Contents. The Bibliography is a good place to start for those new to the field who wish to do further reading, but the curious omissions mentioned above should be noted. There is also for some reason a separate list of sources of text samples, information that is already given when the sample text is presented in the chapter.

At present, there are no good textbooks available for the teaching of translation. In fact, there seem to be no books available at all for teaching translation as a subject in its own right. Translation is still taught as if it were a craft which can only be learned by doing. Many translation teachers openly resist quite strongly the notion that teaching translation theory could improve the practice of translation. This may be because of a lack of understanding on their part as to what translation theory actually is. Discourse and the Translator might lead these skeptics to appreciate the link between linguistic studies and the practice of translation. In their forward, Hatim and Mason state: "The gap

between theory and practice in translation studies has existed for far too long." It is to be hoped that *Discourse and the Translator* might serve as one part of the bridge being built in many separate, related fields of linguistics, to cross that gap.

Kela Ruuskanen
University of Helsinki

Notes

1. The relationship between systemics and translation is perhaps best found in Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*, Edward Arnold, London.

2. Vermeer, H.J. Most of Vermeer's work is published in German Tubingen by Niemeyer. One essay in English is available in Chesterman, A.C. (ed.) (1989) *Readings in translation theory*, Helsinki: FinnLectura. See also Reiss, K. and Vermeer, H.J. (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* Tubingen: Niemeyer.

3. Nida, E.A. (1964) *Toward a science of translation* Leiden: Brill. See also: Nida, E.A. and Taber, C. (1969) *The theory and practice of translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Barbosa, Heloisa G. *Procedimentos técnicos da tradução: uma nova proposta*. **Campinas: Pontes, 1990.**

Como traduzir? – esta é a pergunta que move a discussão de Heloisa Barbosa ao longo de *Procedimentos técnicos da tradução: uma nova proposta*. Ao apresentar, discutir, expandir e recaracterizar os procedimentos técnicos da tradução originalmente arrolados pelos teóricos Vinay e Darbelnet, a autora conduz o leitor interessado em teoria da tradução a um passeio pelos principais modelos teóricos que tratam da questão sob o ponto de vista da lingüística. Só depois disso ela parte para sua proposta de recategorização dos procedimentos técnicos da tradução.

Após uma introdução em que o texto quase sempre elegante de Heloisa Barbosa anuncia seus propósitos de executar uma análise e reordenação da discussão acerca dos "possíveis modos de proceder à disposição do tradutor", o segundo capítulo apresenta os modelos teóricos da tradução conforme cinco autores. De maneira sucinta, mas com bastante propriedade, uma vez que apresenta cada modelo com profundidade razoável, situando cada um de acordo com seu substrato teórico maior, apontando falhas e avanços e chamando a atenção do

leitor até mesmo para a estrutura do texto original, Heloisa Barbosa dá conta dos modelos de Vinay e Darbelnet (1977, edição original 1958), Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Vásquez-Ayora (1977) e Newmark (1981). O primeiro modelo tem proeminência sobre os seguintes, que são sempre cotejados a ele.

Outra marca desta apresentação dos modelos teóricos da tradução escolhidos pela autora como mais relevantes é a insistência de que todos eles se colocam de forma mais ou menos estanque frente à questão mais antiga dos estudos da tradução, tradução literal versus tradução não-literal. Todos parecem dicotomizar a resposta à pergunta (Como traduzir?): ou o tradutor apega-se à *forma* ou ao *conteúdo* do texto da língua de origem no texto da língua de tradução. A busca de uma visão mais flexível é o objetivo do trabalho de Heloisa Barbosa.

No terceiro capítulo, temos a análise de cada um dos procedimentos técnicos da tradução mencionados em qualquer uma das obras estudadas, acompanhada de opiniões da autora quanto às falhas e inconsistências de cada abordagem sob o seu ponto de vista de tradutora e professora de tradução.

É justamente este cuidado com a organização da teoria da tradução de um ângulo pedagógico que matiza o trabalho de Heloisa Barbosa. Trata-se de um texto de lingüística aplicada por excelência, pois cumpre seu intuito de esclarecer a teoria no sentido de colocá-la mais facilmente ao alcance daqueles que irão utilizá-la para fins eminentemente práticos. Os exemplos apresentados no texto, ora emprestados dos autores revisados, ora traduzidos da obra de outros tradutores ou da própria Heloisa Barbosa, atestam o caráter teórico-aplicado de *Procedimentos*.

Portanto, o tradutor ou estudante de tradução tem neste capítulo um guia dos procedimentos técnicos da tradução, já crítica e didaticamente ordenados, que inclui a tradução palavra-por-palavra, tradução literal, transposição, modulação, equivalência, omissão vs. explicitação, compensação, reconstrução de períodos, melhorias, transferências, explicação, decalque e adaptação.

O fulcro da produção original da autora está, porém, no quarto capítulo, "Duas propostas de recategorização dos procedimentos de tradução", em que ela advoga uma categorização menos estática e mais abrangente dos procedimentos do que aquelas propostas pelos teóricos que discutiu. Rejeitando o critério "dificuldades para o tradutor", ela propõe dois outros critérios para uma categorização dos procedimentos técnicos da tradução que os integraria em um todo que faça sentido não apenas para o teórico, mas também para o tradutor e para o estudante.

O primeiro critério proposto, o da freqüência de uso de cada procedimento em traduções, é logo posto de lado pela autora devido aos obstáculos encontrados por quem tentou medir esta freqüência: imprecisões e finalmente inoperabilidade dos dados. A solução encontrada foi a de criar um outro critério, este sim utilizado na recategorização dos procedimentos: o da convergência ou divergência lingüística e extralingüística entre a língua original e a língua de tradução.

A recategorização de acordo com este critério de fato resulta mais interessante do que aquela inicialmente proposta por Vinay e Darbelnet e seguida sem questionamento pelos demais teóricos. Ela miniminiza, se não elimina, a dicotomia tradução livre/tradução literal considerada pouco feliz por Heloisa Barbosa, na medida em que relativiza o juízo de valor sobre como traduzir ao distribuir os procedimentos em eixos geradores dos mesmos.

Com isso Heloisa Barbosa alcança seu intento de trazer para alunos, professores e para todos os interessados pela teoria de tradução em geral, os elementos mais objetivos dos modelos lingüísticos tradicionais sobre a tradução e com uma apresentação didaticamente estruturada. Além disto, a obra é aconselhável também para todos que procuram uma visão panorâmica das teorias de tradução mencionadas acima.

Contudo cabe ainda perguntar à obra: afinal, como traduzir? Em busca de sua contribuição original, tem-se a indicativa do valor e do limite de *Procedimento técnicos da tradução*. Se por um lado temos nele um belo resumo de cinco modelos lingüísticos da tradução e uma tentativa bem sucedida de uni-los criticamente para uma compreensão mais abrangente e prática, por outro lado a própria escolha de um critério em parte extra-lingüístico para a recategorização dos procedimentos chama a atenção para a ausência de uma discussão de elementos de abordagens não unicamente lingüísticas da tradução dentro do corpo do trabalho.

A falta de uma reflexão mais profunda dos aspectos filosóficos e/ou antropológicos da tradução torna o critério da convergência ou divergência lingüística e extralingüística das línguas envolvidas na tradução um pouco abrupto.

Mas se por isto o subtítulo "Uma nova proposta" soa forte demais, é preciso recorrer à conclusão do trabalho em que a autora diz que os procedimentos técnicos da tradução são um modo de responder à pergunta 'como traduzir', para sentirmos que apesar de procurar elementos ausentes da discussão dos autores em que se baseia para dar conta do que é a tradução, na verdade seu escopo é

essencialmente cognitivo. Sua preocupação está em limites bem menos amplos do que se poderia esperar de uma nova proposta e ainda mais de uma proposta que envolvesse fatores extralingüísticos em profundidade.

Assim, ao refinar e recategorizar de forma orgânica os diversos passos que um tradutor pode tomar, Heloisa Barbosa responde à pergunta coerentemente com sua definição de tradução, que privilegia o aspecto cognitivo da atividade e a perspectiva do tradutor no processo.

Finalmente, a qualidade editorial do livro editado pela Pontes é notável por sua despretensão. A apresentação simples, porém cuidadosa, e a impressão quase sem erros, limpa como o texto fluido da autora, revelam a qualidade do trabalho editorial.

Procedimentos técnicos da tradução: uma nova proposta não está aí para revolucionar, mas certamente para trazer uma reflexão clara e lúcida a respeito dos procedimentos lingüísticos adotados por tradutores em seu trabalho a partir das idéias renovadas de um número de lingüistas respeitados. Servirá com precisão a estudantes e profissionais do mercado brasileiro, carente de publicações sérias e objetivas a respeito do ato de traduzir.

Pedro de Moraes Garcez
University of Pennsylvania

Malcolm Coulthard e Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard *Tradução: Teoria e Prática,* **1992, Florianópolis: Editora da UFSC**

No final de 1992, a editora da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina publicou uma coletânea de quatorze artigos dedicados a vários aspectos da tradução. A organização ficou aos cuidados de **Malcolm Coulthard** e **Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard.** Alguns dos artigos já tinham sido publicados, outros foram escritos especialmente para esta publicação.

O primeiro artigo é de **Malcolm Coulthard.** Numa tentativa de introduzir o livro como um todo, o autor enfoca alguns dos temas abordados. O artigo oferece um panorama, sem cair em generalidades.

A idéia central de **Coulthard** é que todo autor, na hora de escrever, tem em mente um *leitor ideal.* O leitor real pode responder a esse perfil, ser o *destinatário* da mensagem, mas ele pode também

ser um simples *ouvinte* ou até um *ouvinte-não-ratificado*. De certa maneira, toda pessoa tentando ler um texto numa língua estrangeira, é um *ouvinte-não-ratificado*. O tradutor, portanto, é "qualquer pessoa que tente tornar acessível a um certo grupo de leitores interessados, um texto até então inacessível. Desta forma, o tradutor começa com o texto ou, mais literalmente, com a mensagem derivada do texto (...) e tenta reescrevê-lo, ou melhor, *re-textualizá-lo* para um outro leitor ideal." Podemos incluir neste conceito de tradução as "modernizações" de autores clássicos e as "vulgarizações". O tradutor pode tentar colocar seu leitor ideal na posição de mero "ouvinte não-ratificado lingüisticamente competente", ou ele pode tentar colocá-lo na posição de *ouvinte*. Este não chega a ser o *destinatário*, mas torna-se um novo *leitor ideal*. A partir da nunca esgotada distinção *signifié/signifiant* Malcolm Coulthard sistematiza os problemas fundamentais encontrados por um tradutor que se propõe a construir um novo *leitor ideal*. Os exemplos, muitos de poesia, foram cuidadosamente escolhidos.

Em *Tradução e Reconfiguração do Imaginário: O Tradutor como Transfingidor*, **Haroldo de Campos** se propõe, *grosso modo*, a defender a tradução criativa. Parte do artigo é um resumo comentado do ensaio de Benjamin "A tarefa do tradutor". Além disso, o autor leva o leitor pela obra de Iser, Jakobson, Puttenham, Peirce, Vodicka, Jauss. Em apoio a suas teses, Haroldo de Campos aduz, fundamentalmente, a opinião de Benjamin, segundo a qual uma obra literária continua, ao longo do tempo, se modificando, devido às mudanças que sofrem as palavras, os critérios estéticos, etc. O tradutor toma parte neste processo. Logo o autor cita Iser, conforme o qual intervem, no ato de ficcionalização, um processo de seleção, combinação, etc. Em outras palavras, o próprio ato de escrever é também uma forma de tradução. O tradutor, então, é um agente ativo na sobrevivência da obra, porque ele percorre novamente os caminhos percorridos pelo autor.

O argumento de Haroldo de Campos não se deixa deduzir com muita facilidade do seu ensaio. Uma grande quantidade de parênteses, sinônimos e comentários entre travessões mais escondem o argumento do autor em vez de aclará-lo. É como se alguém tivesse desenhado as ruas de várias cidades num mapa só. Também não entendo porque tantos termos são seguidos pelo equivalente alemão, uma vez que não se trata de conceitos de tradução problemática.

Em *Aspectos sociolingüísticos da tradução*, **Fernando Tarallo** alerta para o "transporte da variação: como decodificar variantes sociolingüísticas de um sistema, e transportá-los para outro que, não

necessariamente, apresente as mesmas variantes dentro do mesmo escopo gramatical". O artigo é bem informado e não deixa de sensibilizar o leitor para o problema. No entanto, temo que o autor não chegue a abordar concretamente os aspectos sociolingüísticos da tradução interlingual. Eu não consegui achar nenhum exemplo de questões deste tipo, nem tampouco indicações concretas sobre sua possível resposta.

Em *Tradução: encontro de linguagens e ideologias*, **Maria Candida Rocha Bordenave** fala da incidência da "ideologia" na tradução. A linguagem de todos os dias, diz ela, está carregada ideologicamente e isto aparecerá na escolha do tradutor. Há várias possibilidades. O tradutor pode não concordar com a ideologia do livro e traduzir mal. Pode haver uma incompatibilidade entre a cultura do texto original e a do tradutor, devendo este escolher entre uma tradução literal e uma tradução que encaixe o texto na cultura do tradutor. Finalmente, **Bordenave** aborda as marcas formais do discurso enquanto carregadoras menos aparentes de ideologia. Neste artigo interessante, o leitor fica, no entanto, sedento de exemplos.

Em *A tradução automática: a Babel conquistada?*, **Muriel Vasconcelos** descreve métodos, história e possíveis desenvolvimentos da tradução automática por computador. O artigo é lúcido e informado. Mostra claramente as vantagens da máquina, sem se mostrar eufórico quanto às suas possibilidades.

Bastante agradável é o artigo de **Carmem Rosa Caldas-Coulthard**. Em *Interação recriada: A representação da fala na tradução*, a autora trata do discurso falado. Os hábitos lingüísticos se expressam singularmente na conversação. Num livro traduzido um diálogo passou por duas transformações: primeiro foi recriada uma situação de fala o autor geralmente não transcreve uma gravação, depois esta fala foi transposta para uma língua onde as convenções da interação verbal são diferentes. (Quanto mais coloquial o registro da fala, mais típico ele é; não é por acaso que a gíria é falada e não escrita.) No caso de culturas muito diferentes a transposição é difícil e a autora o demonstra com lindos exemplos agridoces. Pena, contudo, que estes exemplos sejam todos de fracassos, deixando a sensação de que diálogos, minimamente "típicos", são intraduzíveis.

Em *Interpretação da estrutura temporal em* Evelyne*: no original e na tradução*, **Rosa W. Konder** faz uma análise cuidadosa da tradução de verbos do passado. O sistema de modos e tempos inglês não corresponde ao brasileiro. O tradutor precisou escolher.

No seu segundo artigo, sólido como o primeiro, **Muriel Vasconcellos** discute os conceitos "hallidayanos" de *tema* e *foco* na

tradução. Pelos exemplos referidos, fica estabelecida a necessidade de respeitar, ao traduzir, a ordem em que aparecem o *foco* e o *tema* dentro de uma unidade. Às vezes será preciso traduzir um verbo por um substantivo ou recorrer a outra possibilidades sintática.

No seu artigo, **Leonor Scliar Cabral** relata sua experiência com a tradução do importante *Dicionário de lingüística* de Dubois. Nesta contribuição interessante a autora analisa alguns dos erros que um tradutor desprevenido teria cometido e as soluções que a autora encontrou. Ficamos também sabendo alguma coisa dos bastidores das editoras. Assim, o trabalho foi aparentemente distribuído por letras, cabendo à autora as letras P, Q, R e S.

É num artigo de 1981 que **Zélia de Almeida Cardoso** discorre, em termos gerais, sobre as dificuldades que acarreta a tradução da "linguagem poética". A autora dá alguns exemplos de tradução de prosa. Nenhum, penso eu, de poesia. As opiniões que ela cita levam a pensar que tal tipo de tradução seria quase impossível. Talvez tenhamos, justamente no Brasil, alguns exemplos de poesia muito bem traduzida.

Também trata da tradução de poesia o artigo de **Paulo Vizioli**, *A tradução de poesia em língua inglesa*. Após defender a traduzibilidade da poesia, o autor sugere um caminho "intermediário": a *recriação literária*. O autor adota a classificação da atividade poética de Ezra Pound: *melopéia, fanopéia* e *logopéia*. Com a ajuda de vários exemplos, muitas vezes oriundos de sua própria prática de tradutor, **Paulo Vizioli** exemplifica as dificuldades particulares à tradução da poesia inglesa. A maioria dessas dificuldades a não ser a "discrepância silábica" é comum a todas as línguas.

Apesar das aparências, o artigo de **Paulo Vizioli** não chega a sistematizar o que é peculiar à tradução de poesia inglesa, para apontar os eventuais "macetes" que o leitor não deixa de esperar. Mas talvez seja impossível fazer um "guia prático" e seja melhor formular esta bem escrita "Invitation au voyage".

Em *O corvo tropical de Edgar Allan Poe*, Sérgio Bellei examina o caso de uma tradução, feita por Machado de Assis, do poema "Raven" de Edgar Allan Poe. Ao contrário da tradução de Pessoa do mesmo poema, a versão do escritor carioca se afasta de diversas maneiras do original. Não só o ritmo mas, por exemplo, a função do próprio *corvo* são diferentes nas duas traduções. A tradução de Machado, por exemplo, torna o poema mais abstrato (característica, aliás, de muitas traduções). No caso do escritor brasileiro, no entanto, a "má tradução" não seria conseqüência de descuido ou de falta de

conhecimento da língua. O que se expressaria por estas vias, seria sua vontade de apropriar-se do texto. Isto seria típico do escritor "periférico", que se sente em situação de minoria com relação a uma suposta "literatura universal". Agora, neste artigo sólido e agradável de se ler, o leitor talvez ficará se perguntando porque *tais* desvios são conseqüência de *tal* atitude. A ligação causa-efeito talvez não fique tão claramente explicada. E, se o Brasil era periferia na época de Machado, se uma literatura nacional ainda estava por se fundar, por quê ele quis se apropriar daquilo que não era modelo a literatura norte-americana, na época, com certeza igualmente periférica. E finalmente, será que se vê na natureza das mudanças, das infidelidades, a natureza dos móveis do tradutor, ou só o fato de ele ter introduzido aquelas mudanças já é suficiente para imputar-lhe uma vontade de fundação de literatura nacional?

Certamente são raros os casos em que o autor traduz a própria obra. **Ecléia Audi**, em *O bilingüismo de Beckett*, confronta a versão francesa e inglesa de *Esperando Godot*. Contrariamente ao que se podia esperar de um escritor irlandês, a primeira versão da peça foi escrita em francês. Aparentemente a tradução inglesa não é uma versão fiel do original. Há omissões e acréscimos. Cor local francesa é substituída por cor local anglo-saxônica. Apesar de Beckett ter aprendido francês a uma idade relativamente tardia, a versão francesa, segundo **Ecléia Audi**, é mais coloquial do que a versão inglesa.

De uma experiência de sala de aula na Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina nasceu o artigo de **Malcolm Coulthard** e **Iria Werlang Garcia**: uma tradução do conto *Cat in the rain,* de **Hemingway**. O artigo se detém nos itens principais de toda tradução, da tradução literária em particular. Como nenhum outro tipo de tradução, a literária requer sensibilidade, lingüística e outra. Literatura é interpretação, e o artigo sobre *Cat in the rain* demonstra bem isto. Exemplos de cada tipo de dificuldade sensibilizam o leitor para o problema. Além da importância da interpretação certa, o artigo mostra como é difícil chegar a um consenso entre variantes regionais do português brasileiro. Os autores e seus alunos optaram pela norma carioca, imaginamos que alguns com certa relutância.

Como um todo, a coletânea dá uma boa idéia das várias facetas do traduzir. A tradução é um campo de estudo recente. Foi isto, certamente, que levou os organizadores a escolherem artigos que abordam o problema desde o ponto de vista de diversas especialidades. As análises são às vezes muito gerais mas, por essa mesma razão, não estreitamente singularizadas. Falta em alguns

artigos, talvez, o enfoque de quem está acostumado com a tradução na prática.

Philippe Humblé
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina