

## NOTAS

- 1 A reflexão acerca da teoria de Eugene Nida foi extraída a partir do trabalho de Rosemary Arrojo em *Oficina de tradução: a teoria na prática*.
- 2 Professor da Seção de Lisboa da Faculdade de Filosofia da Universidade Católica Portuguesa.

## REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Arrojo, R. (1997) *Oficina de tradução: a teoria na prática*. São Paulo: Ática.
- Berman, A. *A tradução e a letra ou o albergue ao longe*. Trad. Marie Hélène Catherine Torres & Walter Carlos Costa. Inédito.
- Hume, D. (1989) *Enquiries concerning human understanding and concerning the principles of moral*. Edited by L.A. Selby-Bigge with text revised and notes by P.H. Nidditch. 3<sup>a</sup> ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1998) *An enquiry concerning the principles of moral*. Edited by Tom L. Beauchamp. New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995) *Uma investigação sobre os princípios da moral*. Trad. José Oscar de Almeida Marques. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Investigação sobre o entendimento humano*. Trad. Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1989.
- Schleiermacher, F. "Sobre diferentes métodos de tradução." In: Heidermann, W. (org.) (2001) *Clássicos da teoria de tradução*.

Florianópolis: UFSC, Núcleo de tradução.

***Contemporary Translation Theories: 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition*, by Edwin Gentzler. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. 230 pp.**

The second revised edition of *Contemporary Translation Theories*, by Edwin Gentzler, presents the same structure as its first edition, that is, seven chapters divided into different sections providing a historical overview and discussing some of the most prominent approaches over the last decades. Why writing a second revised edition then?

Its first edition raised much controversy as to the choice of approaches, as Larose puts it:

Sont donc exclus tous les travaux des traductologues français (de Mounin à Berman, en passant par Ladmiral) et canadiens d'expression française ou anglaise. On s'étonne que Steiner, Newmark, de Beaugrande et Pym, auteurs non négligeables dans le domaine de la traductologie contemporaine, soient absents de *Contemporary Theories of Translation*. L'auteur écarte aussi les études d'inspiration linguistique (Hatim et Mason, Bell, Nord, etc.) ou à vocation empirique (Klings, Lörcher, Tirkkonen-Condit, Dancette, Séguinot, etc.) (Larose, 1996 : 164).

Gentzler responded to those criticisms on the preface to the revised edition where he states that, '[t]his book, how-

ever, was never intended to provide a quantitative overview (...) I chose to discuss five of the most important ones at the time; and I still think that those five do reflect innovations crucial to the young field's development' (2001: xi). Some arguments presented were also criticized and he acknowledges that:

This second edition has allowed me to correct typos and errors of fact, and to update sections to reflect new developments within the specific areas. Occasionally, I moderated my voice when I felt it led to a distortion of the ideas presented by any individual scholar – those changes have been surprisingly few (2001: xii).

This review lies its focus on specifically some changes Gentzler made on the much-criticized third chapter, *The "Science" of Translation*. This chapter deals both with the influence Chomsky's generative grammar had on Nida's scientific claim of his dynamic equivalence and with the science of translation in German speaking countries. Much of the criticism directed at this chapter is based on its superficial review and on Gentzler's harsh criticism of the latter. Larose writes:

Les sept dernières pages de ce troisième chapitre portant sur les tendances en traductologie allemande (Kade, Neubert, Reiss, Vermeer, etc.) sont très riches, mais malheureusement beaucoup trop courtes. Gentzler est extrêmement sévère à l'endroit des traductologues allemands et à l'égard de leurs théories, qu'il considère "prétendument scientifiques", lesquelles ont tendance à être prescriptives (Larose, 1996).

Gentzler worked on the superficiality alluded to. He inserted a paragraph on page 67 about Paul Kussmaul's contribution to the research of the mental

processes involved in translation. The main difference, however, lies in his approach on Reiss and Vermeer's functionalist translation theory. Gentzler expanded a single paragraph on the first edition into nine on the second revised edition. The main problem though is restated, that is, a misconceived notion of the functional approach as toward fidelity to the source text. He writes that 'they (Reiss and Vermeer) argue that translation should be governed primarily by the one functional aspect which predominates, or, in the new terminology, by the original's "Skopos"' (Gentzler, 1993: 71). On the second edition he writes:

Despite advances over the faithful vs. free debate, these approaches at some point still tend to be source-oriented in nature and invest the original with some sort of structure and information that can subsequently be encoded in another language, to which the translator must remain faithful (Gentzler, 2001: 75).

Toury though states the opposite when contrasting Skopos Theory and Descriptive Translation Studies:

A second paradigm which was heavily target-oriented, so-called *Skopostheorie*, gradually emerged as an alternative. It even managed to gain considerable ground, albeit mainly in German-speaking circles. Thus, target-orientedness as such no longer arouses the same antagonism it used to less than twenty years ago (Toury, 1995: 136).

In our opinion, Gentzler failed to notice the difference between the earlier Skopos Theory formulated by Reiss and Vermeer and the later by Nord who reintroduced the concept of fidelity or loyalty, as she puts it. According to Pym 'Nord tells us the translator remains "responsible" for work carried out according to someone else's crite-

ria and further posits that the translator's "loyalty" is to both senders and receivers' (Pym, 1993: 188).

On the first edition it seems like both functional and dynamic concepts blurred; on the second he reexamines:

Pushing the boundaries of Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence to new levels of flexibility and adaptability, functionalist scholars (...) have adapted well to conditions of the new global market (...) The two most important shifts in theoretical developments in translation theory over the past two decades have been (1) the shift from source-text oriented theories to target-oriented theories and (2) the shift to include cultural factors as well as linguistic elements in the translation training models. Those advocating functionalist approaches have been pioneers in both areas. Functionalist theorists conceive of translation as an *action* carried out by a person who has a specific communication goal, which Reiss and Vermeer refer to as the text's *Skopos*. Because the appropriateness of the form of communication always relates to the accomplishment of the intended goal, the target cultural takes on crucial importance (Gentzler, 2001: 70).

Herein he sheds light on the previous unsettled boundaries between dynamic and functional translation theories. He also points out to the more active role the translator plays since henceforth (s)he is a true cultural mediator who may negotiate suitable strategies to be used in a given translation process. Despite those advances, Gentzler could have explored more the translator's exclusion of the functionalist new binary model, that is, author/initiator. As Pym mentions:

[T]he skopos is "a more or less explicit description of the prospec-

tive target situation". It is thus to be derived from the instructions given by the "initiator", the person for whom the translator is working (not to be confused with authors or readers, although authors and readers may become initiators). The skopos is in a sense the pragmatic content of the initiator's instructions (Pym, 1993: 184).

Nevertheless, Gentzler examines thoroughly the bases of the functionalist approach and unveils the economic interests behind it and its normative nature. Far from pretending impartiality, Gentzler provides the readers with a much more detailed perspective of the matter.

As to the severe criticism on the functionalist approach Larose mentioned, it is in perfect concordance with Gentzler's beliefs in the translator taking an active part in text production. Gentzler wrote on a subsequent article:

I suggest that scholars continue with an open mind, open multiple versions, and remain open to translators' voices from all parts of the culture voices. Postcolonial translation studies is still in its infant stages, and before falling into rhetorical strategies of affirmation or negation, I suggest creating more openings and letting more thoughts proliferate. Let's have more voices at the table rather than fewer. Too many voices have been silenced for too long (Gentzler, 2003).

Despite Gentzler's misconstruction of fidelity in Skopos Theory, an attentive reader of the second edition of *Contemporary Translation Theories* will perceive the meticulous work he went through in reediting it. Gentzler updated each of the approaches to Translation theory, incorporating 50-60

pages of new material, including new research and a new conclusion. He has accomplished successfully to attain the right tone and to provide his readers with a more comprehensive version of the approaches examined offering new insights into the nature of translation, language and cross-cultural communication. This book would be beneficial to professors and students alike and it can prove useful as a starting point for those who aim to research as it offers an overview of some of the most alluded approaches to translating.

Toury, G. (1995) *The Notion of Assumed Translation: An Invitation to a New Discussion*. In: H. Bloemen, E. Hertog, W. Segers (eds.). *Letterlijkheid, Wordelijkheid/Literality, Verbality*. Antwerpen: Fantom, pp. 135-147.

*Luana Ferreira de Freitas*

*PGL/UFSC*

*Christine Bareño Etges*

*PGI/UFSC*

## REFERENCES

Gentzler, E. (1993) *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Gentzler, E. (2001) *Contemporary Translation Theories: 2nd revised edition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gentzler, E. (2003) *Translation, Postcolonial Studies, and the Americas*. In: Paula Burnett (ed.) *Translation and Transcreation*, vol. 2, no. 2. <http://www.brunel.ac.uk/faculty/arts/entertext> (08/01/2004)

Larose, R. (1996) *C. R. Gentzler, E. (1993): Contemporary Theories of Translation* In: *Meta* vol. XLI no. 1 pp. 163-170. <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1996/v41/n1/003404ar.html> (09/01/2004)

Pym, A. (1993) *Christiane Nord. Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Method, and Didactic Application of a Model for a Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. In: *TTR* 6/2, 184-190.