Borges: “O Literalismo sacrifica o literário”, ou ainda: “O dicionário baseia-se na hipótese — obviamente não comprovada — de que as línguas são constituídas de sinônimos equivalentes”.

A meu ver, a grande lição do estudo em tela reside no juízo que seu autor faz acerca da viabilidade versus necessidade da tradução. Evocando Goethe, Barnstone reforça a ideia daquele, que afirma, que a tradução é, a um só tempo, impossível e necessária; em outras palavras, dificilmente chegaremos a uma fórmula que sistematize a tradução, conquanto a transposição de signos absolutamente equivalentes seja impossível; tampouco prescindiremos da tradução, dada a sua necessidade.

Tomemos, então, essas circunvoluções como um fim em si mesmas, do mesmo modo que, em literatura, e exemplarmente em Guimarães Rosa (para citar um autor quase que intraduzível), os enredos são, em geral, bem menos relevantes que o trabalho artesanal da palavra: o processo “conta” bem mais que a própria história.

Lauro Meller
UFSC


It is interesting to see that most of the time when translation is the topic of classes, lectures, debates, etc., it seems inevitable that the question of what can and what cannot be translated comes into discussion. It also seems that no matter how many new different attempts to answer it are presented, one might have the feeling that a solution is hard to find. Such a question obviously could not be left out of the “I Seminário de ensino-aprendizagem de tradução” held in Salvador, Bahia, in 1991. The papers presented on that occasion were collected and published, and the brand new book has just been released with the suggestive title *Limites da traduzibilidade*. Written by scholars, translation professors and also by translators, the papers and articles not only bring the specific problem of translatability into discussion, but also discuss the teaching and learning of translation, different methodologies, experiences of translators...

The first four papers, on the topic of translatability, were written by Boris Schnaiderman, Haroldo de Campos, Luis Maia Varela and Serge Boujea, respectively. Their approaches to the topic are quite different and their ideas are exposed through different angles, but on the whole the problems of limitations seem to reach a single point. For Schnaiderman, the limits of any translation will depend exclusively on the competence of the translator. For him translation is art, and any translated piece (poetry or literary prose) will only be significant if the translator herself finds it artistically rewarding. Quite a similar view is the one Campos has. He says that the more difficult a text is to be translated, the more possibilities of recreation it will give to a translator, pointing out that he only translates a work which brings in itself a whole culture and, like Schnaiderman, it has to be rewarding. For Varela, any limit has to be seen as a challenge. Limits are there to be surpassed. Another aspect, brought by Bourjea, is the possibility of looking at manuscripts of a literary piece. This possibility would help translators to overcome many of the so-called limits of translatability. So, it seems that any translator facing difficulties, either linguistic or cultural, has to find within her/his knowledge and skills, a way out of those difficulties.

On the topic of the teaching-learning of translation, the main point the different writers call attention to is integration. A new role of the university, providing courses on translation, is called for, focusing on the research on translation, translation for publishing companies, the teaching, and also the relationship between teachers and students need to be reviewed. The discussion proposed is important and necessary for all those involved in translation as well as for those who intend to become involved since they are all affected by the process of teaching and learning about translation.

Next, there are a number of papers which bring together the experience of translators within their working field. Some are exciting, some are actually tedious but they all give a good view of what translation is and what translators-to-be can expect.

Two other papers, on the subject of methodology, present an account of experiences of teachers and translators within the university spectrum. Interesting and valid for those who are already engaged in the work of translation itself.

One important section is the one which brings into discussion five
translations in five different languages of *A Morte e a Morte de Quincas Berro d'Água* written by Jorge Amado. The papers provide a technical account of the difficulties encountered in the translation of that work by different translators. It is quite interesting to see how those difficulties were dealt with or what could have been done to make the translation sound better.

Finally, the last two papers discuss how theory can be seen in the practical side of translation. Rather theoretical, actually, these papers could probably be inserted somewhere else in the book, leaving more interesting articles to close this book.

As a whole, *Limites da traduzibilidade* is an important book that reaches translation scholars, professors, students and also readers in general, giving a very good view of what is happening in the field of translation in Brazil and abroad. Sometimes it might not be an easy reading, but it is surely interesting.

Marcos Antonio Morgado de Oliveira
UFSC

---


*The Translatability of Cultures* is a collection of 14 essays, subdivided into two themes. It is devoted to exploring critiques on oppositeness (alterity) and otherness, within a cultural context of translations. All the contributors to this book have some other publications in the area that they approach, and most of them are very recent, like this book (1996).

This book begins with a short introductory chapter written by one of the editors, Sanford Budick, entitled 'Crises of Alterity', including the approach on critical conditions, self-sameness and secondary otherness of translations. Following this introductory chapter, the next articles are subdivided according to their central approach: the first subtheme is 'Historical Perspective', involving articles on the (un)translatability of religious culture and Biblical poetics; vertical to horizontal translation; universalism; modern American cri-