

Skopos Theory as an Extension of Rhetoric

Isabelle Collombat *Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3 (ESIT)*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Recommended Citation

Collombat, Isabelle. "Skopos Theory as an Extension of Rhetoric." *Poroi* 13, Iss. 1 (2017): Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.13008/2151-2957.1236>

Hosted by [Iowa Research Online](https://www.iowa-research.org/)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Iowa Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Poroi* by an authorized administrator of Iowa Research Online. For more information, please contact lib-ir@uiowa.edu.

***Skopos* Theory as an Extension of Rhetoric**



Isabelle Collombat

Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3 (ESIT)

Poroi 13,1 (May 2017)

Keywords: translation studies, *skopos* theory, rhetoric

Although rhetoric and, in particular, one of its branches, metaphorology, seem at this point to have been increasingly appropriated by various fields of study, such as semantics, semiotics, philosophy, communications, or even psychology (Charbonnel and Kleiber, 1999), there is nevertheless an implicit recognition of its contribution to numerous disciplines. In fact, as concerns many of these fields of study, it can rightly lay claim to being a foundational discipline.

This essay, which pertains to translation studies, presents a reflection aiming at defining intersections between the areas covered respectively by rhetoric and by *skopos* theory, which, in the field of translation studies, is one of the most frequently used theoretical frameworks that structures practice, and therefore teaching.

The term of *skopos* has been originally used by Aristotle to refer to the aim of actions, as opposed to *telos*, which refers to their end. More precisely, as Eikeland states, “a *skopos* is conscious and intended, and may be set arbitrarily as an aim (. . .). A *telos*, or end, may be either subconscious or conscious” (Eikeland, 2008, 130).

In translation studies, *skopos* theory was defined in the late 1970s by Hans Vermeer (see notably Vermeer, 1978), expanded in the 1980s with contributions by Katharina Reiss (Reiss and Vermeer, 1984, 2014), and then expanded in the 1990s further with those of Christine North (North, 1997). According to this theory, any translation strategy is defined by the aim or purpose of the translation, which is based in particular on an adaptation to the recipient (the “audience” of the rhetorician) and a consideration of text typology (the rhetorician’s “type of discourse”).

With this said, if the question of purpose is as central in contemporary translation studies as it is in classical rhetoric, it can

nevertheless be said that the latter offers a more complete model if we consider the use of discursive means that are more suitable for this aim (essentially, the “invention” of the rhetorician). It is important to point out in this regard that the grammatical or stylistic aspects that are part of both correctness and aesthetics—often confused in classical rhetoric—are lessened in most current theoretical frameworks of translation, where the rejection to which they were subjected in the 1970s continues, as we shall see.

This reflection aims to lay the foundations of a translatorial theoretical framework based on the following: an extension of the *skopos* model that includes the stylistic elements of classical rhetoric, and perhaps also an extension of the rhetorical model to embrace a wide range of text types. With this in mind, let us carefully examine some key concepts.

Rhetoric as a Foundational Discipline

Today, it can be said that rhetoricians are probably the ancestors of what we now call “language professionals,” a group composed mainly of writers and translators. Revisors will not be included, because whether monolingual or bilingual, they perform a task that stems more from quality control than from actual production. It is rather surprising that professional language training programs still struggle too often to establish their legitimacy, while in antiquity, the teaching of rhetoric enjoyed prestige in part because it was based on a harmonious blend of theory and practice, both regarded as inseparable. We should also mention that this dichotomy between theory and practice is still a source of friction between the different “peoples” on the continent of translation, where translators (practitioners) are still frequently opposed to translation studies specialists (theorists), as if they were antagonists. One of the few to pose as a mediator on this issue was Umberto Eco (2007, 5-6), who quite rightly established that one cannot exist without the other. To talk about translation studies, we must have already grappled with translation. In short, without being overly attached to the past, sometimes it seems as though we have spent many centuries trying to reinvent the wheel. For example, in the field of didactics, might not socio-constructivism simply be an avatar of the Socratic method?

It is undeniable in any event that rhetoric is the foundation of all models that attempt to define and delimit the language production activity, and more specifically, the teaching of it.

The Translator as a Rhetorician

On the surface, one of the most significant differences between the art of rhetoricians and that of translators is that the latter seem deprived of the use of *invention* in the rhetorical sense of the term, meaning they are deprived of subject choice according to the definition provided by Michèle Aquien and Georges Molinié (1996, 209). However, for Roland Barthes “the *inventio* refers less to an invention (arguments) than to a discovery” (Barthes, 1970, 198, my translation). For him, “everything already exists and thus can only be found, a concept that is more ‘extractive’ than ‘creative’” (ibid). Essentially, the role of the rhetorician is to find pre-existing arguments and to arrange them appropriately depending on purpose, and according to “disposition.” In this way, translators are indeed rhetoricians, because their role will most often consist of finding arguments in the target culture that are equivalent to those contained in the source text. I have examined what I call the “rational empathy” of the translator, an attitude based on intercultural effectiveness criteria, which the translator adopts almost simultaneously with respect to the author, recipient, text, or even characters, in the case of literary translation (Collombat, 2010). In short, the rational empathetic attitude of translators leads them to reconstruct a rhetorical environment, to transpose the rhetorical universe of the source text onto the target culture. Most of the time, this process can only be accomplished discretely through transparent creativity, whose very purpose is adherence.

It should be added that it is commonly accepted (although most often implicitly) that a text can be improved by a translation, for one simple reason: nowadays, translators, who are language professionals, are mostly asked to translate texts created by specialists of a given field, who are not professional writers (Jean Delisle, 2013, 631-638). It could even be that these specialists are not native speakers of the language in which they have chosen to express themselves, as is very often the case with the use of English. Even in literary translation, it is not uncommon for translators to find inconsistencies or anomalies in published original texts that they correct during translation. This phenomenon was addressed in 1946 by Larbaud, who stated that the translator remains the most astute and in-depth reader of a text, because basically translation is but a “form of criticism” (Larbaud, 1997, 69-70). This approach is also that of Gaddis Rose, who states that “translation and literary criticism [...] have always been historically interdependent” (Rose, 1997, 2).

Persuasion and Adherence: Towards an Extension of Text Typology

Rhetoric is generally defined as the art of persuasion. As Molinié reminds us, “We argue, which is logical, to convince, which is moral, whereas we only succeed through persuasion, which is emotional” (Molinié, 1992, 7).¹ Molinié also frequently recalls that persuasion is the end purpose of rhetoric, acknowledging that the “median purposes” are to educate, to please, and to touch.

This perspective contains in itself cognitive (logical argument), intellectual (belief), and emotional (persuasion) arguments. In the end, rhetoric is perhaps generally a process that aims for the adherence of the audience (or, more broadly, the recipient, to use the preferred term in *skopos* theory) on at least one of these three levels. And these three levels call to mind the three text types differentiated by translation studies specialist Katharina Reiss, who distinguishes informative, expressive, and operative texts, based in part on the typology established in the 1970s by Egon Werlich, which was later developed by Jean-Michel Adam (Reiss, 2009, 109-110; Werlich, 1975; Adam, 1992).

This notion of text typology is in fact predominant in *skopos* theory, which bases any translation strategy on the determination of the text’s purpose, which differs depending on the text type.

Moreover, although in antiquity rhetoric was initially associated with the legal and political spheres, the multiplication of types of discourse and media that coexist today—as mentioned in particular in Joëlle Garde-Tamine’s work—causes a necessary expansion of text typology beyond the limited sphere of the spoken word (Garde-Tamine, 1996, 35). As such, the notion of *adherence* is a productive extension of *persuasion*, because it allows us to focus on the world of literature particularly, where the reader’s adherence comes from the “reading pact,” an “implicit pact between the author and the reader based on the existence of a double protocol: that of the author, which is essentially declaratory, and that of the text editor, which is primarily typographical. This pact is understood as a set of reading instructions that program in the reader the mobilization of pertinent knowledge and the realization of cognitive operations”

¹ This is my translation of the original quotation: “On argumente, ce qui est logique, pour convaincre, ce qui est moral, où l’on réussit seulement si l’on a persuadé, ce qui est affectif.”

(Plassard, 2007, 288).² The reading pact is determined for example by paratextual indicators such as genre, the original language of the text, if indicated, the reputation of the publisher and the author, etc. In a way, these paratextual indicators can be used as so many rhetorical devices, if not to gain the adherence of readers, at least to direct it, even if this directing is unintended by the producer (author).

The Recipient

In addition to the inclusion of the issue of text typology put forward by Reiss, Aristotelian rhetoric already contains a reflection on discourse (in a broad sense) and its effects on recipients. Whether the objective is to inform, touch, seduce, or convince, it is necessary to first identify the recipient in order to determine the means to achieve the end. It is interesting to note that Gardes-Tamine associates memory and the use of common places to influence the public, which feels itself in familiar territory when the speaker uses common cultural references (Gardes-Tamine, 1996, 39). This awareness of the need for a form of empathy for the discourse recipient that we wish to engage is at the heart of the contemporary language specialist's concerns. One could argue that this is certainly the starting point for Eco's reflection in *The Role of the Reader*, a book on the interpretive cooperation of the reader, which introduces the concept of the Model Reader's encyclopaedia (Eco, 1981).

The Rehabilitation of Linguistic Concepts in Translation

Linguistic elements (grammar and stylistics) were excluded from translation studies in the 1970s in response to the exclusively linguistic approach of the time. This tendency began with the arrival of the interpretative theory (*théorie du sens*) in translation, which is a "theory of meaning" developed in reaction to comparative stylistics, at the time considered subservient to the linguistic view of language, which thrived at the expense of meaning (see notably Seleskovitch and Lederer, 2001 [1984]; Vinay and Darbelnet, 1977 [1958]). The turn in translation studies during

² This is my translation of the original quotation: "On argumente, ce qui est logique, pour convaincre, ce qui est moral, où l'on réussit seulement si l'on a persuadé, ce qui est affectif."

this period was thus intended primarily to emancipate translation from linguistics. Although this position was then largely justified by the omnipresence of “asemanticist” linguistics (especially that of Ladmiral, 2004), which only allowed an imperfect description of the act of translation and of documenting translation didactics. The current evolution of the supradiscipline that is becoming the linguistics of today now seems to consider this view as fragmentary (Ladmiral, 2004).

Beyond this, and even if it is historically justifiable, it is regrettable that by overwhelmingly rejecting any connection to linguistics, this approach was also detached from language and words. In consequence, it amounted to the denial of the semantic value of words. As the translation studies specialist Christine Durieux notes:

In fact, meaning is not attached to words but is constructed from words. To this end, translators use their linguistic knowledge, mobilize their knowledge of the subject matter and related knowledge often brought about through analogy, and take into account the text’s production situation with all of its circumstances. This in turn allows them to interpret the words to bring out the intended meaning (Durieux, 2005, 4).³

Even today, calling to mind the linguistic aspects of translation arouses suspicion, as this often comes with the impression that the translation activity is merely seen as an operation of interlingual transcoding. *Skopos* theory does, however, evoke stylistic aspects, especially in relation to discourse analysis methodology, which is essential in the determination of text types, something that the proponents of the interpretive theory mentioned above still refuse to do. As for the more formal aspects related to the issues of idiomaticity and interlingual interference, they often remain obscure.

In reality, the “comparative stylistics” approach that emerged in 1958 in French Canada was intended to help French apprentice translators become aware of the linguistic interferences that could adversely affect idiomaticity or the semantic load of the target text.

³ This is my translation of the original quotation: “De fait, le sens n’est pas attaché aux mots mais se construit à partir des mots. À cet effet, le traducteur fait appel à ses connaissances linguistiques, mobilise ses connaissances du sujet traité et ses connaissances connexes souvent sollicitées par un jeu d’analogie, prend en compte la situation de production du texte rassemblant l’ensemble des circonstances, ce qui lui permet d’interpréter le dire pour en faire émerger le vouloir-dire.”

This process is especially important in linguistic contexts where languages come into contact, and it is clear that European theories, which are often dominant, do not consider this parameter sufficiently, and often promote a falsely unified vision of translation processes within the same linguistic community regardless of any consideration of diatopic context. This point, discussed in Collombat, is crucial when linked to the problematic of the recipient, especially in the context of globalization (Collombat, 2012). Actually, and as paradoxical as it may seem, the emergence of globalization has led to enhancing local cultures, as explained by Tartaglia and Rossi, among others (Tartaglia and Rossi, 2015). This phenomenon, called *glocalization*, tends to promote the expression of local identities and leads to a refined approach of the recipient, taking into account the specificities of local linguistic usages and particularisms in order to better reach the communication target, whatever the *skopos* is.

Thus, it may be wise to advocate a more holistic approach to translation studies by integrating linguistic elements in the manner of classical rhetoric, and by recognizing their instrumental and potentially semantic value in a perspective that is free of complex ideology.

Conclusion

In the minds of many translation specialists, if a relationship were drawn between rhetoric and translation, it would spontaneously evoke stylistics and, by association, the comparative stylistics approach that emerged in the late 50s and was ostracized in the 70s in Europe, even though it has always existed implicitly in most translation training programs. Actually, Mathieu Guidère even (wrongly) states that comparative stylistics was eventually abandoned because this approach was transcoding-oriented, focused on words at the expense of “message” (Guidère, 2008, 45). I take up this issue elsewhere more fully in demonstrating that this perspective is clearly eurocentrist, insofar as it does not take into consideration linguistic contact countries/regions such as Canada or Belgium (Collombat, 2012).

Indeed, while translation was emancipating itself from linguistics, rhetoric was being increasingly reduced to the linguistic aspects of speech, and mostly to tropes. In both cases, the evolution of the discipline has unfortunately led to a fragmented view. Whatever the reasons for these changes, they are due as much to ideological as to historical contexts. In this sense, it would be futile

to challenge them since merely acknowledging their existence legitimizes their presence.

With this said, a return to classical rhetoric allows us to affirm that *skopos* theory includes most of its components. It could even be said that placing function—*skopos*—at the center of this theory may slightly reduce its scope. As such, it may be more appropriate to speak of *congruence*, meaning a balance between means and purpose, and to move from a paradigm that sometimes plays down the means (especially linguistic) in favor of the end to a holistic paradigm that gives back to each parameter the place it deserves with a view to redefining the art of persuasion.

Copyright © 2017 Isabelle Collombat

Reference List

Adam, J.-M. *Les textes: Types et prototypes*. Paris: Nathan, 1992.

Aquien, M. and G. Molinié. *Dictionnaire de rhétorique et de poétique*. Paris: Librairie générale française, 1996.

Barthes, R. “L’ancienne rhétorique. Aide-mémoire.”
Communications 16 (1970): 172-223.
<https://doi.org/10.3406/comm.1970.1236>

Charbonnel, N. and G. Kleiber (Eds.). *La métaphore entre philosophie et rhétorique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.

Collombat, I. “Traduction et variation diatopique dans l’espace francophone: Le Québec et le Canada francophone.” *Arena Romanistica, Journal of Romance Studies* 10 (2012): 28-55.

———. “L’empathie rationnelle comme posture de traduction.”
TranscUlturAl 1.3 (2010): 56-70.
<https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/TC/article/view/10053/7874>, accessed 8/11/15.

Delisle, J. *La traduction raisonnée, 3^e édition: Manuel d’initiation à la traduction professionnelle de l’anglais vers le français*. Ottawa, ON: Les Presses de l’Université d’Ottawa, 2013.

Durieux, C. “L’enseignement de la traduction: Enjeux et démarches.” *Meta: Journal des traducteurs /Meta: Translators’ Journal* 50.1 (2005): 36-47.

- Eco, U. *The Role of the Reader*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press and Hutchinson, 1981 [1979].
- . *Experiences in Translation*. Translated by A. McEwen. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Eikeland, Olav. *The Ways of Aristotle: Aristotelian Phronêsis, Aristotelian Philosophy of Dialogue, and Action Research*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008
- Gaddis Rose, M. *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis*. Manchester, UK: St Jerome, 1997.
- Gardes-Tamine, J. *La rhétorique*. Paris: Éditions Armand Colin, 1996.
- Ladmiral, J.-R. “Dichotomies traductologiques.” *La linguistique* 40.1 (2004): 25-50.
- Larbaud, V. *Sous l'invocation de Saint-Jérôme*. Paris: Gallimard, 1997 [1946].
- Lederer, M. and D. Seleskovitch. *Interpréter pour traduire*. 5th ed. Collection traductologiques. Paris: Éditions Les Belles Lettres, 2014.
- Molinié, G. *Dictionnaire de rhétorique*. Paris: Librairie générale française, 1992.
- Nord, C. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity-Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.
- Plassard, F. *Lire pour traduire*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2007.
- Reiss, K and H. Vermeer. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen, DE: Niemeyer, 1984.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111351919>
- . *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.
- . *Problématiques de la traduction*. Paris: Economica, 2009.
- Tartaglia, S. and M. Rossi. “The Local Identity Functions in the Age of Globalization: A Study on a Local Culture.” *Community Psychology in Global Perspective* 1.1 (2015): 105-121.
- Vermeer, H. J. “Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie.” *Lebende Sprachen* 23 (1978): 99-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/les.1978.23.3.99>

———. *A Skopos Theory of Translation*. Heidelberg, DE:
TEXTconTEXT Verlag, 1996.

Werlich, E. *Typologie der Text*. Heidelberg, DE: Quelle & Meyer,
1975.