The Traditional Approach to Principles of Translation A Theoretical Deadlock or a Practical Wedlock?

Dr. Yaser Ibrahim[*]

◻ ABSTRACT ◻

Traditionalists, among translation theoreticians, have established the foundations of a systematic handling of the rendition process. Their contribution is best described as normative since they pursue the nuances of the SL text, express their obedience towards it, and work hard to retain the *idea*, *style* and all other components, which conform the *ease*, of the original SL text. This piece of research attempts to disclose the implications of the proposed traditional stream towards *principles of translation*. The point of focus turns to be whether traditionalists' *laws of translation* have come up with a practical wedlock out of the theoretical deadlock since they basically depended on the religious and scientific text-types as a foundation stone for their work, from which they applied them to other text-types. Finally, it endeavours to create a concrete configuration of these *traditional laws* that will serve as a beneficial basis for later researchers to further extend their hypotheses on *principles of translation* thus helping translators to provide a solution even to the most daunting among dilemmas.

Keywords: Principles of Translation, Translating Drama, Translating poetry, Translating Prose, Translating Religious Text, Translator's Liberty and Constraint, and Traditional Approach.

[*]**Assistant Professor in the Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities; Tishreen University; Lattakia, Syria.**

الطّرح التقليدي لمبادئ الترجمة
فشل نظري أم نجاح عملي؟

الدكتور ياسر إبراهيم*

□ الملخّص □

لقد أسّس الباحثون التقليديون، من بين الباحثين في مجال التّرجمة، اللّبنات الأولى للتّعامل الموضوعي مع عملية التّرجمة. إذ إنّ أفضل ما يمكن وصف إسهاماتهم في هذا المجال بالمعياريّ، لأنّهم يقتفون دقائق مكونات النّص الأصلي في لغة الأصل، ويعبّرون عن خضوعهم له، ويسعون جاهدين للحفاظ على الفكرة، والأسلوب إلى جانب المكونات الأخرى جميعها، والتي تشكّل النّص الأصلي في لغة الأصل ويحاول هذا البحث بيان مضامين الاتجاه التقليدي المطروحة بما يخصّ مبادئ الترجمة. بيد أن جوهر المسألة هو فيما إذا خلُصت مبادئ التّرجمة إلى نجاحٍ عمليٍّ واستفادت من واقعها النّظري؛ ذلك لأنّها اعتمدت النّص الدّيني والعلميّ بشكلٍ مبدئي، ومن ثمّ تمّ تطبيقها على أنواع النّصوص الأخرى. وخلاصة القول، إنّ هذا البحث يهدف إلى خلق تجسيدٍ ملموسٍ لمبادئ التّرجمة التّقليدية، من شأنه أن يشكّل إحدى القواعد المفيدة لعمل الباحثين ممّن يتوخّون الاستزادة في الطّروحات التي تتمحور حول مبادئ التّرجمة أملاً في أن تضمن المساعدة لدى جمهور المترجمين في تقديم حلّ حتى لأكثر المسائل صعوبةً في الترجمة.

كلمـات مفتاحيـة: مبادئ الترجمة، ترجمة المسرح، ترجمة الشعر، ترجمة النثر، ترجمة النّص الدّيني، حرّية المترجم وتقييده، والطّرح التقليدي.

* مدرَّس في قسم اللغة الإنكليزية بكلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية؛ جامعة تشرين؛ اللاذقية؛ سورية.

1.   Introduction: the Scope of the Study:

Principles of Translation (PoT) have always been, and still are, a key issue in the field of translation studies owing to the significant role they play in every translation process. Translation theoreticians have also tried hard to establish them under many names, such as *laws*, *rules*, *basics*, or *principles* of translation. Approaches to principles of translation can be subclassified into two extremes. On the one hand, the first subclassification casts light on the *equivalence-based* theories of translation. It discloses apparent *servitude* of the TL (Target Language) text to the SL (Source Language) text. On the other hand, the second subclassification casts light on the *functional* theories of translation. It reveals its insistence on the *liberty* of the TL text from its servitude to the SL text. However, the former is given the nomenclature of the traditional approach, whereas the latter the nomenclature of the modern approach. This paper attempts to discuss the significance of former approach leaving the latter approach to further separate research.

There are some important issues that contribute to the understanding of the principles of translation: First, translation theoreticians try to define translation and distinguish between *good* and *bad translation*. Eugene A. Nida (1975: 33) defines *translating* by stating, "Translating consists in producing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence to the message of the source language, first in meaning and second in style". Nida's definition does not seem to differ from Alexander Fraser Tytler's (1813: 15-16)**1.** definition of a good translation as that "in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language, as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work"**2**. Second, the question of *fidelity* remains central to the process of translating. When translating, translators become divided between remaining faithful/obedient to the SL text and causing diminution/ betrayal to the SL text **3**. Third, there is still no consensus on *whether or not translation is a science, an art, a skill, or a process*. Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber (1969: vii) propose, "Translating is far more than a science. It is also a skill, and in the ultimate analysis fully satisfactory translation is always an art". Viewing translation as a political act and seeing it as culture bound arguing, Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (1996: 2) state, "Cultural hegemony plays an important role". On the other hand, Ernst-August Gutt (2000: 9), quoting George Steiner (1975) and Peter Newmark (1988), considers translation as neither a theory nor a science, but a process.

2.   Essentiality of Conducting This Research

It is important to research the traditional approach to principles of translation because: firstly, from a theoretical point of view, it comprises one essential cornerstone to the work of later researchers in this field. Secondly, from a practical point of view, it helps the translators to prescribe the mechanisms they implement throughout their translations. This implies debating the following two points:

Unity in Diversity:
Savory (1968: 49) claims that:
A statement of the principles of translation in succinct form is impossible, and that a statement in any form is more difficult than might be imagined; and further that this difficulty has arisen from the writings of the translators themselves. The truth is that there

are no universally accepted principles of translation, because the only people who are qualified to formulate them have never agreed among themselves…

It seems there are significant reasons behind the impossibility of the succinct form of the principles of translation. One main reason is that total equivalence is often impossible. Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 22) advocates, "There is ordinarily no full equivalence through translation". Bell (1993: 6) also promulgates, "it is apparent, and has been for a very long time indeed, that the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera". Another main reason is that during the transplanting of the original ideas many things happen, as expressed by Nida (1975: 27) who stresses that "all types of translation involve (1) loss of information, (2) addition of information, and/or (3) skewing of information"**4**. Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 30) supports this idea in stating "once the principle is accepted that sameness cannot exist between two languages, it becomes possible to approach the question of *loss and gain* in the translation process".

Constraints Vs Liberty:

Another dichotomy appears to be crucially pertinent to the formulation of the principles of translation, the constituents of which are *constraints* and *liberty*. The constraints, on the one hand, are manifold, as illustrated by Alvarez and Vidal (1996: 6) who state:

Translators are constrained in many ways: by their own ideology; by their feelings of superiority or inferiority towards the language in which they are writing the text being translated; by the prevailing poetical rules at that time; by the very language in which the texts they are translating is written; by what the dominant institutions and ideology expect of them; by the public for whom the translation is intended. The translation itself will depend upon all of these factors.

On the other hand, the translators' main concern is to free themselves from these troublesome constraints. This may involve the use of different mechanisms such as the amplification of the SL text or the retrenchment of the TL text, or to insist on using the embellishments of some literary genres as to have freedom in poetical translation, etc.

The choice of focusing or finding *formal* equivalents and *functional* equivalents goes back to the Classical times - Cicero 46 BC, according to Roger T. Bell (1993: 7) who designates the former as translating word-for-word (literal translation) and the latter as meaning-for-meaning (free translation). He (ibid) proposes:

Pick the first and the translator is criticized for the 'ugliness' of a 'faithful' translation; pick the second and there is criticism of the 'inaccuracy' of a 'beautiful' translation. Either way it seems, the translator cannot win, even though we recognize that the crucial variable is the *purpose* for which the translation is being made, not some inherent characteristic of the text itself.

Bell's, among many translation theoreticians, recognition of the inability of the translators to win or overcome the problems of translation, is not to suggest they should give up trying to resolve them in every possible way. This has also been the case for other scholars who have similarly recognized the moments of hardship for translators to resolve the obstacles of translating. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1993: 15), for example, realise, "since total re-creation of any language transaction is impossible, translators will always be subject to a conflict of interests as to what are their communicative priorities, a conflict which they resolve as best they can".

3.   The Traditional Approach: Major Theoretical Propositions:

The *traditional approach* includes those endeavours of translation theoreticians who consider *equivalence* their key point upon promulgating their packages of principles of translation. They start and end their translation process considering one global aspiration: achieving as close *equivalence* as possible with the SL text, and as such, keeping faithful to the thematic and schematic aspects of the SL text. The traditional approach, however, debates the *pre-Tytlerean approach*, *Tytler's principles* as the first recorded contribution to the principles of translation, and *post-Tytlerean approach* which will cover different eras spanning from Savory (1968) to the contributions made in the second half of the twentieth century.

Pre-Tytlerean Approach:

The dominant feature of the pre-Tytlerean approach is *literality* or *word-for-word translation* in which translators reveal an apparent servitude to the SL text. Even though proponents of this approach may declare their tendency to keep far from the word-for-word translation, they do still manoeuvre over some methods in which they finally get trapped. This is not to mention their constant efforts to centripetally move towards the essence of the SL text. Considering the pre-Tytlerean approach, we shall discuss the principles of translation with regard to the techniques that had been followed by Cicero **5**, St. Jerome **6** and Boethius **7**, and Dolet.

Cicero, St. Jerome and Boethius

Cicero, according to Louis G. Kelly (2000: 496), formulates two basic principles of translation. Kelly (ibid) states, "Cicero makes two major points: that word-for-word translation is not suitable; and that translators should seek in their own language expressions that reproduce as much as possible the cogency of the original". Accordingly, the two Ciceronian norms can be systematically formulated as:

1. That word-for-word translation is not suitable

2. That translators should seek in their own language expressions that reproduce as much as possible the cogency of the original.

Scrutinising these two norms, we notice that in the first norm Cicero calls for free translation, which presumably should not follow the formal nuances of the original text. However, in the second norm, Cicero expresses his complete support for the literal translation, through seeking expressions in the TL, that reproduce as much as possible the strength of the SL text. What Cicero tends to achieve is an equivalent text that can be formally reduced to linguistic correspondence. He does not actually exceed the confines of the linguistic signs. The thing that is not supposed to make us disillusioned by his protest orientated against the word-for-word translation.

St. Jerome and Boethius worked on philosophical and religious texts. Because their main concern was truth, they adopted the literal translation; fearing that any change or modification of the SL text, irrespective of how small it may appear, would disfigure the faithfulness of the semantic message in the TL text. Thus, they were after *word-for-word* or *sense-for-sense* translation. Kelly (2000: 497) comments, "Boethius is notable for his uncompromising espousal of literality", and realises that "literal translation was generally seen as the way to truth" when examining the translations of St. Jerome, mainly his translation of the Bible.

In the Middle Ages (fifth to fifteenth centuries), Kelly (ibid) argues, "literal translation was generally seen as the way to truth". This is most probably due to the continuing and pervasive religious thoughts that dominated life at that time. Translations had been exclusively from Latin as the source language. Towards the Renaissance (fourteenth to sixteenth centuries), Kelly (ibid) continues the argument, "Renaissance translation theory followed Ciceronian norms". However, Renaissance differs from the previous eras in that it was a time of rethinking rather than a time of exploring the old civilizations. Therefore, having the Ciceronian norms in mind, the principles of translation during the Renaissance take the shape of literal translation, though not preferring (or preferring not to announce) the word-for-word mechanisms, but adopting the strategies of imitating the SL original text in every possible way.

In *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, Mona Baker (2000) briefly discusses the Arabic tradition **8**, and sketchily highlights translation in the Islamic Empire, which she sees as unprecedented due to the following three factors: range of source languages, range of topics and subjects, and most importantly:

The translation movement which evolved under Islamic rule was organized and institutionalised. Translation was sponsored and supported by the government, and specific institutions, or translation chambers, were set up to initiate and regulate the flow of translations. The first such translation chamber was set up by al-Mansur, the second Abbasid caliph (754-775) and expanded considerably by al-Rashid (786-809) and al-Ma'mun (813-33).

Two methods of translation had been adopted in the Abbasid era, as noticed by Baker (ibid):

The first method was highly literal and consisted of translating each Greek word with an equivalent Arabic word, and where none existed, borrowing the Greek word into Arabic.

The second method consisted of translating sense-for-sense, creating fluent target language texts which conveyed the meaning of the original without distorting the target language.

As adopted by the Abbasid translators, these two methods, next to employing the strategy of commenting on the SL text, resemble the principles of translation that are previously adopted by Cicero and St. Jerome, that is, word-for-word and sense-for-sense translations.

Dolet:

Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 54) mentions the French humanist Etienne Dolet (1509-46) who in 1540 published a short outline of translation principles, entitled *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (How to Translate from one Language into Another) and established the following principles of translation:

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 can be analysed in terms of two orientations: thematic and systematic. The thematic perspective is manifested in the first two principles in which Dolet stresses the full understanding of the sense and meaning as intended by the original author, and a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL. The three remaining principles concentrate on the systematic perspective in which Dolet draws on some important stylistic features on the formal level, such as avoiding the word-for-word transference, and choosing and ordering words appropriately so that the correct output is attained.

Dolet's views were recapitulated, according to Bassnett-McGuire (ibid: 54-55), by George Chapman (1559-1634) who is considered one of the great translators of Homer. In the *Epistle to the Reader* of his translation of *The Iliad*, Chapman propounds 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.

Chapman's first principle is a repetition of Dolet's third principle; the second re-echoes Dolet's first two principles, and the third re-expresses Dolet's last two principles, which focus on formal and stylistic procedures. In other words, this reshaping of the antecedent principles fails to get out of the limits surrounding the essence of the SL text per se.

Prior to Tytler's principles of translation, and according to Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 60), John Dryden (1631-1700) tackled the problems of translation by introducing three basic types (in his important Preface to Ovid's Epistles 1680):

1.*Metaphrase*, or turning an author word-by-word, and line-by-line, from one language into another;

2.*Paraphrase*, or translation with attitude, 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 three types, Bassnett-McGuire (ibid) argues, Dryden chooses the second "as the more balanced path". Being a poet, Dryden believes that to translate poetry, "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". Again, it may trigger the argument over whether or not these three types proposed by Dryden are mere types, and not principles. In practice, when the translator chooses to adopt one of these extremes, then he is systematically applying strategies or techniques that belong to these types. Later in this paper, we shall explore the principles of translating poetry and see whether they match up with these introduced by Dryden.

Tytler's Approach:

Tytler's (1813: 16) proposes (see endnote **1**):

I.   A translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work

II.   The style and manner of writing in a translation should be of the same character with that of the original

III.   A translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

These were the principles of translation that first appeared in 1791 in Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. It was the first time in the history of translation studies that they were formulated exclusively as the *laws* governing the process of translating. Translation theoreticians admit its essential role in shaping the translation theory since that time. Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 63) realizes, "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". Bell (1993: 11) argues, "it is no exaggeration to say that the programme followed by most translation theorists… has been and still is, dominated by the thinking put forward in an essay written two centuries ago in 1791". Hatim and Mason (1993: 15-6) also consider Tytler's (1791) Essay to be "the first whole book in English devoted to translation studies".

In every translation principle that Tytler formulates, there is a clear evidence of servitude to the SL text as he frequently uses the expressions *should, give, be, have* and *the original work/composition*. The first translation principle calls for retaining the semantic message of the SL text intact; that is, to be completely faithful to the meaning of the original. The second principle stresses the assimilation of the style and manner of the SL text. Tytler (ibid: 109) admits this cannot always be achieved and gives examples of failure in this particular respect when "The grave exchanged for the formal; -The elevated for the bombast; -The lively for the petulant; -The simple for the childish". The third principle carries extreme difficulty in observing and achieving its entailment because, as Tytler (ibid: 211) explains, the translator "uses not the same colours with the original, but is required to give his picture the same force and effect". He (ibid: 214) adds, "It is extremely difficult to attain this delicate medium in a translation: because the writer has neither a freedom of choice in the sentiments, nor in the mode of expressing them". The translator is thus allowed to add or retrench the ideas of the original, especially in poetical translation, with the greatest caution.

Accordingly, Tytler's rules set the foundations for the later specialised study of translation. Commenting on the nature of these rules, Bell (1993: 11) states, "they are all, it will be recognized, normative prescriptions deriving directly from the subjective and evaluative description of the 'good translation' [see the introduction above, and endnote **2**, for the definition of *good translation*]. That is, they are normative regulatory type of rules in the sense that they regulate an already existing activity as opposite to definitive ones, which tell us about no existing rules. In brief, the normative approach of do's and don'ts has impoverished translation, probably because it stagnates the urge to widen the scope of the theory of translation. Hatim and Mason (1993: 15-16) criticize Tytler's laws of translation, "the trouble with 'laws' such as these is that they imply that the three objectives are entirely compatible and achievable; whereas, if matter and manner are indeed separable entities, then **I**, **II** and **III** are, at least in part, mutually exclusive".

One major deficiency of Tytler's principles is their negligence of the TL audience, among other different areas, as largely contrasted to the modern approach. This is probably because Tytler's essay is one of the eighteenth-century theories of aesthetics that adopt simplification and generalization. Huntsman, in the introduction of the third edition of Tytler's essay (1813: XLVI) observes, "Tytler's intention, in contrast, was to help his readers form individual judgements by providing a set of criteria derived from previous, good translations, not to make an ultimate statement about immutable truth". Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 63) sees, "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".

Post Tytlerean Approach:
Savory's Contrasting Pairs:

Earlier in this paper, we have mentioned that Savory (1968: 49) believes in the impossibility of formulating a statement of the principles of translation in a succinct form because, he claims, "the truth is that there are no universally accepted principles of translation, because the only people who are qualified to formulate them have never agreed among themselves, but have so often and for so long contradicted each other". However, using the three grades of instructing *must*, *should* and *may*, Savory (1968: 50) puts forward a set of principles of translation in the form of contrasting pairs, as follows:

1. A translation must give the words of the original.
2. A translation must give the ideas of the original.
3. A translation should read like an original work.
4. A translation should read like a translation.
5. A translation should reflect the style of the original.
6. A translation should possess the style of the translator.
7. A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
8. A translation should read as a contemporary of the translator.
9. A translation may add to or omit from the original.
10. A translation may never add to or omit from the original.
11. A translation of verse should be in prose.
12. A translation of verse should be in verse.

The first contrastive pair reveals the distinction between the *literal translation* and the *free translation*. Principle (2) should be adopted because to keep faithful to the SL text does not mean a literal or word-for-word translation, which is, Savory (ibid: 51) comments, "the most primitive type of translating". In the second pair of principles, principle (3) should be adopted, because common sense, according to Savory (ibid: 53), suggests that "the original reads like an original: hence a translation of it should do so too". In the third pair of principles, principle (5) should be adopted because style is an essential characteristic of every piece of writing, and because it determines the author's choice of words and phrases of the SL text, it affects its accuracy. Some translation theoreticians express the degree of difficulty of adopting the style of the original. For example, Nida and Taber (1969: 13) find out that "it is usually quite impossible to represent some of the stylistic subtleties of the original". The three remaining pairs of Savory's contrastive principles contribute to (what Tytler called) the ease of the original SL text. The translator is supposed to handle them cautiously: he should keep the spirit of SL text, he may add or omit from the SL text, and he provides a choice of whether or not to render verse as either verse or prose. Savory (ibid: 75) claims that "adequate translation of a poem is impossible", due to the involvement of the elements of illusion, rhythm, emotion, etc. Jakobson (1966: 236) expresses the same point of view on the translation of poetry; he proclaims, "Poetry by definition is untranslatable. Only creative transposition is possible".

Comparing Savory's principles to Tytler's holistic approach, we find that both concentrate on preserving the idea of the original text, the style of the original text, and all the ease of the original text. However, Savory (ibid: 58) concludes his argument of the principles by distinguishing four groups of TL readers. The first is the reader who knows nothing at all of the original language, but reads either from curiosity or from a genuine interest in its literature. The second is the student, who is learning the language of the original, and does so in part by reading its literature with the help of a translation. The third

is the reader who knew the language in the past, but who, because of other duties and occupations, has now forgotten almost the whole of his early knowledge. The fourth is the scholar who knows it still. This dictates different degrees of apprehension for different levels of readership. In brief, Savory (ibid) advocates, "The same translation cannot be equally suited to them all".

Scrutinizing Savory's principles, and realizing that they are incomplete in themselves, Gutt (2000: 127) comments, "What Savory does not bring out is that the link between different translations lies in the principle of relevance". However, the *principle of relevance* illustrates the relationship between the text, the context of the text, the situations in which this text has been structured, and any other relevant parameter that may contribute to the understanding of this text. He justifies his criticism to Savory by claiming, "in fact, I tried to show that the principles, rules and guidelines of translation are applications of the principle of relevance…". However, Gutt defends his contribution to translation theory through applying the theory of relevance to translation field because he (ibid: 26) believes that "the principle of relevance, however, accounts for rules and exceptions alike". Needles to say that the principle of relevance falls within the domain of the modern approach to the principles of translation, that as mentioned above, will be discussed separately in further research.

Other Traditionalist Contributors to Principles of Translation

The following contributions to the principles of translation are categorized under the traditional approach because they display features that are comparable to those previously highlighted by traditionalists. They either stress the word-for-word or sense-for-sense models of rendition, or in the whole, they keep praising the processes that trace the components of the SL text. These include: the *Catford's thesis*, *Andre Lefevere's strategies*, *Hilaire Belloc's general rules for the translating of prose texts*, *Ambrose Phillip's principal criteria for translating drama*, and finally the *principles of Bible translation*.

Catford's Thesis:

Although J. C. Catford claims that "the theory of translation is essentially a theory of applied linguistics", he does not seem to have intended to delineate what other translation theoreticians have done, that is, formulating a set of principles of translation. Only in two places in his *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, he defines what *a translation rule* is, and what *transliteration rules* are. First, he (1965: 31) defines *a translation rule* as "an exploitation of the probability values of textual translation equivalences. Such a rule is a statement of highest unconditioned probability equivalence, supplemented by highest conditioned probability equivalences, with an indication of the conditioning factors". It appears that Catford's definition is based on the probabilities and highest conditions, which means it cannot be relied on as a fixed basis to pursue.

Second, in *transliteration*, Catford (1965: 66) expounds, "SL graphological units are replaced by TL graphological units; but these are not translation equivalents". He defines *the transliteration rules* as those which "specify transliteration-equivalents which differ from translation equivalents in two ways: first, in not necessarily being relatable to the same graphic substance as the SL letters; secondly, in being … in *one-to-one* correspondence with SL letters or other units"**9**. Catford's apparent advocacy of transliteration illustrates his position as staunchly obedient to the linguistic constituents and properties of the SL text; and this does lead us to consider him a traditionalist.

As far as the linguistic equivalence is concerned, Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 22) proposes five procedures to give an English equivalence to the phrase *good appetite* in French. She offers many English equivalents such as: the colloquial *Dig in* or *Tuck in*, the more formal *Do start*, or even the ritualistically apologetic *I hope you like it*, or *I hope it's alright*. She did not call these procedures translation principles[11].

Andre Lefevere's Strategies for Poetry Translation:

Andre Lefevere (1975), according to Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 81-82), catalogues seven different strategies for translating poetry. They include:

1.*Phonemic translation*
2.*Literal translation*
3.*Metrical translation*
4.*Poetry into prose*
5.*Rhymed translation*
6.*Blank verse translation*
7.*Interpretation*

So far, we have become aware of the implications of some of these strategies, mainly strategy (2), which emphasizes word-for-word translation (as we have seen with St. Jerome and Boethius for example), and strategy (4), which has been earlier mentioned by Savory as a contrasting pair of principles. In either of these strategies, there is a resulting distortion of the sense, communicative value and syntax of the SL text. However, strategy (1), according to Lefevere, attempts to reproduce the SL sound in the TL while at the same time producing an acceptable paraphrase of the sense. Strategy (3) concentrates on one aspect, which is the reproduction of the SL metre. Strategy (5) suggests that the translator aims at achieving two goals at the same time: metre and rhyme. Strategy (6) imposes some restrictions on the translator for choosing a particular structure, and this results in noticeable literalness. Finally, strategy (7) involves the change of the form of the SL text whilst retaining its contents. However, this last strategy seems to be a kind of free translation of the SL text.

All these seven strategies reveal some kind of deficiency, which will spoil the outcome of the translation process, as has been noticed by Lefevere himself. Commenting on these strategies, Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 82) realises that "the translator has focused on some elements at the expense of others and from this failure to consider the poem as an organic structure comes a translation that is demonstrably unbalanced". If we compare these strategies to those of Dryden, as mentioned under **1.1.2.** above, we find that Dryden chooses *paraphrase* as the most suitable strategy for achieving a balanced TL poem, through adopting the Ciceronian principle of sense-for-sense translation that opposes the word-for-word strategy. Moreover, the best way to translate a poem is, most likely, to have it translated by a poet who has a command of the mechanisms of translation; and Dryden was a supporter of this view.

Hilaire Belloc's General Rules for the Translation of Prose Texts:

Hilaire Belloc (1931), according to Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 116-117), proposes six general rules for the translator of prose texts. They are:

1.The translator should not 'plod on' word-by-word or sentence-by-sentence, but should 'always "block out" his word'.

2.The translator should render *idiom-by-idiom* 'and idioms of their nature demand translation into another form from that of the original'.

3.The translator must render 'intention by intention', bearing in mind that 'the intention of a phrase in one language may be less emphatic than the form of the phrase, or it may be more emphatic'.

4.Belloc warns against *les faux amis*, those words or structures that may appear to correspond in both SL and TL but actually do not.

5.The translator is advised to 'transmute boldly' and Belloc suggests that the essence of translating is 'the resurrection of an alien thing in a native body'.

6.The translator should never embellish.

By discarding the literal translation, i.e. word-by-word or sentence-by-sentence, Belloc stresses other translation mechanisms such as *idiom-by-idiom*, and *intention-by-intention*, which demands special skill in providing TL equivalents. This is so because, on the one hand, translating an idiom is not based on the translation of its individual formal constituents. On the other hand, Belloc brings about a new way of thinking towards the strategies of translation by introducing the intention-by-intention rendition, in which the SL phrase may be more emphatic or less emphatic than the TL phrase. This depends on the context of the text. By *intention*, however, Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 116) explains, "Belloc seems to be talking about the weight a given expression may have in a particular context in the SL that would be disproportionate if translated literally into the TL". The role of 'intention' in the process of translating can be further highlighted and understood from the modern approach point of view.

Other translation principles Belloc introduces, like principles (4), (5), and (6), are style-oriented; most interesting of which is Belloc's warning, "should never embellish". Embellishment necessitates adding more information to the details of the SL in the TL text which may be interesting but not necessary. This would not only influence the thematic perspective of the SL text, but also its structure. Because a novel is different from other literary works, as being divided into chapters, the translator should bear in mind the scale of expanding (and/or contracting) the phrases and sentences of the original text.

Ambrose Phillip's Principal Criteria for Translating Drama:

The translation of dramatic texts is unequivocally different from the translation of other kinds of texts, in the sense that a written dramatic text is incomplete per se. It becomes complete when it is performed. The implication here is that there are other paralinguistic factors that contribute to the overall understanding of the dramatic text. The translator, in this case, encounters one complex problem: how to translate the dramatic text? Would he translate it as a written text, or as a performed text? In either case, the process of rendition will involve a kind of free translation, which will tend to make clear in the TL text those aspects that a written text lacks.

According to Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 125-126), Ambrose Phillips' principal criteria for translation (who lived in the eighteenth century) appears to have been:

1.Playability;

2.The relationship of the play to the established conventions of the theatre of his day (a theatre which restructured Shakespeare in the interests of canons and of decorum and good taste);

3.Clarity of the interrelationship between the characters.

The first criterion Phillips proposes, i.e. *playability*, sums up those features that make the totality of a play, which may include the text, language, costume, divisions of scenes and acts, music, gestures, bracketed illustrations, etc. The translator is supposed to be well aware of elements that make a drama and at the same time differentiate it from non-dramatic texts. The second criterion is also crucial to its rendition: the synchronic interpretation of the period of history in which a drama was written. The translator is responsible for creating the link between a drama written at a specific time and performed later at a time when the established conventions are different **11**. The third criterion touches upon the interrelationship between the characters, monologues and dialogues, etc., which would all contribute to the total semantic message of the SL text, as intended by its author. In other words, as Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 132) postulates, "with theatre translation, the problems of translating literary texts take on a new dimension of complexity, for the text is only one element in the totality of theatre discourse".

Principles of Bible Translation:

We shall cast light on the set of principles suggested for the rendition of the Bible in the light of what John Purvey and Eugene A. Nida had advocated at contrastively different periods of time.

Purvey (some time around 1408), according to Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 46-47), describes the four stages of the translation process (in the fifteenth chapter of the Prologue of the second Wycliffite Bible, composed between 1395-6):

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.

It seems apparent in these stages that the first three stages are preparatory, i.e. setting the scene through possessing the authentic Latin SL text, and comparing the different versions, next to counselling about hard words and complex meanings. But the proper translation strategy is the fourth stage in which, to quote Bassnett-McGuire (ibid: 47), "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". There is also little to gain in saying that Purvey had been after idiomatic translation in which meaning becomes the primary goal. By attempting to counsel with old grammarians and old divines, Purvey aimed at making the TL text accessible to the layman, who is no longer obstructed by hard word and complex meanings.

Nida (1964: 164) promulgates four principles for translating the Bible. They are:

1.Making sense

2.Conveying the spirit and manner of the original

3.Having a natural and easy form of expression, and

4.Producing a similar response.

The first principle relates the transference of the idea of the SL text. The second and third principles touch upon maintaining the style of the SL text. These principles, i.e. the first, the second and the third, are comparable to those of Tytler. However, it has been

envisaged by Hatim and Mason (1993: 16) that the fourth principle "is an addition to Tytler's list, reflecting modern concern with reader response". That is, Nida has focused on the author-translator-reader translating which is apparently different from Tytler's approach, which concentrates on author-translator relationship. Believing in the probabilistic, rather than deterministic, nature of the rules of translation, Nida (ibid: 164) announces, "in general, translators are agreed that, when there is no happy compromise, meaning must have priority over style".

Later, Nida and Taber (1969) illustrate the main discrepancy between old focus and new focus **12**. They also mention a package of attitudes with respect to receptor language **13** and source language **14** (ibid: 6). Then they (ibid: 14) establish certain fundamental sets of priorities:

1.Contextual consistency has priority over verbal consistency (word-for-word correspondence),

2.Dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence,

3.The aural (heard) form of language has priority over the written form,

4.Forms that are used by and acceptable to the audience for which a translation is intended have priority over forms that may be traditionally more prestigious.

These sets of priorities are crucial to the understanding of the main tenets of the old focus and the new focus of translation theories. The second set of priorities, in particular, outlines the disparity between the dynamic equivalence, which aims at complete naturalness of expression", and the formal equivalence, in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original". The former is best described as target (i.e. TL) oriented, whereas the latter as source (i.e. SL) oriented. Later on, due to the overall changes that occurred with the lapse of time, translators become less fanatic and literal in translating the religious text, specifically in relation to its style, and working hard towards keeping its contents intact.

4. Efficiency Vs Deficiency

Although very many translation scholars, especially the modernists, have expressed their reluctance towards revealing their support or negligence of the traditional approach, it remains undeniable that it has set up certain bases that can be considered so important towards establishing the principles of translation. At this stage, it is functionable to manifest the merits and demerits of the traditional approach in relation to the principles of translation. On the one hand, the merits stand for the elements of efficiency of this approach. This means the degree of significance that this approach displays throughout the overall process of translation. On the other hand, the demerits stand for the elements of deficiency. In turn, this reveals the weaknesses that translators experience by adhering to the traditional approach of principles of translation.

The elements of efficiency can be viewed in the light of the following remarks:

A. The traditionalists' principles of translation are undoubtedly one of the foundation stones for delineating the framework of the science of translation.

B. These groups of principles of translation are mere attempts proposed by scholars who have worked on specific fields of knowledge, mainly religious and literary. Then follows the attempts to generalise to every other field.

C. Proponents of the traditional approach, it seems, have not contradicted themselves. That is, irrespective of the constraints they kept themselves within, they introduce similar regulations over different periods of time.

D.   Although the modern tendency for analysing the text goes beyond the frontiers of the written form of the text, it can not ignore the formal dimension of the text. This stresses the essentiality of *equivalence-based* textual transference during translation.

E.   By and large, because of the religious nature of the early stages in which these principles were phrased, traditionalists feared any attempt to exceed the frontiers of the religious text. Thus, they retain as closely as possible every element already proposed in the SL text.

Whereas the elements of deficiency can be seen in the light of the following remarks:

A.   The traditional approach is *traditional in spirit* in the sense that it remains interlocked within what had been drawn long time ago: within dictations and limits of obligatory lists of regulations.

B.   It can not cope with the requirements of modern life improvements and changes: fields of knowledge are far broader than religious, scientific or literary domains. Nowadays changes in every respect of life do influence the understanding of the text, thus translating it into another readership.

C.   Lack of extratextual components: it fully concentrates on the text, and therefore on the intrinsic properties of the text.

D.   Because of its dependency on the SL text - thus unidirectional, it ignores the multi-directional operations that happen during translation. This means traditionalists ignore the second part of the equation: i.e. the receptors of the TL text.

E.   Some other features like overgeneralization and oversimplification seem dominant in the traditional approach to principles of translation: for example, the recurring focus on the translator's paralleled acquaintance with the source language and target language. Another example is the tendency to keep repeating points such as respecting the SL thematic and systematic constituents.

In brief, it transpires that the deficiencies embedded in the traditionalist approach to principles of translation are excusable to some extent due to the circumstances in which they were first originated. It is the creativity of translators that will make creative implementation of the aspects of this approach among other more recent approaches.

5.   Conclusion:

In this piece of research, I have tried to elaborate on the importance of the special rudimentary proposition: *the traditional approach* to principles of translation. This approach has undeniably established the foundation stones to the recently proved independent science of translation. Diachronically speaking, traditionalists have made the maximum of efforts to systematize the process of translation by outlining what they think the most crucial steps to follow during the act of translating. The surrounding circumstances, such as the subjects they have applied their work on and the actual nature of translation at those periods of time, have confined their efforts, but are still considered relevant and essential to start with. On the other hand, modernists have not developed their latest theories in general, and their approach towards principles of translation in particular, from a vacuum. Rather they have depended on their predecessors and benefited from where they have reached their conclusions. Moreover, researching this traditional approach avails a great chance to compare and contrast its contents with other following approaches. As this may reveal how graceful it will be when the translators are equipped with more than one approach to principles of translation: some consider the concept of *equivalence* (thus *servitude* to SL text) their starting point, whereas the concept of *function* (thus *freedom of constraints* of SL text) outlines the ultimate goal to the others.

Endnotes:

[1] The first edition of Alexander Fraser Tytler's (1747-1813) *The Essay on the Principles of Translation* appeared in 1791; the second in 1797. The third edition appeared in 1813 as referred to by Jeffrey F. Huntsman (1978) to which he wrote an introductory article. When, for example, I refer to Tytler as Tytler (1978), I mean the edition as appeared in 1978, Volume 13 of *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*.

[2] Gutt (2000: 47) reiterates, "A good translation should read not like a translation at all, but like a target original". See also Gutt (ibid) for more information on the definitions of the other kinds of translation, like the *covert*, which enjoys or enjoyed the status of an original ST [Source Text] in the target culture, and the *overt*, which makes it impossible to achieve the functional equivalence. To add, Bassnett (1996: 10) quotes the Earl of Roscommon (1633-85) who struggles with the distinction between writing/composition and translation:

> 'Tis true, Composing is the nobler Part,
> But good Translation is no Easie Art,

Bassnett (ibid: 11) concludes her argument by praising the role or the translator who "ceases to be an interpreter and becomes the source writer for the target reader".

[3] Aixela (1996: 53) distinguishes four basic fields of the double 'loyalty' of 'reading as *an* original' and 'reading as *the* original': the linguistic diversity, the interpretive diversity, the pragmatic or intertextual diversity and the cultural diversity.

[4] Nida (1964: 156) realises, "since no two languages are identical, either in the meanings given to corresponding symbols or in the ways in which such symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences, it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence, there can be no fully exact translations".

[5] Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC) was born at Arpinum to the south-east of Rome. He translated from Greek, and wrote on translation in his *De finibus honorum et Malorum* and *De optimo genere oratorum*.

[6] Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus St. Jerome (c.342-420) was born of Christian parents at Strido, Dalmatia, and went to school in Rome. Between 380 and 420 he produced a huge number of miscellaneous translations covering Church administration, monastic rules, theology, and letters.

[7] Manlius Anicius Severinus Boethius (c.480-524) is considered as last of the classical Romans and first of the Medievals. His well-known translations include most of Aristotle's *Organon*, Porphyry's *Isagoge*, and the *Geometria*, a rather free translation of Euclid's *Elements*.

[8] Baker (2000: 317) mentions the most important periods and caliphates, when discussing *the Arabic tradition*, as follows:

    A. *The orthodox period of the early caliphate*, starting with the death of Muhammad in 632 and ending with the death of Ali, the fourth Guided Caliph, in 661. The seat of the caliphate during this period moved from Medina, in present-day Saudi Arabia, to al-Kufa and al-Basra in present-day Iraq.

    B. *The Umayyad Caliphate* (661-750), with its seat in Damascus.

    C. *The Abbasid Caliphate* (750-1258), with its capital in Baghdad.

    D. *The Fatimid Caliphate* (909-1171), a Shi'ite offshoot of the main caliphate, with its capital in Cairo.

E. *An offshoot of the Umayyad Caliphate* which was established in Cordoba (929-1031).

F. *The Ottoman Caliphate* (c.1517-1924), with its seat in Constantinople. This last great caliphate of Islam was Turkish.

The office of caliph (i.e. leader of the Muslim community) was officially abolished in 1924.

[9] Catford (1965: 66) advocates:

In principle, the process of setting up a transliteration-system involves three steps:

1. SL letters are replaced by SL phonological units; this is the normal literate process of converting from the written to the spoken medium.
2. The SL phonological units are translated into TL phonological units.
3. The TL phonological units are converted into TL letters, or other graphological units.

[10] Bassnett-McGuire (1980: 22) states,

In determining what to use in English, the translator must:

1. Accept the untranslatability of the SL phrase in the TL on the linguistic level.
2. Accept the lack of a similar cultural convention in the TL.
3. Consider the range of TL phrases available, having regard to the presentation of class, status, age, sex of the speaker, his relationship to the listeners and the context of their meeting in the SL.
4. Consider the significance of the phrase in its particular context – i.e. as a moment of high tension in the dramatic text.
5. Replace in the TL the invariant core of the SL phrase in its two referential systems (the particular system of the text and the system of culture out of which the text has sprung).

[11] Phillips (in Bassnett-McGuire 1980: 125) makes clear, in the Preface to his translation of Racine's *Andromache*, why he felt the need to adapt Racine [because a number of critics attack his translation as deviant]:

If I have been able to keep up to the Beauties of Monsieur Racine in my Attempt, and to do him no Prejudice in the Liberties I have taken frequently to vary from so great a Poet, I shall have no reason to be dissatisfied with the Labour it has cost me to bring the completest of his works upon the *English* stage.

[12] Nida and Taber (1969: 1) explain the main difference between the old focus and the new focus of the translation theory, "the older focus in translating was the form of the message, and translators took particular delight in being able to reproduce stylistic specialities… The new focus, however, has shifted from the form of the message to the response of the receptor".

[13] Nida and Taber (ibid: 3).

[14] Nida and Taber (ibid: 6).

References:

- Aixela, Javier Franco. "Culture-Specific Items in Translation". In Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (eds). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD. 1996. pp. 52-78.

- Alvarez, Roman and VIDAL, M. Carmen-Africa. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD. 1996.

- Baker, Mona. "Arabic Tradition". In Mona Baker (ed). *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 1998-2000. pp. 316-325.

- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen & Co. LTD.1980.

- Bassnett, Susan. "The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator". In Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (eds). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.1996. pp. 10-24.

- Bell, Roger T. *Translation and Translating Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.1991-1993.

- Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press. 1965.

- Gutt, Ernst-August. *Translation and Relevance Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. 2000.

- Hatim, Basil, and MASON Ian. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman Group UK Limited. 1990-1993.

- Kelly, Louis G. "Latin Tradition". In Mona Baker (ed). *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 1998-2000. pp. 495-505.

- Nida, Eugene A. *Towards a Science of Translation*. Netherlands: Leiden, E.J. Brill. 1964.

- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber Charles R. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1969.

- Nida, Eugene A. *Language Structure and Translation*. Selected and Introduced by: Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1975.

- Savory, Theodore. *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape LTD. 1968.

- Tytler, Alexander Fraser. *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. In *Amsterdam Classics in Linguistics* with an introductory article by Jeffrey F. Huntsman. 13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. 1978.