2
HISTORY OF TRANSLATION THEORY

No introduction to Translation Studies could be complete without consideration of the discipline in an historical perspective, but the scope of such an enterprise is far too vast to be covered adequately in a single book, let alone in a single chapter. What can be done in the time and space allowed here is to look at the way in which certain basic *lines of approach* to translation have emerged at different periods of European and American culture and to consider how the role and function of translation has varied. So, for example, the distinction between *word for word* and *sense for sense* translation, established within the Roman system, has continued to be a point for debate in one way or another right up to the present, while the relationship between translation and emergent nationalism can shed light on the significance of differing concepts of culture. The persecution of Bible translators during the centuries when scholars were avidly translating and retranslating Classical Greek and Roman authors is an important link in the chain of the development of capitalism and the decline of feudalism. In the same way, the hermeneutic approach of the great English and German Romantic translators connects with changing concepts of the role of the individual in the social context. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the study of translation, especially in its diachronic aspect, is a vital part of literary and cultural history.

PROBLEMS OF 'PERIOD STUDY'

George Steiner, in *After Babel,*[1] divides the literature on the theory, practice and history of translation into four periods. The first, he

claims, extends from the statements of Cicero and Horace on translation up to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791. The central characteristic of this period is that of 'immediate empirical focus', i.e. the statements and theories about translation stem directly from the practical work of translating. Steiner's second period, which runs up to the publication of Larbaud's *Sous l'invocation de Saint Jérome* in 1946 is characterized as a period of theory and hermeneutic enquiry with the development of a vocabulary and methodology of approaching translation. The third period begins with the publication of the first papers on machine translation in the 1940s, and is characterized by the introduction of structural linguistics and communication theory into the study of translation. Steiner's fourth period, coexisting with the third has its origins in the early 1960s and is characterized by 'a reversion to hermeneutic, almost metaphysical inquiries into translation and interpretation'; in short by a vision of translation that sets the discipline in a wide frame that includes a number of other disciplines:

> Classical philology and comparative literature, lexical statistics and ethnography, the sociology of class-speech, formal rhetoric, poetics, and the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of 'life between languages'.

Steiner's divisions, although interesting and perceptive, nevertheless illustrate the difficulty of studying translation diachronically, for his first period covers a span of some 1700 years while his last two periods cover a mere thirty years. Whilst his comments on recent developments in the discipline are very fair, it is also the case that the characteristic of his first period is equally apparent today in the body of work arising from the observations and polemics of the individual translator. His quadripartite division is, to say the least, highly idiosyncratic, but it does manage to avoid one great pitfall: periodization, or compartmentalization of literary history. It is virtually impossible to divide periods according to dates for, as Lotman points out, human culture is a dynamic system. Attempts to locate stages of cultural development within strict temporal

boundaries contradict that dynamism. A splendid example of the kind of difficulties that arise from the 'periodization approach' emerge when we consider the problem of defining the temporal limits of the Renaissance. There is a large body of literature that attempts to decide whether Petrarch and Chaucer were medieval or Renaissance writers, whether Rabelais was a medieval mind *post hoc,* or whether Dante was a Renaissance mind two centuries too soon. An examination of translation in those terms would not be very helpful at all.

Yet undoubtably there are certain concepts of translation that prevail at different times, which can be documented. T.R.Steiner[2] analyses English translation theory between the cut-off dates of 1650–1800, starting with Sir John Denham and ending with William Cowper, and examines the prevailing eighteenth-century concept of the translator as painter or imitator. André Lefevere[3] has compiled a collection of statements and documents on translation that traces the establishment of a German tradition of translation, starting with Luther and moving on via Gottsched and Goethe to the Schlegels and Schleiermacher and ultimately to Rosenzweig. A less systematic approach, but one which is still tied to a particular time frame, may be found in F.O.Matthiesson's analysis of four major English translators of the sixteenth century (Hoby, North, Florio and Philemon Holland),[4] whilst the methodology employed by Timothy Webb in his study of Shelley as translator[5] involves a careful analysis of the work of an individual translator in relation to the rest of his opus and to contemporary concepts of the role and status of translation.

Studies of this kind, then, that are not bound to rigid notions of period, but seek to investigate changing concepts of translation systematically, having regard to the system of signs that constitutes a given culture, are of great value to the student of Translation Studies. This is indeed a rich field for future research. All too often, however, studies of past translators and translations have focused more on the question of *influence;* on the effect of the TL product in a given cultural context, rather than on the processes involved in the creation of that product and on the theory behind the creation. So, for example, in spite of a number of critical statements about the

significance of translation in the development of the Roman literary canon, there has yet to be a systematic study of Roman translation theory in English. The claims summed up by Matthiesson when he declared that 'a study of Elizabethan translations is a study of the means by which the Renaissance came to England' are not backed by any scientific investigation of the same.

In trying to establish certain lines of approach to translation, across a time period that extends from Cicero to the present, it seems best to proceed by following a loosely chronological structure, but without making any attempt to set up clear-cut divisions. Hence, instead of trying to talk in what must inevitably be very general terms about a specifically 'Renaissance' or 'Classical' concept of translation, I have tried to follow *lines of approach* that may or may not be easily locatable in a temporal context. So the *word for word v. sense for sense* lines can be seen emerging again and again with different degrees of emphasis in accordance with differing concepts of language and communication. The purpose of a chapter such as this must be to raise questions rather than answer them, and to reveal areas in which further research might proceed rather than to pretend to be a definitive history.

THE ROMANS

Eric Jacobsen[6] claims rather sweepingly that translation is a Roman invention, and although this may be considered as a piece of critical hyperbole, it does serve as a starting point from which to focus attention on the role and status of translation for the Romans. The views of both Cicero and Horace on translation were to have great influence on successive generations of translators, and both discuss translation within the wider context of the two main functions of the poet: the universal human duty of acquiring and disseminating wisdom and the special art of making and shaping a poem.

The significance of translation in Roman literature has often been used to accuse the Romans of being unable to create imaginative literature in their own right, at least until the first century BC. Stress has been laid on the creative imagination of the Greeks as opposed to the more practical Roman mind, and the Roman exaltation of their Greek models has been seen as evidence of

their lack of originality. But the implied value judgement in such a generalization is quite wrong. The Romans perceived themselves as a continuation of their Greek models and Roman literary critics discussed Greek texts without seeing the language of those texts as being in any way an inhibiting factor. The Roman literary system sets up a hierarchy of texts and authors that overrides linguistic boundaries and that system in turn reflects the Roman ideal of the hierarchical yet caring central state based on the true law of Reason. Cicero points out that mind dominates the body as a king rules over his subjects or a father controls his children, but warns that where Reason dominates as a master ruling his slaves, 'it keeps them down and crushes them'.[7] With translation, the ideal SL text is there to be imitated and not to be crushed by the too rigid application of Reason. Cicero nicely expresses this distinction: 'If I render word for word, the result will sound uncouth, and if compelled by necessity I alter anything in the order or wording, I shall seem to have departed from the function of a translator.'[8]

Both Horace and Cicero, in their remarks on translation, make an important distinction between *word for word* translation and *sense for sense* (or *figure for figure*) translation. The underlying principle of enriching their native language and literature through translation leads to a stress on the aesthetic criteria of the TL product rather than on more rigid notions of 'fidelity'. Horace, in his *Art of Poetry,* warns against overcautious imitation of the source model:

A theme that is familiar can be made your own property so long as you do not waste your time on a hackneyed treatment; nor should you try to render your original word for word like a slavish translator, or in imitating another writer plunge yourself into difficulties from which shame, or the rules you have laid down for yourself, prevent you from extricating yourself.[9]

Since the process of the enrichment of the literary system is an integral part of the Roman concept of translation, it is not surprising to find a concern with the question of language enrichment also. So prevalent was the habit of borrowing or coining words, that Horace, whilst advising the would-be writer to avoid the pitfalls that beset

'the slavish translator', also advised the sparing use of new words. He compared the process of the addition of new words and the decline of other words to the changing of the leaves in spring and autumn, seeing this process of enrichment through translation as both natural and desirable, *provided* the writer exercised moderation. The art of the translator, for Horace and Cicero, then, consisted in judicious interpretation of the SL text so as to produce a TL version based on the principle *non verbum de verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu* (of expressing not word for word, but sense for sense), and his responsibility was to the TL readers.

But there is also an additional dimension to the Roman concept of enrichment through translation, i.e. the pre-eminence of Greek as the language of culture and the ability of educated Romans to read texts in the SL. When these factors are taken into account, then the position both of translator and reader alters. The Roman reader was generally able to consider the translation as a metatext in relation to the original. The translated text was read *through* the source text, in contrast to the way in which a monolingual reader can only approach the SL text through the TL version. For Roman translators, the task of transferring a text from language to language could be perceived as an exercise in comparative stylistics, since they were freed from the exigencies of having to 'make known' either the form or the content *per se,* and consequently did not need to subordinate themselves to the frame of the original. The good translator, therefore, presupposed the reader's acquaintance with the SL text and was bound by that knowledge, for any assessment of his skill as translator would be based on the creative use he was able to make of his model. Longinus, in his *Essay On the Sublime,*[10] cites 'imitation and emulation of the great historians and poets of the past' as one of the paths towards the sublime and translation is one aspect of imitation in the Roman concept of literary production.

Roman translation may therefore be perceived as unique in that it arises from a vision of literary production that follows an established canon of excellence across linguistic boundaries. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that with the extension of the Roman Empire, bilingualism and trilingualism became increasingly commonplace, and the gulf between oral and literary Latin widened.

The apparent licence of Roman translators, much quoted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, must therefore be seen in the context of the overall system in which that approach to translation was applied.

BIBLE TRANSLATION

With the spread of Christianity, translation came to acquire another role, that of disseminating the word of God. A religion as text-based as Christianity presented the translator with a mission that encompassed both aesthetic and evangelistic criteria. The history of Bible translation is accordingly a history of western culture in microcosm. Translations of the New Testament were made very early, and St Jerome's famous contentious version that was to have such influence on succeeding generations of translators was commissioned by Pope Damasus in AD 384. Following Cicero, St Jerome declared he had translated sense for sense rather than word for word, but the problem of the fine line between what constituted stylistic licence and what constituted heretical interpretation was to remain a major stumbling block for centuries.

Bible translation remained a key issue well into the seventeenth century, and the problems intensified with the growth of concepts of national cultures and with the coming of the Reformation. Translation came to be used as a weapon in both dogmatic and political conflicts as nation states began to emerge and the centralization of the church started to weaken, evidenced in linguistic terms by the decline of Latin as a universal language.[11]

The first translation of the complete Bible into English was the Wycliffite Bible produced between 1380 and 1384, which marked the start of a great flowering of English Bible translations linked to changing attitudes to the role of the written text in the church, that formed part of the developing Reformation. John Wycliffe (c. 1330–84), the noted Oxford theologian, put forward the theory of 'dominion by grace' according to which man was immediately responsible to God and God's law (by which Wycliffe intended not canon law but the guidance of the Bible). Since Wycliffe's theory meant that the Bible was applicable to all human life it followed that each man should be granted access to that crucial text in a language

that he could understand, i.e. in the vernacular. Wycliffe's views, which attracted a circle of followers, were attacked as heretical and he and his group were denounced as 'Lollards', but the work he began continued to flourish after his death and his disciple John Purvey revised the first edition some time before 1408 (the first dated manuscript).

The second Wycliffite Bible contains a general Prologue, composed between 1395–6 and the fifteenth chapter of the Prologue describes the four stages of the translation process:

 (1) a collaborative effort of collecting old Bibles and glosses and establishing an authentic Latin source text;
 (2) a comparison of the versions;
 (3) counselling 'with old grammarians and old divines' about hard words and complex meanings; and
 (4) translating as clearly as possible the 'sentence' (i.e. meaning), with the translation corrected by a group of collaborators.

Since the political function of the translation was to make the complete text of the Bible accessible, this led to a definite stance on priorities by the translator: Purvey's Preface states clearly that the translator shall translate 'after the sentence' (meaning) and not only after the words, 'so that the sentence be as open [plain] or opener, in English as in Latin and go not far from the letter.' What is aimed at is an intelligible, idiomatic version: a text that could be utilized by the layman. The extent of its importance may be measured by the fact that the bulk of the 150 copies of Purvey's revised Bible were written even after the prohibition, on pain of excommunication, of translations circulated without the approval of diocesan or provincial councils in July 1408. Knyghton the Chronicler's lament that 'the Gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden under feet of swine' was certainly contradicted by the widespread interest in the Wycliffite versions.

In the sixteenth century the history of Bible translation acquired new dimensions with the advent of printing. After the Wycliffite versions, the next great English translation was William Tyndale's (1494–1536) New Testament printed in 1525. Tyndale's proclaimed intention in translating was also to offer as clear a version as

possible to the layman, and by the time he was burned at the stake in 1536 he had translated the New Testament from the Greek and parts of the Old Testament from the Hebrew.

The sixteenth century saw the translation of the Bible into a large number of European languages, in both Protestant and Roman Catholic versions. In 1482, the Hebrew Pentateuch had been printed at Bologna and the complete Hebrew Bible appeared in 1488, whilst Erasmus, the Dutch Humanist, published the first Greek New Testament in Basle in 1516. This version was to serve as the basis for Martin Luther's 1522 German version. Translations of the New Testament appeared in Danish in 1529 and again in 1550, in Swedish in 1526–41, and the Czech Bible appeared between 1579–93. Translations and revised versions of existing translations continued to appear in English, Dutch, German and French. Erasmus perhaps summed up the evangelizing spirit of Bible translating when he declared

> I would desire that all women should read the gospell and Paules episteles and I wold to God they were translated in to the tonges of all men so that they might not only be read and knowne of the scotes and yrishmen But also of the Turkes and the Sarracenes…. I wold to God the plowman wold singe a texte of the scripture at his plow-beme. And that the wever at his lowme with this wold drive away the tediousnes of tyme. I wold the wayfaringeman with this pastyme wold expelle the weriness of his iorney. And to be shorte I wold that all the communication of the christen shuld be of the scripture for in a manner such are we oure selves as our daylye tales are.[12]

William Tyndale, echoing Erasmus, attacked the hypocrisy of church authorities who forbade the laypeople to read the Bible in their native tongue for the good of their souls, but nevertheless accepted the use of the vernacular for 'histories and fables of love and wantoness and of ribaudry as filthy as heart can think, to corrupt the minds of youth.'

The history of Bible translation in the sixteenth century is intimately tied up with the rise of Protestantism in Europe. The public burning of Tyndale's New Testament in 1526 was followed in

quick succession by the appearance of Coverdale's Bible (1535), the Great Bible (1539) and the Geneva Bible in 1560. Coverdale's Bible was also banned but the tide of Bible translation could not be stemmed, and each successive version drew on the work of previous translators, borrowing, amending, revising and correcting.

It would not perhaps be too gross a generalization to suggest that the aims of the sixteenth-century Bible translators may be collocated in three categories:

(1) To clarify errors arising from previous versions, due to inadequate SL manuscripts or to linguistic incompetence.
(2) To produce an accessible and aesthetically satisfying vernacular style.
(3) To clarify points of dogma and reduce the extent to which the scriptures were interpreted and re-presented to the laypeople as a metatext.

In his *Circular Letter on Translation* of 1530 Martin Luther lays such emphasis on the significance of (2) that he uses the verbs *übersetzen* (to translate) and *verdeutschen* (to Germanize) almost indiscriminately. And Luther also stresses the importance of the relationship between style and meaning: 'Grammar is necessary for declension, conjugation and construction of sentences, but in speech the meaning and subject matter must be considered, not the grammar, for the grammar shall not rule over the meaning.'[13]

The Renaissance Bible translators perceived both fluidity and intelligibility in the TL text as important criteria, but were equally concerned with the transmission of a literally accurate message. In an age when the choice of a pronoun could mean the difference between life or condemnation to death as a heretic, precision was of central importance. Yet because Bible translation was an integral part of the upward shift in the status of the vernacular, the question of style was also vital. Luther advised the would-be translator to use a vernacular proverb or expression if it fitted in with the New Testament, in other words to add to the wealth of imagery in the SL text by drawing on the vernacular tradition too. And since the Bible is in itself a text that each individual reader must reinterpret in the reading, each successive translation attempts to allay doubts in the

wording and offer readers a text in which they may put their trust. In the Preface to the King James Bible of 1611, entitled *The Translators to the Reader,* the question is asked 'is the kingdom of God words or syllables?' The task of the translator went beyond the linguistic, and became evangelistic in its own right, for the (often anonymous) translator of the Bible in the sixteenth century was a radical leader in the struggle to further man's spiritual progress. The collaborative aspect of Bible translation represented yet another significant aspect of that struggle.

EDUCATION AND THE VERNACULAR

The educative role of translation of the Scriptures was well-established long before the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the early vernacular glosses inserted in Latin manuscripts have provided valuable information concerning the development of a number of European languages. With regard to English, for example, the Lindisfarne Gospels (copied out c. AD 700), had a literal rendering of the Latin original inserted between the lines in the tenth century in Northumbrian dialect. These glosses subordinated notions of stylistic excellence to the word-for-word method, but may still be fairly described as translations, since they involved a process of interlingual transfer. However, the system of glossing was only one aspect of translation in the centuries that saw the emergence of distinct European languages in a written form. In the ninth century King Alfred (reign 871–99), who had translated (or caused to be translated) a number of Latin texts, declared that the purpose of translating was to help the English people to recover from the devastation of the Danish invasions that had laid waste the old monastic centres of learning and had demoralized and divided the kingdom. In his Preface to his translation of the *Cura Postoralis* (a handbook for parish priests) Alfred urges a revival of learning through greater accessibility of texts as a direct result of translations into the vernacular, and at the same time he asserts the claims of English as a literary language in its own right. Discussing the way in which the Romans translated texts for their own purposes, as did 'all other Christian nations', Alfred states that 'I think it better, if you agree, that we also translate some of the books that all men should

know into the language that we can all understand.'[14] In translating the *Cura Postoralis,* Alfred claims to have followed the teachings of his bishop and priests and to have rendered the text *hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgiet of andgiete* (sometimes word by word, sometimes sense by sense), an interesting point in that it implies that the function of the finished product was the determining factor in the translation process rather than any established canon of procedure. Translation is perceived as having a moral and didactic purpose with a clear political role to play, far removed from its purely instrumental role in the study of rhetoric that coexisted at the same time.

The concept of translation as a writing exercise and as a means of improving oratorical style was an important component in the medieval educational system based on the study of the Seven Liberal Arts. This system, as passed down from such Roman theoreticians as Quintilian (first century AD) whose *Institutio Oratoria* was a seminal text, established two areas of study, the *Trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectic) and the *Quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy), with the Trivium as the basis for philosophical knowledge.[15]

Quintilian stresses the usefulness of paraphrasing a given text as a means of assisting the student both to analyse the structures of a text and to experiment in turn with forms of embellishment or abridgement. He prescribes paraphrasing as a set of exercises that move through two distinct stages: the initial straightforward closeness of a first paraphrase and the more complex second stage when the writer adds more of his own style. Together with these exercises, Quintilian advocates translation, and indeed the two activities are not clearly distinguished since both are employed to the same end: that of improving the science of oratory. Quintilian recommends translating from Greek into Latin as a variation on paraphrasing original Latin texts in order to extend and develop the student's imaginative powers.

Quintilian's advocacy of translation as a stylistic exercise involved, of course, the translation of Greek originals into Latin, and Latin remained the language of the educational system throughout Europe for centuries. But the emergence of vernacular literatures from the tenth century onwards led to another shift in the role of

translation. Alfred had extolled the importance of translation as a means of spreading understanding, and for him translation involved the creation of a *vernacular* SL text. As emerging literatures with little or no written tradition of their own to draw upon developed across Europe, works produced in other cultural contexts were translated, adapted and absorbed on a vast scale. Translation acquired an additional dimension, as writers used their abilities to translate as a means of increasing the status of their own vernacular. Thus the Roman model of enrichment through translation developed in a new form.

In his useful article on vulgarization and translation, Gianfranco Folena suggests that medieval translation might be described either as vertical, by which he intends translation into the vernacular from a SL that has a special prestige or value (e.g. Latin), or as *horizontal,* where both SL and TL have a similar value (e.g. Provençal into Italian, Norman-French into English).[16] Folena's distinction, however, is not new: Roger Bacon (c. 1214–92) was well aware of the differences between translating from ancient languages into Latin and translating contemporary texts into the vernacular, as was Dante (1265–1321), and both talk about translation in relation to the moral and aesthetic criteria of works of art and scholarship. Bacon, for example, discusses the problem of *loss* in translation and the counter-issue, that of coinage, as Horace had done centuries earlier. Meanwhile Dante focuses more on the importance of *accessibility* through translation. But both agree that translation involves much more than an exercise in comparative stylistics.

The distinction between *horizontal* and *vertical* translation is helpful in that it shows how translation could be linked to two coexistent but different literary systems. However, there are many different strands in the development of literary translation up to the early fifteenth century and Folena's distinction only sheds light on one small area. And whilst the *vertical* approach splits into two distinct types, the interlinear gloss, or word-for-word technique, as opposed to the Ciceronian sense-for-sense method, elaborated by Quintilian's concept of para-phrase, the *horizontal* approach involves complex questions of *imitatio* and borrowing. The high

status of *imitatio* in the medieval canon meant that originality of material was not greatly prized and an author's skill consisted in the reworking of established themes and ideas. The point at which a writer considered himself to be a translator of another text, as opposed to the use he might make of translated material plagiarized from other texts, is rarely clear. Within the opus of a single writer, such as Chaucer (c. 1340–1400) there is a range of texts that include acknowledged translations, free adaptations, conscious borrowings, reworkings and close correspondences. And although theoreticians such as Dante or John of Trevisa (1326–1412) raise the question of *accuracy* in translation, that notion of accuracy is dependent on the translator's ability to read and understand the original and does not rest on the translator's subordination to that SL text. Translation, whether vertical or horizontal, is viewed as a skill, inextricably bound up with modes of reading and interpreting the original text, which is proper source material for the writer to draw upon as he thinks fit.

EARLY THEORISTS

Following the invention of printing techniques in the fifteenth century, the role of translation underwent significant changes, not least due to the great increase in the volume of translations undertaken. At the same time, serious attempts to formulate a theory of translation were also made. The function of translation, together with the function of learning itself changed. For as the great voyages of discovery opened up a world outside Europe, increasingly sophisticated clocks and instruments for measuring time and space developed and these, together with the theory of the Copernican universe, affected concepts of culture and society and radically altered perspectives.

One of the first writers to formulate a theory of translation was the French humanist Etienne Dolet (1509–46) who was tried and executed for heresy after 'mistranslating' one of Plato's dialogues in such a way as to imply disbelief in immortality. In 1540 Dolet published a short outline of translation principles, entitled *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (How to Translate

Well from one Language into Another) and established five
principles for the translator:

(1) The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of
    the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify
    obscurities.
(2) The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and
    TL.
(3) The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings.
(4) The translator should use forms of speech in common use.
(5) The translator should choose and order words appropriately to
    produce the correct tone.

Dolet's principles, ranked as they are in a precise order, stress the
importance of *understanding* the SL text as a primary requisite. The
translator is far more than a competent linguist, and translation
involves both a scholarly and sensitive appraisal of the SL text and
an awareness of the place the translation is intended to occupy in the
TL system.

   Dolet's views were reiterated by George Chapman (1559–1634),
the great translator of Homer. In his dedication of the *Seven Books*
(1598) Chapman declares that

> The work of a skilfull and worthy translator is to observe the
> sentences, figures and formes of speech proposed in his
> author, his true sence and height, and to adorne them with
> figures and formes of oration fitted to the originall in the same
> tongue to which they are translated: and these things I would
> gladlie have made the questions of whatsoever my labours
> have deserved.[17]

He repeats his theory more fully in the *Epistle to the Reader* of his
translation of *The Iliad*. In the *Epistle* Chapman states that a
translator must:

 (1) avoid word for word renderings;
 (2) attempt to reach the 'spirit' of the original;

(3) avoid overloose translations, by basing the translation on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses.

The Platonic doctrine of the divine inspiration of poetry clearly had repercussions for the translator, in that it was deemed possible for the 'spirit' or 'tone' of the original to be recreated in another cultural context. The translator, therefore, is seeking to bring about a 'transmigration' of the original text, which he approaches on both a technical and metaphysical level, as a skilled equal with duties and responsibilities both to the original author and the audience.

THE RENAISSANCE

Edmond Cary, discussing Dolet in his study of the great French translators, stresses the importance of translation in the sixteenth century:

> The translation battle raged throughout Dolet's age. The Reformation, after all, was primarily a dispute between translators. Translation became an affair of State and a matter of Religion. The Sorbonne and the king were equally concerned with it. Poets and prose writers debated the matter, Joachim du Bellay's *Défense et lllustration de la Langue française* is organized around problems relating to translation.[18]

In such an atmosphere, where a translator could be executed as a result of a particular rendering of a sentence or phrase in text, it is hardly surprising that battle lines were drawn with vehemence. The quality of aggressive assertiveness that can be discerned in Chapman's *Epistle* or Dolet's pamphlet can be seen through the work and statements of a number of translators of the time. One major characteristic of the period (reflected also in the number of translations of the Bible that updated the language of preceding versions without necessarily making major interpretative changes) is an affirmation of the present through the use of contemporary idiom and style. Matthiesson's study of Elizabethan translators gives a number of examples of the way in which the affirmation of the

individual in his own time manifests itself. He notes, for example, the frequent replacement of indirect discourse by direct discourse in North's translation of Plutarch (1579), a device that adds immediacy and vitality to the text, and quotes examples of North's use of lively contemporary idiom. So in North's version it is said of Pompey that 'he did lay all the irons in the fire he could, to bring it to pass that he might be chosen dictator' (V, p. 30–1) and of Anthony that he decided Caesar's body should 'be honourably buried and not in hugger mugger' (VI, p. 200).

In poetry, the adjustments made to the SL text by such major translators as Wyatt (1503–42) and Surrey (c. 1517–47) have led critics to describe their translations at times as 'adaptations', but such a distinction is misleading. An investigation of Wyatt's translations of Petrarch, for example, shows a faithfulness not to individual words or sentence structures but to a notion of the meaning of the poem in its relationship to its readers. In other words, the poem is perceived as an artefact of a particular cultural system, and the only faithful translation can be to give it a similar function in the target cultural system. For example, Wyatt takes Petrarch's famous sonnet on the events of 1348 with the death of Cardinal Giovanni Colonna and of Laura that begins

> Rotta è I'alta colonna e'l verde lauro
>   Che facean ombra al mio stanco pensero;
>
> (CCLXIX)

> (Broken is the tall column (Colonna) and the green laurel tree
> (Laura) That used to shade my tired thought)

and turns it into:

> The pillar pearished is whearto I lent;
>   The strongest staye of myne unquyet mynde:
>
> (CCXXXVI)

It is clear that he is using the translation process to do something other than render Petrarch's words line for line or recapture the elegiac quality of the original. Wyatt's translation stresses the 'I',

and stresses also the strength and support of what is lost. Whether the theory that would see this sonnet as written in commemoration of the fall of Cromwell in 1540 is proven or not, it remains clear that the translator has opted for a voice that will have immediate impact on contemporary readers as being of their own time.

The updating of texts through translation by means either of additions, omissions or conscious alterations can be very clearly seen in the work of Philemon Holland (1552–1637) the 'translator general'. In translating Livy he declared that his aim was to ensure that Livy should 'deliver his mind in English, if not so eloquently by many degrees, yet as truly as in Latine', and claimed that he used not 'any affected phrase, but…a meane and popular style'. It is his attempt at such a style that led to such alterations as the use of contemporary terminology for certain key Roman terms, so, for example *patres et plebs* becomes *Lords* or *Nobles and Commons; comitium* can be *common hall, High court, Parliament; praetor* becomes *Lord Chiefe Justice or Lord Governour of the City*. At other times, in his attempt to clarify obscure passages and references he inserts explanatory phrases or sentences and above all his confident nationalism shows through. In the *Preface to the Reader* of his translation of Pliny, Holland attacks those critics who protest at the vulgarization of Latin classics and comments that they 'think not so honourably of their native country and mother tongue as they ought', claiming that if they did they would be eager to 'triumph over the Romans in subduing their literature under the dent of the English pen' in revenge for the Roman conquest of Britain effected in earlier times by the sword. Translation in Renaissance Europe came to play a role of central importance. As George Steiner puts it:

> At a time of explosive innovation, and amid a real threat of surfeit and disorder, translation absorbed, shaped, oriented the necessary raw material. It was, in a full sense of the term, the matière première of the imagination. Moreover, it established a logic of relation between past and present, and between different tongues and traditions which were splitting apart under stress of nationalism and religious conflict.[19]

Translation was by no means a secondary activity, but a primary one, exerting a shaping force on the intellectual life of the age, and at times the figure of the translator appears almost as a revolutionary activist rather than the servant of an original author or text.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By the mid-seventeenth century the effects of the Counter-Reformation, the conflict between absolute monarchy and the developing Parliamentary system, and the widening of the gap between traditional Christian Humanism and science had all led to radical changes in the theory of literature and hence to the role of translation. Descartes' (1596–1650) attempts to formulate a method of inductive reasoning were mirrored in the preoccupation of literary critics to formulate rules of aesthetic production. In their attempt to find models, writers turned to ancient masters, seeing in *imitation* a means of instruction. Translation of the classics increased considerably in France between 1625 and 1660, the great age of French classicism and of the flowering of French theatre based on the Aristotelian unities. French writers and theorists were in turn enthusiastically translated into English.

The emphasis on rules and models in Augustan England did not mean, however, that art was perceived as a merely imitative skill. Art was the ordering in a harmonious and elegant manner of Nature, the inborn ability that transcended definition and yet prescribed the finished form. Sir John Denham (1615–69), whose theory of translation, as expressed in his poem 'To Sir Richard Fanshawe upon his Translation of Pastor Fido' (1648) and in his Preface to his translation of *The Destruction of Troy* (1656) (see below) covers both the formal aspect (Art) and the spirit (Nature) of the work, but warns against applying the principle of literal translation to the translation of poetry:

> for it is not his business alone to translate Language into Language, but Poesie into Poesie; and Poesie is of so subtile a spirit, that in pouring out of one Language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *Caput mortuum*.[20]

Denham argues for a concept of translation that sees translator and original writer as equals but operating in clearly differentiated social and temporal contexts. He sees it as the translator's duty to his source text to extract what he perceives as the essential core of the work and to reproduce or recreate the work in the target language.

Abraham Cowley (1618–67) goes a stage further, and in his 'Preface' to his *Pindarique Odes* (1656) he boldly asserts that he has 'taken, left out and added what I please' in his translations, aiming not so much at letting the reader know precisely what the original author said as 'what was his way and manner of speaking'. Cowley makes a case for his manner of translating, dismissing those critics who will choose (like Dryden) to term his form of translation 'imitation', and T.R.Steiner notes that Cowley's preface was taken as the manifesto of the 'libertine translators of the latter seventeenth century'.

John Dryden (1631–1700), in his important Preface to Ovid's Epistles (1680), tackled the problems of translations by formulating three basic types:

(1) *metaphrase,* or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another;
(2) *paraphrase,* or translation with latitude, the Ciceronian 'sense-for-sense' view of translation;
(3) *imitation,* where the translator can abandon the text of the original as he sees fit.

Of these types Dryden chooses the second as the more balanced path, provided the translator fulfils certain criteria: to translate poetry, he argues, the translator must be a poet, must be a master of both languages, and must understand both the characteristics and 'spirit' of the original author, besides conforming to the aesthetic canons of his own age. He uses the metaphor of the translator/portrait painter, that was to reappear so frequently in the eighteenth century, maintaining that the painter has the duty of making his portrait resemble the original.

In his *Dedication of the Aeneis* (1697) Dryden claims to have followed his prescribed path of moderation and to have steered 'betwixt the two extremes of paraphrase and literal translation', but

following French models he has updated the language of his original text: 'I have endeavoured to make Virgil speak such English as he would himself have spoken, if he had been born in England, and in this present age.' As an example of Dryden's version of Virgil, consider the opening lines of Dido's speech describing her thoughts about Aeneas in the decorous language of a contemporary heroine:

> My dearest Anna! What new dreams affright
> My labouring soul! What visions of the night
> Disturb my quiet, and distract my breast
> With strange ideas of our Trojan guest.[21]

Dryden's views on translation were followed fairly closely by Alexander Pope (1688–1744), who advocates the same middle ground as Dryden, with stress on close reading of the original to note the details of style and manner whilst endeavouring to keep alive the 'fire' of the poem.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Underlying Dryden's and Pope's concept of translation is another element, beyond the problem of the debate between overfaithfulness and looseness: the whole question of the moral duty of the translator to his contemporary reader. The impulse to clarify and make plain the essential *spirit* of a text led to large-scale rewritings of earlier texts to fit them to contemporary standards of language and taste. Hence the famous re-structuring of Shakespearian texts, and the translations/ reworkings of Racine. Dr Johnson (1709–84), in his *Life of Pope* (1779–80), discussing the question of additions to a text through translation, comments that if elegance is gained, surely it is desirable, provided nothing is taken away, and goes on to state that 'the purpose of a writer is to be read', claiming that Pope wrote for his own time and his own nation. The right of the individual to be addressed in his own terms, on his own ground is an important element in eighteenth-century translation and is linked to changing concepts of 'originality'.

To exemplify the particular approach Pope brought to his version of Homer, compare the following passage to Chapman's version of

an episode from Book 22 of *The Iliad*. Pope's Andromache suffers and despairs, whilst Chapman's Andromache comes across as a warrior in her own right. Chapman's use of direct verbs gives a dramatic quality to the scene, whilst Pope's Latinate structures emphasize the agony of expectation leading up to the moment when the horror is plain to see. And even that horror is quite differently presented—Pope's 'god-like Hector' contrasts with Chapman's longer description of the hero's degradation:[22]

> She spoke; and furious, with distracted Pace,
> Fears in her Heart and Anguish in her Face,
> Flies through the Dome, (the maids her steps pursue)
> And mounts the walls, and sends around her view.
> Too soon her Eyes the killing Object found,
> The god-like Hector dragg'd along the ground.
> A sudden Darkness shades her swimming Eyes:
> She faints, she falls; her Breath, her colour flies. (Pope)
> Thus fury-like she went,
> Two women, as she will'd, at hand; and made her quick ascent
> Up to the tower and press of men, her spirit in uproar. Round
> She cast her greedy eye, and saw her Hector slain, and bound
> T'Achilles chariot, manlessly dragg'd to the Grecian fleet,
> Black night strook through her, under her trance took away her
> feet.
>
> (Chapman)

The eighteenth-century concept of the translator as painter or imitator with a moral duty both to his original subject and to his receiver was widespread, but underwent a series of significant changes as the search to codify and describe the processes of literary creation altered. Goethe (1749–1832) argued that every literature must pass through three phases of translation, although as the phases are recurrent all may be found taking place within the same language system at the same time. The first epoch 'acquaints us with foreign countries on our own terms', and Goethe cites Luther's German Bible as an example of this tendency. The second mode is that of appropriation through substitution and reproduction, where the translator absorbs the sense of a foreign work but reproduces it in his

own terms, and here Goethe cites Wieland and the French tradition of translating (a tradition much disparaged by German theorists). The third mode, which he considers the highest, is one which aims for perfect identity between the SL text and the TL text, and the achieving of this mode must be through the creation of a new 'manner' which fuses the uniqueness of the original with a new form and structure. Goethe cites the work of Voss, who translated Homer, as an example of a translator who had achieved this prized third level. Goethe is arguing for both a new concept of 'originality' in translation, together with a vision of universal deep structures that the translator should strive to meet. The problem with such an approach is that it is moving dangerously close to a theory of untranslatability.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, in 1791, Alexander Fraser Tytler published a volume entitled *The Principles of Translation,* the first systematic study in English of the translation processes.[23] Tytler set up three basic principles:

(1) The translation should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work.
(2) The style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
(3) The translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

Tytler reacts against Dryden's influence, maintaining that the concept of 'paraphrase' had led to exaggeratedly loose translations, although he agrees that part of the translator's duty is to clarify obscurities in the original, even where this entails omission or addition. He uses the standard eighteenth-century comparison of the translator/painter, but with a difference, arguing that the translator cannot use the same colours as the original, but is nevertheless required to give his picture 'the same force and effect'. The translator must strive to 'adopt the very soul of his author, which must speak through his own organs'.

Translation theory from Dryden to Tytler, then, is concerned with the problem of recreating an essential spirit, soul or nature of the work of art. But the earlier confident dichotomy between the formal

structure and the inherent soul becomes less easily determinable as writers gradually turned their attention towards a discussion of theories of Imagination, away from the former emphasis on the artist's moral role, and from what Coleridge described as 'painful copying' that 'would produce masks only, not forms breathing life'.[24]

ROMANTICISM

In his great standard work on European Romanticism, *Le romantisme dans la littérature européenne* (1948), Paul van Tieghem describes the movement as 'une crise de la conscience européenne'.[25] Although the crisis is intimated much earlier in the eighteenth century, the extent of the reaction against rationalism and formal harmony (the Neo-classical ideals), began to be clear in the last decade of the century, together with the ever-widening shock waves that followed the French Revolution of 1789. With the rejection of rationalism came a stress on the vitalist function of the imagination, on the individual poet's world-vision as both a metaphysical and a revolutionary ideal. With the affirmation of individualism came the notion of the freedom of the creative force, making the poet into a quasi-mystical creator, whose function was to produce the poetry that would create anew the universe, as Shelley argued in *The Defence of Poesy* (1820).

Goethe's distinctions between types of translation and stages in a hierarchy of aesthetic evaluation is indicative of a change in attitude to translation resulting from a revaluation of the role of poetry and creativity. In England, Coleridge (1772–1834) in his *Biographia Literaria* (1817) outlined his theory of the distinction between Fancy and Imagination, asserting that Imagination is the supreme creative and organic power, as opposed to the lifeless mechanism of Fancy. This theory has affinities with the theory of the opposition of mechanical and organic form outlined by the German theorist and translator, August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767–1845) in his *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur* (1809), translated into English in 1813. Both the English and German theories raise the question of how to define translation—as a creative or as a mechanical enterprise. In the Romantic debate on the

nature of translation the ambiguous attitude of a number of major writers and translators can be seen. A.W.Schlegel, asserting that all acts of speaking and writing are acts of translation because the nature of communication is to decode and interpret messages received, also insisted that the form of the original should be retained (for example, he retained Dante's *terza rima* in his own translations). Meanwhile, Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829) conceived of translation as a category of thought rather than as an activity connected only with language or literature.

The ideal of a great shaping spirit that transcends the everyday world and recreates the universe led to re-evaluation of the poet's role in time, and to an emphasis on the rediscovery of great individuals of the past who shared a common sense of creativity. The idea of writers at all times being involved in a process of repeating what Blake called 'the Divine Body in Every Man' resulted in a vast number of translations, such as the Schlegel-Tieck translations of Shakespeare (1797–1833), Schlegel's version and Cary's version of the *Divina Commedia* (1805–14) and the large intertraffic of translations of critical works and of contemporary writings across the European languages. Indeed, so many texts were translated at this time that were to have a seminal effect on the TL (e.g. German authors into English and vice versa, Scott and Byron into French and Italian, etc.) that critics have found it difficult to distinguish between influence study and translation study proper. Stress on the impact of the translation in the target culture in fact resulted in a shift of interest away from the actual processes of translation. Moreover, two conflicting tendencies can be determined in the early nineteenth century. One exalts translation as a category of thought, with the translator seen as a creative genius in his own right, in touch with the genius of his original and enriching the literature and language into which he is translating. The other sees translation in terms of the more mechanical function of 'making known' a text or author.

The pre-eminence of the Imagination as opposed to the Fancy leads implicitly to the assumption that translation must be inspired by the higher creative force if it is to become more than an activity of the everyday world with the loss of the original shaping spirit But

this raises another problem also: the problem of *meaning*. If poetry is perceived as a separate entity from language, how can it be translated unless it is assumed that the translator is able to read between the words of the original and hence reproduce the text-behind-the-text; what Mallarmé would later elaborate as the text of silence and spaces?

In his study of Shelley and translation Timothy Webb shows how the ambiguousness of the role of the translator is reflected in the poet's own writings. Quoting from Shelley's works and from Medwin, his biographer, Webb demonstrates that Shelley saw translation as an activity with a lower status, as a 'way of filling in the gaps between inspirations', and points out that Shelley appears to shift from translating works admired for their ideas to translating works admired for their literary graces. This shift is significant, for in a sense it follows Goethe's hierarchy of translating and it shows the problem that translation posed in the establishment of a Romantic aesthetic. Most important of all, with the shift of emphasis away from the formal processes of translation, the notion of untranslatability would lead on to the exaggerated emphasis on technical accuracy and resulting pedantry of later nineteenth-century translating. The assumption that meaning lies below and between language created an impasse for the translator. Only two ways led out of the predicament:

(1) the use of literal translation, concentrating on the immediate language of the message; or
(2) the use of an artificial language somewhere in between the SL text where the special feeling of the original may be conveyed through strangeness.

POST-ROMANTICISM

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) proposed the creation of a separate sub-language for use in translated literature only, while Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828–82) proclaimed the translator's subservience to the forms and language of the original. Both these proposals represent attempts to cope with the difficulties described so vividly by Shelley in *The Defence of Poesy* when he warned that:

It were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as to seek to transfuse from one language into another the creations of a poet. The plant must spring again from its seed, or it will bear no flower—and this is the burthen of the curse of Babel.[26]

Schleiermacher's theory of a separate translation language was shared by a number of nineteenth-century English translators, such as F.W. Newman, Carlyle and William Morris. Newman declared that the translator should retain every peculiarity of the original wherever possible, 'with the greater care the more foreign it may be',[27] while an explanation of the function of peculiarity can be found in G.A.Simcox's review of Morris' translation of *The Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs* (1870) when he declared that the 'quaint archaic English of the translation with just the right outlandish flavour' did much to 'disguise the inequalities and incompletenesses of the original',[28]

William Morris (1834–96) translated a large number of texts, including Norse sagas, Homer's *Odyssey,* Vergil's *Aeneid,* Old French romances, etc., and received considerable critical acclaim. Oscar Wilde wrote of Morris' *Odyssey* that it was 'a true work of art, a rendering not merely of language into language, but of poetry into poetry'. He noted, however, that the 'new spirit added in the transfusion' was more Norse than Greek, and this opinion is a good illustration of the expectations the nineteenth-century reader might have of a translation. Morris' translations are deliberately, consciously archaic, full of such peculiarities of language that they are difficult to read and often obscure. No concessions are made to the reader, who is expected to deal with the work on its own terms, meeting head-on, through the strangeness of the TL, the foreignness of the society that originally produced the text. The awkwardness of Morris' style can be seen in the following passage, taken from Book VI of the *Aeneid*:

What God, O Palinure, did snatch thee so away
From us thy friends and drown thee dead amidst the watery way?

Speak out! for Seer Apollo, found no guileful prophet erst,
By this one answer in my soul a lying hope hath nursed;
Who sang of thee safe from the deep and gaining field and fold
Of fair Ausonia: suchwise he his plighted word doth hold![29]

THE VICTORIANS

The need to convey the remoteness of the original in time and place is a recurrent concern of Victorian translators. Thomas Carlyle (1795– 1881), who used elaborate Germanic structures in his translations from the German, praised the profusion of German translations claiming that the Germans studied other nations 'in spirit which deserves to be oftener imitated' in order to be able to participate in 'whatever worth or beauty' another nation had produced.[30] Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828–82) in his Preface to his translations from Early Italian Poets (1861) declared similarly that 'The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty',[31] noting, however, that the originals were often obscure and imperfect.

What emerges from the Schleiermacher—Carlyle—Pre-Raphaelite concept of translation, therefore, is an interesting paradox. On the one hand there is an immense respect, verging on adulation, for the original, but that respect is based on the individual writer's sureness of its worth. In other words, the translator invites the intellectual, cultivated reader to share what he deems to be an enriching experience, either on moral or aesthetic grounds. Moreover, the original text is perceived as *property,* as an item of beauty to be added to a collection, with no concessions to the taste or expectations of contemporary life. On the other hand, by producing consciously archaic translations designed to be read by a minority, the translators implicitly reject the ideal of universal literacy. The intellectual reader represented a very small minority in the increasingly diffuse reading public that expanded throughout the century, and hence the foundations were laid for the notion of translation as a minority interest.

Matthew Arnold (1822–68) in his first lecture *On Translating Homer* advises the lay reader to put his trust in scholars, for they alone can say whether the translation produces more or less the same effect as the original and gives the following advice to the would-be translator:

> Let not the translator, then, trust to his notions of what the ancient Greeks would have thought of him; he will lose himself in the vague. Let him not trust to what the ordinary English reader thinks of him; he will be taking the blind for his guide. Let him not trust to his own judgement of his own work; he may be misled by individual caprices. Let him ask how his work affects those who both know Greek and can appreciate poetry .[32]

The translator must focus on the SL text primarily, according to Arnold, and must serve that text with complete commitment. The TL reader must be brought to the SL text through the means of the translation, a position that is the opposite of the one expressed by Erasmus when discussing the need for accessibility of the SL text. And with the hardening of nationalistic lines and the growth of pride in a national culture, French, English or German translators, for example, no longer saw translation as a prime means of enriching their own culture. The élitist concept of culture and education embodied in this attitude was, ironically, to assist in the devaluation of translation. For if translation were perceived as an instrument, as a means of bringing the TL reader to the SL text *in the original,* then clearly excellence of style and the translator's own ability to write were of less importance. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807–81) added another dimension to the question of the role of the translator, one which restricted the translator's function even more than Arnold's dictum. Discussing his translation of Dante's *Divina Commedia,* and defending his decision to translate into blank verse, Longfellow declared:

> The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it

> rhythmic, I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a
> prose translation…. In translating Dante, something must be
> relinquished. Shall it be the beautiful rhyme that blossoms all
> along the line like a honeysuckle on the hedge? It must be, in
> order to retain something more precious than rhyme, namely,
> fidelity, truth, —the life of the hedge itself…. The business of
> a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain
> what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an
> author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the
> translator.[33]

Longfellow's extraordinary views on translation take the literalist
position to extremes. For him, the rhyme is mere trimming, the
floral border on the hedge, and is distinct from the life or truth of the
poem itself. The translator is relegated to the position of a technician,
neither poet nor commentator, with a clearly defined but severely
limited task.

In complete contrast to Longfellow's view, Edward Fitzgerald
(1809–63), who is best known for his version of *The Rubaiyat of
Omar Khayyam* (1858), declared that a text must live at all costs
'with a transfusion of one's own worst Life if one can't retain the
Original's better'. It was Fitzgerald who made the famous remark
that it were better to have a live sparrow than a stuffed eagle. In other
words, far from attempting to lead the TL reader to the SL original,
Fitzgerald's work seeks to bring a version of the SL text into the TL
culture as *a living entity,* though his somewhat extreme views on the
lowliness of the SL text, quoted in the Introduction (p. 11), indicate
a patronizing attitude that demonstrates another form of élitism. The
Romantic individualist line led on, in translators like Fitzgerald, to
what Eugene Nida describes as a 'spirit of exclusivism', where the
translator appears as a skilful merchant offering exotic wares to the
discerning few.

The main currents of translation typology in the great age of
industrial capitalism and colonial expansion up to the First World War
can loosely be classified as follows:

 (1) Translation as a scholar's activity, where the pre-eminence of
      the SL text is assumed *de facto* over any TL version.

(2) Translation as a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the SL original.

(3) Translation as a means of helping the TL reader become the equal of what Schleiermacher called the better reader of the original, through a deliberately contrived foreignness in the TL text.

(4) Translation as a means whereby the individual translator who sees himself like Aladdin in the enchanted vaults (Rossetti's imaginative image) offers his own pragmatic choice to the TL reader.

(5) Translation as a means through which the translator seeks to upgrade the status of the SL text because it is perceived as being on a lower cultural level.

From these five categories, it can be seen that types (1) and (2) would tend to produce very literal, perhaps pedantic translations, accessible to a learned minority, whilst types (4) and (5) could lead to much freer translations that might alter the SL text completely in the individual translator's eclectic process of treating the original. The third category, perhaps the most interesting and typical of all, would tend to produce translations full of archaisms of form and language, and it is this method that was so strongly attacked by Arnold when he coined the verb *to newmanize,* after F.W.Newman, a leading exponent of this type of translation.

ARCHAIZING

J.M.Cohen feels that the theory of Victorian translation was founded on 'a fundamental error' (i.e. that of conveying remoteness of time and place through the use of a mock antique language),[34] and the pedantry and archaizing of many translators can only have contributed to setting translation apart from other literary activities and to its steady decline in status. Fitzgerald's method of translation, in which the SL text was perceived as the rough clay from which the TL product was moulded, certainly enjoyed great popular success, but it is significant that a debate arose around whether to define his work as a translation or as something else (adaptation, version, etc.) which is indicative of the existence of a general view of what a

translation ought to be. But although archaizing has gone out of fashion, it is important to remember that there were sound theoretical principles for its adoption by translators. George Steiner raises important issues when he discusses the practice, with particular reference to Emile Littré's theory and his *L'Enfer mis en vieux longage François* (1879) and to Rudolf Borchardt and his *Dante Deutsch*:

> The proposition 'the foreign poet would have produced such and such a text had he been writing in my language' is a projective fabrication. It underwrites the autonomy, more exactly, the 'meta-autonomy' of the translation. But it does much more: it introduces an alternate existence, a 'might have been' or 'is yet to come' into the substance and historical condition of one's own language, literature and legacy of sensibility.[35]

The archaizing principle, then, in an age of social change on an unprecedented scale, can be compared to an attempt to 'colonize' the past. As Borchardt put it, declaring that the translation should restore something to the original: 'The circle of the historical exchange of forms between nations closes in that Germany returns to the foreign object what it has learnt from it and freely improved upon.'[36] The distance between this version of translation and the vision of Cicero and Horace, also the products of an expanding state, could hardly be greater.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

It is always a problem, in attempting to compress a vast amount of material into a short space, to decide on a cut-off point at which to bring the discussion to a close. George Steiner ends his second period of translation history in 1946, with Valery Larbaud's fascinating but unsystematic work *Sous I'invocation de Saint Jerome,* whilst Cohen's study of English translators and translations tails off rather lamely with occasional references to some of the practical translation work of Robert Graves and C.Day Lewis, and so brings the reader sketchily into the 1950s. Much of the discussion in

English on translation in theory and practice in the first half of the twentieth century notes the continuation of many of the Victorian concepts of translation—literalness, archaizing, pedantry and the production of a text of second-rate literary merit for an élite minority. But it then returns continually to the problem of evaluation *without a solid theoretical base from which to begin such an investigation*. The increased isolationism of British and American intellectual life, combined with the anti-theoretical developments in literary criticism did not help to further the scientific examination of translation in English. Indeed, it is hard to believe, when considering some of the studies in English, that they were written in the same age that saw the rise of Czech Structuralism and the New Critics, the development of communication theory, the application of linguistics to the study of translation: in short, to the establishment of the bases from which recent work in translation theory has been able to proceed.

The progress of the development of Translation Studies has been discussed in the earlier parts of this book, and the steady growth of valuable works on translation in English since the late 1950s has been noted. But it would be wrong to see the first half of the twentieth century as the Waste Land of English translation theory, with here and there the fortresses of great individual translators approaching the issues pragmatically. The work of Ezra Pound is of immense importance in the history of translation, and Pound's skill as a translator was matched by his perceptiveness as critic and theorist. Hilaire Belloc's Taylorian lecture *On Translation,* given in 1931, is a brief but highly intelligent and systematic approach to the practical problems of translating and to the whole question of the status of the translated text. James McFarlane's article 'Modes of Translation' (1953) raised the level of the discussion of translation in English, and has been described as 'the first publication in the West to deal with translation and translations from a modern, interdisciplinary view and to set out a program of research for scholars concerned with them as an object of study'.[37]

From this brief outline, it can clearly be seen that different concepts of translation prevail at different times, and that the function and role of the translator has radically altered. The explanation of such

shifts is the province of cultural history, but the effect of changing concepts of translation on the process of translating itself will occupy researchers for a long time to come. George Steiner, taking a rather idiosyncratic view of translation history, feels that although there is a profusion of pragmatic accounts by individuals the range of theoretic ideas remains small:

> List Saint Jerome, Luther, Dryden, Hölderlin, Novalis, Schleiermacher, Nietzsche, Ezra Pound, Valéry, MacKenna, Franz Rosenzweig, Walter Benjamin, Quine—and you have very nearly the sum total of those who have said anything fundamental or new about translation.[38]

But Steiner's description of the translator as a shadowy presence, like Larbaud's description of the translator as a beggar at the church door, is essentially a post-Romantic view, and has far more to do with notions of hierarchy in the chain of communication between author, text, reader and translator than with any intrinsic aspect of the process of translation itself. Timothy Webb's study of Shelley as translator, for example, documents the growing split between types of literary activity, and shows how a hierarchy could exist within the work of a single author in early nineteenth-century England. For the attitudes towards translation and the concepts of translation that prevail, belong to the age that produces them, and to the socio-economic factors that shape and determine that age. Maria Corti has shown how through the nineteenth century, due to the wider distribution of the printed book, the author could no longer see his public so clearly, either because it was potentially so vast or because it cut across classes and social groups. For the translator this problem of impaired vision was all the more acute.[39]

The history of Translation Studies should therefore be seen as an essential field of study for the contemporary theorist, but should not be approached from a narrowly fixed position. Gadda's definition of system can most aptly be applied to the diachronics of Translation Studies and serves as an illustration of the size and complexity of the work that has barely been begun:

We therefore think of every system as an infinite entwining, an inextricable knot or mesh of relations: the summit can be seen from many altitudes; and every system is referable to infinite coordinated axes: it presents itself in infinite ways.[40]