Early attempts

In the **Western world**, translation, in particular **literary translation**, can be traced back to "**the age of Romans**". Although translation, at that time, played a significant role in **reflecting Greek literature and philosophy in Latin**, the attempts at translation were "**an act of submission that caused awkward lexical Graecisms to enter into the translations**". It was not long before the Romans viewed translation from a different perspective; it meant for them "transformation in order to mould the foreign into the linguistic structures of one's own culture" without tying themselves up with the lexical or syntactic features of the source language (SL). Such a **fundamental change** towards showing respect to the linguistic system of the target language (TL) and not violating it with foreign lexis and hybrid stylistic idiosyncrasies can be elicited from **Cicero's attitude** regarding translation. Therefore, I did not have to make a word-for-word translation but rather a translation that reflects the general stylistic features . . .

Cicero and Horace (first century BCE) were the **first theorists** who made a **distinction** between **word-for-word** translation and **sense-for-sense** translation. Their comments on translation practice influenced the following generations of translation down to the twentieth century. **Five centuries later**, **St Jerome** adopted Cicero and Horace's position on the occasion of his **Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint,** in his letter to **Pammachius** on the best method of translating: **I render not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense.**

Although his was not an excellent translation, it is still **the official Latin translation of the Bible** (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere 1990, 15). His "approach to translating the Greek Septuagint Bible into Latin would affect later translations of the scriptures".

Medieval Arabic Translation (Abbasid Period c. 750–1250 CE)

Medieval Arabic translation of Greek classic works in philosophy, medicine, astrology, and so on, flourished in the **Abbasid Caliphate era (750–1250)**, particularly for over two centuries early in the period. It peaked in **832** with the establishment of the translation centre **Bayt alHikma** (The House of Wisdom) in **Baghdad** during the rule of **the caliph al-Ma'mnjn**, who was said to **remunerate** translators with the weight of the translated book **in gold**.

Major scientist translators of that period, such as Ibn Ishłq, Ibn al-BatrƱq, Ibn Rushd (**Averroes**), Ibn SƱnł (**Avicenna**), and FarłbƱ', among others, dominated the scene of scholarship and translation. In particular, **Hunayn Ibn Ishłq** and **Yahył Ibn al-BatrƱq,** who translated a large number of **Greek works**, were best known for the profession of translation. Here came up again **the issue of the two translation methods of word-for-word or sense-for-sense translation**. While **the translations of Ibn Ishłq tended to be fluent in Arabic (translating sense-for-sense), those of Ibn al-BatrƱq followed the original text more literally and borrowed extensively from Greek.**

However, with the Arabs establishing firm grounds in various domains of scholarship, thanks to the translation movement, and with the Arabic language becoming an international lingua franca (the way English is nowadays), the need for translation started to wane and the translation movement finally came to an end.

1.4 Pre-renaissance: Dante (1265–1321) and Martin Luther (1483–1546)

In the late fifteenth and early to mid sixteenth centuries, **Martin Luther** (c. 1483–1546 CE), one of the most notable **theologian**s in Christian history and responsible for initiating **the Protestant Reformation**, shifted the focus of attention towards the TT and its intended reader. Like Dante, he proclaimed that in order to produce a good translation, one needs to find out how ordinary people in the TL communicate such that their voice and style of speech can emerge through translation. He translated **the New Testament** into German, giving ordinary lay people the opportunity to read God's word for themselves and, for the first time ever, Bibles were distributed among the German people.

1.5 Sixteenth Century: Étienne Dolet (c. 1509–1546 CE) and William Tyndale (c. 1494–1536 CE)

One of the earliest attempts to establish a set of fundamental **translation principles** was made by **Étienne Dolet,** who was found **a heretic** for his **mistranslation of one of Plato's dialogues**. The phrase **"rien du tout" (nothing at all)** illustrated to the Church his **disbelief in immortality,** ultimately leading to his **execution.** In his essay "**La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en autre/** The Way to Translate Well from one Language into Another", Dolet (c. 1540 CE) concluded that:

1. The translator must **understand perfectly** the content and intention of the author;

2. The translator should have an **excellent command in** both languages: SL and TL;

3. The translator should **avoid word-for-word renderings**;

4. The translator should **avoid the uncommon use of archaic words and expressions, but rather should focus on the common usage of the language;** and

5. The translator should **devote his/her attention to rhetorical devices**.

Dolet tried to strike a balance between the SL and TL, while not seeking "to distinguish between the relative degree of control the translator must have in the source and the receptor language" (Nida 1964, 16). The translator, according to **Dolet's principles**, "**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**". It is worth noting here that Dolet's principles are routinely followed today by most translators, particularly in the translation of materials that belong to literary genres, as well as of **any expressive discourse in which emphasis is placed on impressing the receptor of the text such as creative adverts and commentaries full of flowery language**."

1.6 Seventeenth Century: Sir John Denham (c. 1615–1669 CE), Abraham Cowley (c. 1618–1667 CE), John Dryden (c. 1631–1700 CE)

The seventeenth century witnessed **the birth** of many **influential theorists**, such as Sir John Denham, **Abraham Cowley** and **John Dryden**. To begin with, **John Dryden** was and still remains well known for the essays that he wrote on translation. **Dryden**, like many commentators from the time of the Roman Empire onwards, argued that **all translation may be reduced to these three types**:
1- **metaphrase**, i.e., rendering word by word, sentence by sentence, etc. from one language into another;
2- **paraphrase**, i.e., "**translation with latitude**" in which the translator keeps an eye on the author of

the source text, rendering his sense without firmly sticking to his exact words; and 3- **imitation,** i.e., translation in which the translator experiences **a degree of freedom**, "**not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion".**

Having reduced translation into three main types, Dryden explained his position towards them criticizing the first type: (**'tis a faith like that which proceeds from superstition, blind and zealous**) (ibid. 18). Similarly, **he stood against** the third type of translation **claiming "imitation of an author is the most advantageous way for a translator to show himself, but the greatest wrong which can be done to the memory and reputation of the dead". He was in favour of the middle path, that of paraphrase.**

1.7 Eighteenth Century: Alexander Fraser Tytler (c. 1747–1813 CE)

In the **eighteenth** century, **the translator** was likened to **an artist with a moral duty** both to the work of the original author and to the receiver. With the development of **new theories and volumes** on the **translation process,** the study of translation started to be **codified and systematized** – Alexander Fraser Tytler's 1791 volume **"Principles of Translation" is a case in point.** Tytler drew attention to **three principles** that should be taken into account by translators: 1- the **contents** and/or **ideas** of the **ST** should be **transferred completely** into the **TT**; 2- the **style and manner** of the **ST** should be **retained** in the **TL**; and 3- **the translation should have all the ease of the original composition.**

Examining **Tytler's principles,** in particular the first two, one can readily observe that they represent, albeit indirectly, **the age-old debate of the nature of translation:** whether the translator had to opt for word-for-word translation or sense-for-sense translation. While the first principle requires translators to be **faithful** to the content of the original text, the second principle encourages translators to be **free "from linguistic constraints involving form and denotation in favour of a more functional perspective".** In his third principle, Tytler is developing the concepts of '**fluency**' (see Venuti 1995, 68–69), '**naturalness**' (discussed later by **Nida** 1964) and '**domestication**' (discussed first by **Schleiermacher** and later by **Venuti** 1995; 1998; 2004).

1.8 Nineteenth Century: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Muhammad Ali Pasha (Romanticism and Reformism)

The nineteenth century was characterized by **two conflicting tendencies**: (1) considering translation as a **"category of thought**, with the translator seen as a creative genius" who "enriches the literature and language into which he is translating"; and (2) viewing the translator in terms of performing the mechanical function of making a text or an author known. The nineteenth century witnessed the emergence of **Romanticism,** which led to the birth of many theories and translations in the domain of literature. **Particularly gaining in popularity were poetic translations** such as **Edward Fitzgerald's (**c. 1809–1863 CE) **Rubaiyat Omar Al-Khayyam (1858**).

With the rise of **hermeneutic theories**, translation in the **nineteenth century** came to be conceived as an "**interpretive recreation of the text**". However, this does not **rule out** the existence of the **other school** of translation theory that considered translation as being a "**transmission of data**". The **theologian and translator Friedrich Schleiermacher**, **considered the founder of modern hermeneutics**, took the discussion a step further in his essay of **1813** entitled "**On the Different**

Methods of Translating" in which he focused on the "**methodologies of translations**", rather than "**illuminating the nature of the translation process**". Schleiermacher argued that a translator "**either . . . leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer, or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer towards the reader**". He further added: "**Both paths are so completely different from one another that one of them must definitely be adhered to as strictly as possible, since a highly unreliable result would emerge from mixing them, and it is likely that author and reader would not come together at all**" (Schleiermacher 1813/1992, 41–42).

In **the Arab world** and in **Egypt** in particular, a succession of schools was established in the **1820s** for both the army and navy branches of the armed services. In addition to the purely military schools, a number of civilian arts and sciences schools were started up, most of which had some military aspect in their administration. The largest was **the medical school**, founded on the suggestion of **the French physician Clot**, and just a year after his arrival in **1825** the building was completed. Schools of veterinary science, agriculture, pharmaceutics, mineralogy, engineering, and other subjects followed in the **1820s and 1830s**. Clot also played a part in **reforming the primary and secondary school systems.**

During this time, **Muhammad Ali Pasha** began sending students abroad, particularly to **France** where some of them learned specific skills individually, while others were sent to **Paris** in a series of **education missions**. It was not long before those students became experts in French and through their stay abroad acquired Western techniques and adopted the Western style of learning. Upon their return, they began translating significant texts into Turkish and Arabic, teaching in the new schools, and translating what the foreign experts were teaching**.** During that time, **Rifaʻah al-Tahtawi** rose to prominence as a translator as well as for the authorship of **Takhlis Al-Ibriz fi Talkhis Bariz**, a famous account of his journey. A figure of importance in the revival of the Arabic language and literature, known as Nahda, **al-Tahtawi** became the second director of what began as the **School of Translation** and was in **1837** subsequently **renamed the School of Languages**. Despite its title, **this was more of a translation bureau than a language school**.

The establishment of these **new schools** required **textbooks**, which became **the chief product** of the new government **printing press** set up in **Bulaq**, the **port of Cairo**, in **1822**. This was the first permanent press in Egypt, second only to the short-lived press brought by **the French expedition (1798–1801)** that was removed upon French withdrawal. With his expedition **Napoleon** brought scientists and savants in all fields, along with a printer that could type in Arabic, Greek and French. The first translation made by the French mission from French into Arabic was **Napoleon's proclamation** addressing the Egyptians.

- Mohammed Farghal and Ali Almanna: **Contextualizing Translation Theories- Aspects of Arabic–English Interlingual Communication**, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, 2015, pp 1-9.

1.9 Contemporary Translation Theories

In the **1990s**, translation began to find its footing as an independent scholarly discipline, and was described as "the bloom of translation studies" (Gentzler 1993, 187).

A seminal paper in the development of the field as a distinct discipline was James S. Holmes's '**The name and nature of translation studies**' (Holmes **1988**b/2004). Holmes's paper was generally accepted as the founding statement for the field. The published version was an expanded form of a paper Holmes originally gave in **1972** in the **translation section** of the **Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen** (Holmes 1972). Holmes drew attention to the limitations imposed at the time because translation research, lacking a home of its own, was dispersed across older disciplines (languages, linguistics, etc.). He also stressed the need to forge '**other communication channels, cutting across the traditional disciplines to reach all scholars working in the field, from whatever background'** (1988b/2004: 181). Crucially, Holmes put forward an **overall framework**, describing what translation studies covers. This framework was subsequently presented by the leading **Israeli** translation scholar **Gideon Toury**.

In Holmes's explanations of this framework (Holmes 1988b/2004: 184–90), the objectives of the **'pure'** areas of research are: (**1**) the **description** of the phenomena of translation; and (**2**) the establishment of general principles to **explain** and **predict** such phenomena (**translation theory**). The '**theoretical**' branch is divided into **general** and **partial** theories. By 'general', Holmes is referring to those writings that seek to **describe** or account for every type of translation and to make **generalizations** that will be relevant for translation as a whole. 'Partial' theoretical studies are **restricted** according to the **parameters** discussed below (medium, text-type, etc.). **The descriptive branch** of 'pure' research in Holmes's map is known as **descriptive translation studies** (**DTS**). It may examine: (1) the **product**; (2**)** the **function**; and (**3**) the **process**.

(1**) Product-oriented DTS examines existing translations**. This may involve the **description** or **analysis** of a **single** **ST–TT pair** or **a comparative analysis** of **several** **TTs** of the same **ST** (into one or more TLs). These **smaller-scale studies** can build up into a larger body of translation analysis looking at a specific period, language or text/discourse type. Examples would be translation in the twenty-first century, in the English< >Chinese language pair, or of scientific reports. **Larger-scale studies** can be either **diachronic** (following development over time) or **synchronic** (at a single point or period in time). Holmes (ibid. 185) foresees that 'one of the eventual goals of **product-oriented DTS** might possibly be a general history of translations – however ambitious such a goal might sound at this time'.

(2) By **function-oriented DTS**, Holmes means the **description** of the 'function [of translations] in the recipient sociocultural situation: it is a study of **contexts** rather than **texts**'. Issues that may be researched include which texts were translated when and where, and the influences that were exerted. For example, the study of the translation and reception of Shakespeare into European languages, or the subtitling of contemporary cartoon films into Arabic. **Holmes terms this area 'socio-translation studies'**. Nowadays it would probably be called **the sociology and historiography of translation**. It was less researched at the time of Holmes's paper but is more popular in current work on translation studies.

(3) Process-oriented DTS in Holmes's framework is concerned with **the psychology of translation**, i.e. it is concerned with **trying to find out what happens in the mind of a translator**. Work from a **cognitive perspective** includes **think-aloud protocols** (where recordings are made of translators'

verbalization of the translation process as they translate). More **recent** research using **new technologies** such as **eye-tracking** shows how this area is now being more systematically analysed.

The **results of DTS research can be fed into the theoretical branch to evolve either a general theory of translation or, more likely, partial theories of translation 'restricted' according to the following subdivisions.**

1- **Medium-restricted theories** subdivide according to translation by **machine** and **humans**, with further subdivisions according to whether the machine/ computer is working alone (**automatic machine translation**) or as an **aid** to the human translator (**computer-assisted translation**), to whether the human translation is **written** or **spoken** and to whether spoken translation (interpreting) is **consecutive** or **simultaneous**.

2- **Area-restricted theories** are restricted to **specific languages or groups of languages and/or cultures**. Holmes notes that **language-restricted theories** (e.g. for the Japanese< >English pair) are closely related to work **in contrastive linguistics and stylistics**.

3- **Rank-restricted theories** are linguistic theories that have been restricted to a level of (normally) the **word** or **sentence**. At the time Holmes was writing, there was already a trend towards **text linguistics**, i.e. analysis at the level of the text, which has since become far more popular.

4- **Text-type restricted theories** look at discourse types and genres; e.g. **literary**, **business** and **technical translation**. **Text-type approaches** came to prominence with the work of **Reiss and Vermeer**, among others, in the **1970s**.

5- The term **time-restricted** is **self-explanatory**, referring to theories and translations limited according to **specific time frames and periods**. **The history of translation** falls into this category.

6- **Problem-restricted theories** may refer to certain problems such as **equivalence** (a key issue that came to the fore in the 1960s and 1970s) or to a wider question of whether so-called '**universals**' of translation exist.

Despite this categorization, Holmes himself is **at pains to point out that several different restrictions may apply at any one time**. Thus, the study of the prefaces to the new English translations of novels by Marcel Proust would be **area restricted** (translation from Parisian French into English), **text-type restricted** (prefaces to a novel) and **time restricted** (1981 to 2003).

The '**applied**' branch of Holmes's framework concerns applications to the practice of translation:

Q translator training: teaching methods, **testing techniques, curriculum design**; **Q translation aids**: such as **dictionaries and grammars**; **Q translation criticism**: the **evaluation** of translations, including the **marking of student translations** and the **reviews of published translations**.

Another area Holmes mentions is **translation policy**, where he sees the translation scholar advising on **the place of translation in society**. This should include what place, if any, it should occupy in the language teaching and learning curriculum.

There are drawbacks to the structure. **The divisions in the 'map' as a whole are in many ways artificial,** and Holmes himself points out that **the theoretical, descriptive and applied areas do influence one another**. **The main merit of the divisions is, as Toury states (1991: 180; 2012: 93),**

that they allow a clarification and a division of labour between the various areas of translation studies which, in the past, have often been confused. The divisions are still flexible enough to incorporate developments such as the technological advances of recent years.

JEREMY MUNDAY, Introducing Translation Studies, Theories and applications, Taylor and Francis Group, Routledge, London and New York, Fourth Edition 2016, pp. 16,17,18,19.