Once, the great Roman translator Cicero described the difficulty of translation thus: "If I render word for word the result will sound uncouth and if compelled by necessity I alter anything in the order of wording, I shall seem to have deported from the function of translation." Interestingly, what has been voiced by Cicero is definitely correct. Accordingly, it would have been better for Cicero and the other translators to leave their profession rather than to be accused of traitors and unfaithful translators. The statement above tells us many important things. First, it shows us the moral responsibility the translator is bearing while translating. Secondly, it shows the heavy burden the translator experiencing during translation.

Thirdly, the statement reflects the longstanding dilemma between two old translation methods, these are 'word for word' and 'sense for sense' translation and which one of them would be followed. However, this is not our present concern now. Our discussion will limit itself to something completely different, that is, 'What is translation?'

The answer for this question will include variety of translation definitions from different prominent scholars' backgrounds. So, it would be worth mentioning that these reputed figures played (and still play) a major role in improving the translation discipline since it was still infant. Something else worth noting too is that each one of these great scholars has his/her own definition of translation for their long and accumulated experience in such
field. In other words, some definitions will emerge from linguistic based background, some are based on sociolinguistic literature, and others from communicative and cultural oriented theories. Let us start with this question,

‘What is translation?’ For Dr. Johnson, translation involves the process of ‘change into another language, retaining the sense “Which is the basic objective”’ A.H. Smith fully agrees with Dr. Johnson’s statement when he states, “To translate is to change into another language retaining as much of the sense as one can.” Since Catford’s theory in translation is a linguistic based theory, he defines translation as “The replacement of textual material in another language (TL).” Nida proposes two types of equivalence in translation, formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. For the first one, formal equivalence focuses on the message itself, in both form and content... One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the sources language. Formal equivalence is thus keenly oriented towards the ST structure, which exerts strong influence in determining accuracy and correctness.

Dynamic equivalence, according to Nida is based on what he calls “The ‘principle of equivalent effect’, where the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message.” In other words the translated message or work should have the same impact on the reader of the target language as it had in the reader of the source language, “The message has to be tailored to the receptor’s linguistic needs and cultural expression.” In his Approaches to Translation, Peter Newmark defines translation thus:
"Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language."¹ For Theodore Savory, translation is an ‘Art’. Eric Jackobson sees translation as a ‘Craft’. Horst Frenz goes a step ahead to accept translation as an art but "with qualifications, stating that translation is neither a creative art nor an imitative art but stands in between."² Roman Jakobson differentiates among three types of translation:

1. Intralingual translation, or rewording (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language).

2. Interlingual translation or translation proper (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language).

Intersemiotic translation or transmutation (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign system).³ Bassnett-McGuire, on the other side goes beyond linguistic based angle, moving towards cultural based corner. She asserts that replacement of lexical and grammatical items is not enough when translating between two languages since such languages are bound up with cultural based norms and references. In her book Translation Studies, Bassnett states:

"Translation involves for more that replacement of lexical and grammatical items between languages and as can be seen in translation of idioms and metaphors, the process may involve discarding the basic linguistic elements of (SL) text so as to achieve Popovic’s goal of expressive identity between the SL and TL texts. But once the translator moves away from close linguistic equivalence, the problems of determining the exact nature of the
History of Translation

To start with, is translation a new discipline? The answer for this question will definitely be 'no'. In other words, translation is not a new discovery field, rather it is 'as old as the tower of Babel' as Willis Barnstone says. According to some records, translation traces back to the remote history. It has emerged as an urgent human necessity. Encyclopedia Americana states, "This art is as old as written language." In her Aspects of Translation Sreedevi K.Nair points out that literary historians were able to trace translation back as 3000 BC. In the same regard, Ray says "serious traces of translation could be seen right from 3000 B.C. The most ancient translated work is that of Rosetta Stone of second century B.C." Peter Newmark in his Approaches to Translation mentions that the earlier traces of translation date from 3000 BC, during the Egyptian old kingdom where inscriptions of two languages have been discovered. Nair again gives the following accounts as concrete evidence.

Emperor Sargoan of Assyrian made proclamations of his adventures in the Assyrian language, since several languages were spoken in the vast Assyrian Empire, the emperor's proclamations were translated into all these languages ... The proclamations of Hummurabi, the ruler of Babylon (2100BC) were also translated into several languages... Fragmentary versions of the old Sumerian Gilgamesh epic have been found in four or five Asiatic languages of 2nd millennium BC. But who first invented translation?

According to the ancient recorded history, the ancient Romans started
translation in their writings.

‘Translation was a roman invention’ that is what Eric Jackobson pointed out. As stated by Lakshmi in Problems of Translation English and Telugu: A Study of Literary and Technical Texts that the views of Ciecro and Horace on translation had great influence on the later generation of translators. They made a distinction between “word for word” and “sense for sense” translation and used the later in their translation.

Actually ‘word for word’ translation and ‘sense for sense’ translation dominated the translation phenomenon since the Roman era up till now. Argument over which better is to be followed still going on among the contemporary translators and theorists in their diverse translation atmospheres. Both Ciecro and Horace see that the art of the translator “should be the judicious interpretation of the text of the source language based on the role of expressing not word for word but sense for sense.” The first Roman translator, Livius Andronicus translated the Odyssey of Homer into Latin. Andronicus was the first translator whose name to be recorded in Europe. Later came the early Latin authors Naevias and Ennius who translated the great plays of Euripedes.

Bible and Translation

By the dawn of Christianity, translation had taken a completely different approach. It intended to spread the new religion not only through Europe but further. This period witnessed an intensive activity in translating the Bible to many different languages such as “Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic
and Gothic. As stated by Mc-Guire "With the spread of Christianity, translation came to acquire another role that of disseminating the word of God. Lakshmi, puts it this way:

"The history of Bible translation is a miniature representation of the Western Culture. The aim of the Bible translation was more evangelistic than aesthetic.".

Interestingly, the real spirit of translation vanished and shifted to ideology rather than literature. This is what Das rightly points out when he says:

"The Bible translations were neither literary exercises nor spiritual enterprises, they were clearly meant for political defense." He continues:

"The Bible translation across the world was motivated by missionary activity to spread the Christian religion... and the problems increased with the growth of ideas of national culture and with the coming of reformation."

The 15th century was known as the century of printing invention due to so many radical changes which took place on the level of translation which "undergone many significant changes. Serious attempts were made to formulate a theory of translation". Accordingly, Etienn Dolet (1509-46) was the first writer to set up a theory of translation with very visible principles. His famous principles are thus:

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.

What is noticed from Dolet's principles mentioned above is that his new theory of translation puts stress on the importance of the comprehending of SLT text as the first requisite. Similarly, Das, in his book, *The Horizon of Translation* confirms what Lakshmi points out earlier. He writes: “The role of translation underwent important changes after the invention of printing methods in the fifteenth century. New attempts were made to form a theory of translation.” Unfortunately, the owner of the first advanced established theory of translation, Dolet executed just for his mistranslating one of Plato's dialogues and was accused of nonbeliever. In his translation *Iliad*, Dolet stated that a translator must:

1) Avoid word for word renderings.

2) Attempt to reach “spirit” of the original.

3) Avoid over loose translation, by basing the translation on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses.

A last point could be worth mentioning here is that during Renaissance Europe, translation formed a logic relation between past and present and between distinct tongues of traditions which were divided under pressure of nationalism and religious conflict.

The seventeenth century witnessed more radical changes in both translation and literature traditions. Attempts of building up systematic and
well organized translation theories underwent. So did the same in the literature theory. Conflicts between the old and new traditions continued on in which finally the new intellectuals harvested the fruits. In this period three great translation scholars made great contribution towards translation namely, Denham, Cowley and Dryden. Their translation concepts were characterized by ‘deliberate, reasoned statements, unmistakable in their purpose and meaning’.\textsuperscript{33} At that time, and as described by Munday, translation into English ‘was almost exclusively restricted to verse renderings of Greek and Latin classics, some of which were extremely free’.\textsuperscript{34} Cowley, the great prose translator, in his preface to Pindaric Odes attacks poetry that is ‘converted faithfully and word for word into French and Italian prose’.\textsuperscript{35} Cowley proposes the term of imitation to replace such a very free method of translating, explains that the idea was ‘not as the Roman period, that such a free method would enable the translator to go beyond the original rather, this method permitted the spirit of the SL to be best reproduced’\textsuperscript{36} This free method to translation created a reaction from another English poet and translator, John Dryden whose translation process would have impact on subsequent translation theory and practice. John Dryden in his preface to Ovid’s Epistles (1680) summed up translations into three essential types:

1. Metaphrase, a literal translation, which renders SL text word by word and line by line.

2. Paraphrase, a sense for sense translation, keeping the author’s work in view.

3. Imitation, where the translator takes liberty not only to vary the words and sense but also to abandon both if he gets opportunity to do so.\textsuperscript{37}
However, later in his translation, Dryden approved only the second criteria for it is the more balanced path, provided the translator certain criteria. Dryden claimed that the other two types, meta phrase and imitation are the two extremes which are to be avoided. According to him, it is almost impossible to translate verbally and well at the same time... it is much like dancing on ropes with fetter’s leg. Dryden’s triadic model had great influence on the later writings on translation. Sir John Denham, in his theory of translation discussed both the formal (Art) and the spirit (Nature) of the work. He is extremely with the idea that literal translation should not be applied to translation of poetry “For it is not his business alone to translate language into language, but poesie into poesie; and poesie is of so subtle a sprit.” In his concept of translation, Denham doesn’t differentiate between the translator and the original text writer, and the difference between them only from the social and temporal contexts point of view.

Clarity and plainness are the two elements which characterized the eighteenth century translation texts. That is why many earlier texts were written again to fit the contemporary standards of language and taste. The moral duty of translator to his reader was the cornerstone. Samuel Johnson (1709-84), in Life of Pope (1779-80) while discussing the question of additions to text through translation states:

‘The purpose of a writer is to be read’ Munday, in his Introducing Translation Studies opines that the first systematic study of translation after Dryden is Alexander Fraser Tytler’s Essay on the Principles of Translation (1797). However, it seems to be that the main difference between the two people is that Dryden’s concepts of translation focus on ‘the author-oriented
description whereas Tytler is TL-reader oriented terms. Tytler defines 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."

When approaching the early part of the 19th century, two main conflicting ideas can be detected. The first one regards the translator as a creative genius, close to the original writer, while the other sees the translator’s task as a mere mechanical function. It is Coleridge who differentiates between imagination and fancy in his *Biographia Literaria* when he describes imagination as ‘The supreme creative power’ while fancy as ‘a lifeless mechanism’. In this respect, most of the romantic writers viewed translation the second rate activity. For example, Coleridge states that translation is as ‘painful copying that produced masks only, and not forms breathing life.’ For Shelley, translation is an activity which has a lower status and which simply fills in the gaps between inspirations. But Shelley’s viewpoint was rejected by Timothy Webb for ‘shifting from translating works admired for their ideas to translating works admired for their graces.’

During the post-romantic period there was a call for the creation a separate language for the purpose of translation only which was led by the great German translator Friedrich Schleirmacher who was supported by many nineteenth century English translators, like F.W. Newman, Carlyle and
William Morris. At this time, translations from classical languages were abundant and accordingly, William Morris translated into English Homer, Virgil and some Norse Sagas. But unfortunately, the language he used was difficult for readers due to its artificiality and archaism. In his book, *Introducing Translation Studies*, Munday states that the 19th century focused on the status of ST and the form of TL. Mundy mentioned the argument between Francis Newman and Mathew Arnold over Homer’s translation. Thus Newman stressed on the foreignness of the work by a deliberate archaic translation in which strongly opposed by Mathew Arnold in his lecture “On Translation Homer” which called for a transparent translation method. As indicated by H. Lakshmi in, *Problems of Translation*,

The twentieth century was basically the century of translation. Thus translation studies have been developed, principles and theories have been established and radical changes related to translation have taken place within this period of time. Actually, and according to Lakshmi such advancement in translation was due to the following reasons:

1. The development of communication approach.
2. The expansion of field structural linguistics.
3. The application of linguistic to study of translation.

In addition to that and as stated by Sreedevi K.Nair, a real assessment of translation goes hand in hand with the developed theories of translation.

**The Arabs and Translation**

It is needless to mention here that the Arabs, a nation with deep rooted
civilization and reputed history, made their remarkable contribution towards translation, either in their past or present days. For the Arabs, translation was the sole medium for communication with nations speaking languages different from theirs: Indians, Persians, Romans, Greeks and Turks. Furthermore, Arabs used translation for scientific and knowledge purposes and for mutual trading with their neighboring countries. Thus Arabs had had their own translation textbooks which were translated from Sanskrit, Romans, Persian and Latin and the vice versa. Let us start with Mona Baker’s quoted statement. She points out.

The Arabs are credited with initiating the first organized, large-scale, translation activity in history. This activity started during the reign of Umayyads (661-750) and reached its zenith under the Abbaside (750-1258), particularly during the reign of al-Ma’mun (813-33), known as the Golden era of translation. The center of this activity was Baghdad, a fabulous city built by the Abbasid Caliph al-Mansur and the scene of many episodes in the famous Thousand and One Nights. So as a result of such prosperous translating activity, many Arab translators were best-known for their great contribution in the field of translation. Ibn al-Batriq, Ibn Na’ma, Ibn-Qera and Ibn al-Hajaj, to name just a few. It is worth stating here that Ibn Hunny, a noted Arabic scholar, translated Aristotle’s notable book ‘The Poetic’, first from Latin into Syriac then Abu-Bishr Mata from Syriac into Arabic. In this respect, it is said that before rendering the book of Aristotle by Ibn Hunny, one of the Arab scholars, Jackob Ibn Ishaq had made a remarkable illustration on the book which means that the above mentioned book had been rendered
The Arabs made a great deal of contribution toward the translation discipline....They translated into their language many books related to algebra, geometry, medicine, music, chemistry and logic from Sanskrit. It was during this period that the works of Aristotle, Plato, Galen, Hippocrates and others were translated into Arabic by a group of Syrian scholars. According to what Nair states in the above mentioned book, that an intensive activity in translation was established during the Abbasid period in Baghdad and when translation declined in Baghdad, translation shifted to Toledo in Spain which was then under the Arabs rule. In Toledo, many foreign translators work within its libraries, among them was Adelard of Bath who translated an Arabic version of ‘Eucid’s Principles’ into Latin and Robert de Retines who produced the first translation of Quran in 1141-43. In Translating a Nation: An Indo-Russa Saga (Sminar papers), Muzaffar Allam writes:

Major parts of Spain remained under the Arabs rule from 7th until the 13th century. During the 700 Years rule of Arabs, translation continued...... regular translation from Arabic into Latin date from the early 12th century, when Adelard of Bath and Converso Petrus Alphonsus brought knowledge of Arabic astronomy to England and Bishop Michael of Trazano sponsored the translation of scientific texts from Arabic into Latin. With respect to the key centers of translation in the Arab world, the Routledge Encyclopedia mentions the following research centers:

"...the Muslims by the 8th century had created a brilliant civilization with a number of schools and research centers at
Baghdad, Basra, Toledo, Seville and Sicely.\textsuperscript{58}

As for the methods adopted by the Arab translators, Mona Baker, the Egyptian-born translation scholar indicates two translation approaches:

The first [method], associated with Yuhanna Ibn al-Batriq and Ibn Na’ma al-Hemsi, was highly literal and consisted of translating each Greek word with an equivalent Arabic word, and where non-existed, borrowing Greek word into Arabic.\textsuperscript{59} Actually, such a word for word approach failed to be an effective to convey the exact meaning and the spirit of the original text work, so another method was adopted; that is sense for sense. Here is what Mona Baker says:

The second method, associated with Ibn Ishaq and al-Jawahri, consisting of translating sense for sense creating fluent texts which conveyed the meaning of the original with distorting the target language.\textsuperscript{60}

**Essential Principles on Translation**

To meet the problems creating from the translating texts from and into the Arabic language, the Arab linguists proposed strict criteria to ensure faithfulness in translation. To do so, one of the best-known writers of the period, Abu-Othman al-Jahiz developed the following conditions:

1. Translator must be full knowledgeable with literary genres he is translating, their nature, terms and spirit.

2. Translator should have a comprehensive background of the original text’s author including writing style to make his work intelligible.
3. Translator must be fluent in the two languages (source and target languages).

4. Translator should have a thorough linguistic background and full understanding of the two languages, similarities, differences, structures, lexicons.

5. Translator must be honest and faithful. Nevertheless, despite those restricted translation rules, al-Jahiz argues that 'No translator can be perfect and faithful even if he is full master in both languages.'61 (my translation)

Al-Jahiz groups translated textbooks into: translatable and untranslatable. By translatable, he means those texts which don’t create problematic translation difficulties or challenges to translators. Moreover, their translations do not make any big differences among translators in case of rendering the same text. Such a set of texts is applied to scientific ones. However, and according to al-Jahiz, the other group of texts represents a real challenge for translators, especially poetry, philosophy, and religious based texts. Poetry for example, has very special characteristics, privacy, connotations and shades of meaning which add special color and ambiguity to translators.62 The same is applied to philosophy and religion based texts. He, al-Jahiz, emphasizes that both philosophy and religion translations are very sensitive matters, for they bound up with the society’s values and faith: they express the set of values, thought and faith the society believes in, hence, any misunderstanding committed by a translator may lead to a grave reaction.63 (my translation)

It has been stated so far that the Arabs were one of the ancient pioneers
who had made great advancements not only at the level of translation but at other levels too: science, literature and philosophy. Such humanitarian positive landmarks reflected themselves through translating valuable textbooks for many reputed foreign literary and scientific scholars such as Aristotle, Plato, Galen and Hippocrates. It has already been mentioned too, that the most important translation centers, like for example, Baghdad, Toledo, Basra and Sevile attracted many noted foreign translators to work within their libraries. That was in the past. What happened after that?

It seems to be that history is the only honest and just witness on the nation’s rise and fall. In this regard, history says that the Arabs’ past witnessed more achievements in different humanitarian fields, which are equivalent to those in the other nations. But unfortunately, instead of the Arabs heading forward, as history does, they are moving backward. This is not because they themselves want to be retreated and stand behind rather, because outside effects forced them to stay behind. In the earlier chapter, the researcher gave a historical setting, indicating the real obstacles which blocked up the Arabs improvements: that is foreign occupation.

Psychologists say that when an individual loses self-confidence, he might be subjected to grave mental disorder and as a result of that, he suffers from what psychologists called ‘dissociation; but the problem increases when the whole nation fall victim under such a vital sickness. That is what happened to the Arabs under the foreign domination. However, as soon as they freed themselves from the outsiders’ control, after a severe struggle, they felt relieved, started restoring their confidence and resumed their painstaking
journey. But unluckily, as the Arabs’ consciousness gradually revived and breathed again, after they regained their freedom from the Turkish occupation, again they experienced another bad luck: this time came from the west. It started with the invasion of Egypt by the French leader Napoleon Bonaparte in 1798, this incident, at least from the researcher point of view, was a good luck and a bad luck at same time. Good luck for it represented the first contact between the west and the Arab world. Bad luck because of another era of foreign domination.

Translation was one of the positive outcomes of the western occupation to the Arab world for it was the first interchangeable interaction between two diverse civilizations, cultures and unmatched thoughts and values. Hence, as Roger Allen says ‘increasing contacts with western literatures leads to more translation of works of European fictions into Arabic.’ Similarly, and in another place, Mona Baker points out that because the Arabs were isolated and deprived of cultural contacts during the first few centuries of Ottoman rule till the first major contact with Europe representing by the French invasion of Egypt in 1798. Actually, the invasion was the first step to establish a considerable impact on the intellectual development of the area. One of the initial fruitful results, for instance, was when Napoleon brought with him a ‘scientific expedition’ which included a number of scientists who set up the first Arabic press in the region. And in order to explain his mission’s goals he brought some translators, including Muslims. These translators prepared the Arabic circular that Napoleon distributed on landing in Alexandria in which he incited the people of Egypt
to revolt against their rulers.\textsuperscript{66}

As it has been mentioned earlier in the first chapter, Mohammad Ali, the governor of Egypt, was very ambitious to have his country more advanced, so he sent a group of Egyptian students to study in France. This group forms the first cell in establishing the translation tradition on their return home.\textsuperscript{67} One of the most noted translators, Rifat Al-tahtawi, who spent five years of study in France. On his return he was in charge of a very leading linguistic school for translation al-Alsun (literally. the tongues). Those who graduated from this school played a major part in translating a vast range of European sources, covering numerous areas of knowledge.\textsuperscript{68}
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