

The Concept of Translation in Renaissance England¹

英國文藝復興時期的翻譯觀

Hui-zung Perng*

(彭輝榮)

Abstract

Deeply influenced by the medieval theory of *translatio*, Renaissance humanist educators show that “translation” is much more than what we think it to be today. There were “translation practices” indeed, but they must not be seen as Nida’s “dynamic equivalence” in printed form but as a part of rhetoric deriving from classical learning. Wilson (1553) and Ascham (1570) stipulated that “translation” referred to rhetorical work rather than simply rendering one language into another on a printed page. This work involved a great deal of oral expression practices.

The first issue is that grammar schooling all the way through college education since the medieval times has gone through two stages, one without books and papers, the other with printing technology having been invented. The stage without books and papers required pupils to do double oral translating of the classical pieces; the stage with books and papers began to pay more attention to writing training, which, in the following centuries, gradually developed into a translation practice more familiar to us today. Though living in the Early Modern Period, Renaissance writers seem to belong more in the first stage, making translating an enterprise of managing linguistic metaphors. From educators, and particularly from Arthur Golding’s translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, we see very good demonstrations of tremendous personal free will in “translating” Latin into English. William Tyndale, Sir Thomas Hoby, John Florio, and George Chapman provide outstanding examples of the metaphorical point of view that bound translation to rhetorical training.

The second issue is that the political implications of translating the Bible still held sway on the concept (and the business) of translation. Latin was the dominant language in the grammar schools and in the academia, though Mulcaster (1581), more than any other humanist educators, strongly encouraged the use of the vernacular language in schools. In higher education, influenced by Wilson, Ascham, Chapman, Brinsley, Hoole, and Walker, the conflict between the imperial though more useful Latin and the “political correct”

¹ The original title of this project, “Shakespeare’s Idea of Translation: The Case of Shakespearean Ovidianism,” was presented as a working paper in the conference on “The Issue of Translation in the Medieval and Renaissance Studies,” held by the Medieval and Early Modern English Studies Association of Korea (MEMESAK) at Yonsei University in Seoul in 2007. I finally found time to finish documenting all the ideas during the past few weeks.

* Professor, Department of English and Graduate Institute of Children’s English, National Changhua University of Education

English existed. This made rendering “foreign” languages into English a matter of hegemonic and legal encounter. On a safer side, though no less “political” in perspectives, translation became a way of rhetorical training in schools, an adventure into the nature of linguistic sports that made it to self-proximity, not faithfully conveying messages from the source. Moreover, because of its emphasis on use of metaphors, this kind of rhetorical training appears very curious to us.

The third issue is literacy. One of the reasons why translation practices in the medieval and Renaissance times look curious to us today is that reading for pleasure was far from a popular cultural activity. Still limited to the blessed wealthier classes, such as the gentry, the clergyman, the tradesman, and the yeoman, the learning of Latin formed a good part of the efforts in socio-political mobility, showing that classical learning, thus rhetorical training, was an important requirement for the young intellectuals in the system of patronage and the aspirers of the lay society, though only in limited number after a great deal of advances. The translation practice as we see in King James’ Bible was rare. It simply could not obtain any popular momentum in educational arena, particularly for classical *auctores*.

I conclude that seen from the reality of the translation culture experienced by its time, even though it sometimes exceeds its boundaries with use of metaphors and tropes, “out-Herods Herod” (*Hamlet* 3.2.14), the concept of translation in Renaissance England may serve as a polished mirror to hold up to nature for modern translators.

Key words: translation, equivalence, English Renaissance, metaphor, translation culture

英國文藝復興時期的翻譯觀

The Concept of Translation in Renaissance England

彭輝榮*

(Hui-zung Perng)

摘要

受到中世紀 *translatio* 概念的影響，文藝復興時期的教育家所提倡的翻譯和我們今天的觀念可能有相當差距。當時的翻譯觀，和 Eugene Nida 倡言之「靈動對等」不同，它是和學習古典文學——尤其是拉丁文學——關係至深的修辭學。Thomas Wilson 和 Roger Ascham 認為翻譯指的是修辭學上的功夫，而不只是在紙上進行兩種語言的忠實轉換。而且依據筆者觀察，這種修辭學上的練習，如雙向翻譯（double translation），必然存在大量的口譯訓練。

本論文談的第一個議題是自中世紀以來，從私塾至大學教育，翻譯實踐均分兩階段發展，第一階段既無書，亦無紙張，即便初時有，也不易獲得。另一階段則紙張已然發明，並且相對容易獲得。書籍與紙張付諸缺如的年代要求年輕學生練習對古典文學進行雙向翻譯，而且從口譯開始，以省下紙張花費。書籍和紙張普及之後，書寫練習慢慢變得重要起來，並且經過幾個世紀的演變，終於發展成今日我們熟悉的口筆譯分家觀念。雖然活在早期現代，文藝復興時期的作家其訓練似乎仍未脫離第一階段，使得翻譯成為高度口語化、經營管理個人雄辯生涯的事業。教育家們的教科書提倡的，和 Arthur Golding 翻譯 Ovid 的《變形記》是這種高自由度翻譯的極佳例子，William Tyndale, Sir Thomas Hoby, John Florio, and George Chapman 提供十分多例子。他們都對自己的修辭翻譯學觀點——尤其是所謂隱喻觀點——提供許多辯解。

第二個議題是聖經翻譯引起的政治意涵仍然對翻譯觀念和生涯經營有極大影響。在私塾和學術語言訓練的場所，拉丁文一項都是最重要的。雖然和其它教育家有些不同，Mulcaster 對學校使用本土語文（英文）採取鼓勵態度。在語言教育中，受到 Wilson, Ascham, Chapman, Brinsley, Hoole, 及 Walker 等文法教育家的影響，帝國語言雖然用途較廣，其和「政治正確」的本土英文仍有若干衝突。這使得將「外語」翻譯成母語成為權力與法律的遭遇戰。為了相對安全起見——這雖然從其它角度看來仍然可以很政治——翻譯實踐在訓練場所才變成修辭訓練，而且是對語言本質遊戲和對自我完成的一種冒險，而不是今天我們所看到的忠實傳達原語訊息的活動。再者，因為重視「隱喻」的使用，這種修辭訓練於今看來十分特殊。

第三個議題是低識字率的社經與政治意涵仍然遍佈社會。中世紀與文藝復興時期的翻譯觀念之所以令今人覺得好奇的原因，是因為在當時能享受讀書樂的絕不是廣大的平民人口。只有較為富有的階層，如貴族、教會、商人、和鄉紳等階層機會

* 國立彰化師範大學英語系與兒童英語研究所合聘教授

較大，因此，學習拉丁文實是社會與政治流動的重要一環。這使我們瞭解，古典文學和修辭學的學習極為重要，因為這門學問是貴族系統收編年輕知識份子的重要方式，也是非教會的社會育才、選才的重要渠道。詹姆士國王的聖經所展現出的翻譯觀念並不常見，在教育界無法推廣，尤其無法推廣至古典文學作家的翻譯。

筆者所獲結論是，在文藝復興時期，受其時代背景限制，翻譯文化縱然常常以其修辭和隱喻的運用跨越文字的藩籬，其翻譯觀念仍然可以為今日翻譯實踐者提供一面閃亮的鏡子，絕對可以幫助我們進一步瞭解翻譯的真正本質。

關鍵字：翻譯、對等、英國文藝復興、隱喻、翻譯文化

...from translation all science had its offspring.

John Florio 1603²

Translation since the medieval *translatio*³ has always been torn between whether to conform to the surface meaning of the source language or to delve into the implications and find what is “equivalent” in the target language. Influential twentieth-century cultural theoretician and key figure of the Frankfurt School Walter Benjamin (1968) on the theory of translation insisted that “pure language” is all that matters in translation practice. “The task of the translator,” he argued, “is to release in his own language that pure language which is under the spell of another, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work” (Venuti 78). Eugene Nida (1964), who, unlike Benjamin, grounds his tremendous influence within the confines of translation study, invented the term “dynamic equivalence” claiming that such a translation strategy directs its focus “not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response” (Venuti 162). Not to disclaim them in any way, these two translation practitioners, representing two fairly different disciplines, somehow can arguably be said to represent the two extremes of the translation practice, in translation history called “freedom and literalism” (Morini), though to apply these two concepts to their statements requires aggressive qualifications on our part. There are theoreticians who attempt to mitigate the two extremist positions. For instance, on the phenomenon of the translation culture that has emerged hegemonically in the postmodern era, present-day translation theory guru Lawrence Venuti delineates a utopian world where the difference between domestic and foreign cultures and languages, between TL (target language) and SL (source language), become milder. He says—one might perhaps argue a little wishfully—

Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there. The foreign text, then, is not so much communicated as inscribed with domestic intelligibilities and interests. The inscription begins with the very choice of a text for translation, always a very selective, densely motivated choice, and continues in the development of discursive strategies to translate it, always a

² In his preface to the translation of Montaigne’s *Essays* Florio writes: “Yea but my old fellow Nolano told me, and taught publicly, that from translation all science had its offspring. Likely, since even philosophy, grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, and all the mathematics yet hold their name of the Greeks; and the Greeks drew their baptizing water from the conduit pipes of the Egyptians, and they from the well-springs from the Hebrews or Chaldees” (Robinson 133). We can assume that he didn’t mention Latin because it came later than the Greeks.

³ Michelle R. Warren states that the vernacular “author-translator” in the Middle Ages usually could “overcome the aesthetic pitfalls generally attributed to translation” (3).

choice of certain domestic discourses over others. Hence, the domesticating process is totalizing, even if never total, never seamless or final. (Venuti 482)

But such a world centering on language difference and cultural heterogeneity indeed predicts the existence of “heterogeneous communities,” where communication becomes totalizing, unique and impartial for different ethnic communities and sectors of the society. This utopian world takes special interest in the various uses of the translated text, attracting readers from different ethnic constituencies that form the reading public, the “discursive strategies,” of the translating language. Domestic institutions are created to meet different intellectual and production challenges, whether it be “academic or religious, cultural or political, commercial or municipal” (Venuti 491). Thus, a community of translation, rather like a M. M. Pratt’s linguistic utopia, comes into being; its language, identity, and social position, though contested amidst different levels, are widely interpreted and accepted through the fact that in the receiving languages there indeed exists a new culture, a culture of translation. And this culture, dismantling its former mono-linguistic wear, celebrates in its being a linguistic “zone of contact”⁴ between foreign and domestic, particularly within the domestic scenario (Venuti 491).

Thinking self-reflexively, drawn from Venuti’s thought on that world of utopia, we probably live in a translational culture, and there is no time in British history as the Renaissance so close to the one we live in at the present time, not only here on this small Far-Eastern island, but also other corners of the world. A highly developed translation culture in human history is arguably very special, because it demands advanced literacy, not readily attained in all human history, and it must meet challenges from all levels of intellectual and production needs. As what John Florio in 1603 said, which I quoted before this paper begins, “from translation all science had its offspring,” this culture in Renaissance England should probably not only be regarded as a tribute to the scholarly discipline called “translation.” It demands broader and deeper investigation.

So here we begin. Roughly around the 125 years between the beheading of Sir Thomas More in 1535 and the ascendancy of Charles II in 1660, the population of London increased from 50,000 to 500,000, ten times of the size of the previous century. During this period, the publications of the descriptions of the images of the metropolitan city, and “praises, sermons and moral pamphlets, ballads and satires, chronicles, plays, and pageants” (Manley 125) grew in a rate never imagined before. For the first time, the government must issue fiats for “laborers, artisans, immigrants and paupers” who wanted to settle in the city (Manley 126). A historian reports that by the early seventeenth century almost all London population, uneducated particularly, have already felt the impact of

⁴ Venuti gets this term from M. L. Pratt’s essay “Linguistic Utopias” anthologized in N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant, and C. McCabe, eds., *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987.

“the applications of literacy and the products of a literate culture” (Wrightson 195). The “products” included thousands of ballads, poems that tell stories, and hundreds of thousands of “almanacs,” which, now an obsolete term in literature, was a kind of publication that bridged the knowledge of the populace and that of the elites. The cost of an almanac, for instance, was low, only about two to six pennies (Wrightson 196), about the same as the majority of the playgoers afforded for enjoying a play in the south side of Thames on a sunny holiday afternoon (Harbage 59). Literacy advanced rapidly, though not yet widely distributed to the lower class (Wrightson 187-91). Historians report that in 1648 a bookseller in London listed 1200 entries in his inventory, among which there were stocked 110 bibles, dozens of psalters and works of Erasmus, Andrewes, Sibbes, Stubbs, Perkins, Robert Bolton, Thomas Shepherd, John Saltmarsh and many others, including, of course, Shakespeare and Cervantes (Wrightson 198). More significantly, higher education abounded and produced ‘gentlemen’ who later would be selected to dominate the political arena of the Elizabethan and Jacobin courts. These gentlemen came from a college education that was based on “the classics, logic and rhetoric, history, theology and modern languages” (Wrightson 192). To give an idea of how they lived through the literacy movement, in 1584, only 48 per cent of the MP received college education, but in about 60 years, by 1642, some 70 per cent of them had been to a university or Inns of Courts or both. In 1584, 54 per cent of the active justices of Somerset and 50 per cent of those of Northampton Shire can be regarded to belong to the category of intelligentsia, but by 1636, the percentage gained up to 86 and 82 per cent respectively. The gentry class was 100 per cent literate. Governing means you must be educated in language-related disciplines (Wrightson 192). Morality became a part of the techniques you learned through language—so you become “ludic and agonistic” (Lanham 4): for example, one’s character and competency are judged through “the modes of identity-formation, systems of belief, habits of deportment and civility, means of aggression and defense” (Manley 298). We are thus intrigued by the translation culture they lived in.

In my research into the vogue of Ovid in this period’s literature and culture during the past two decades or so, I once wrote the following statement explaining what I believed to be “Shakespearean Ovidianism”:

Shakespearean Ovidianism refers to love and passion represented in the large variety of characters Shakespeare has created. The linguistic expression or play of the love and the passion often draws from the complex human desires Shakespeare takes to heart from Ovidian mythic characters. They generally emerge as eroticism on stage. The desire felt by the characters from both Ovid and Shakespeare often recalls the spirit of metamorphosis which is often used to depict personal identity. However, we find that when desire and personal identity are in focus, society must also be brought in. (Perng 2002: 72-3)

It is easy enough to imagine today that foreign literature must be very difficult to

whoever try to render it into their mother tongue. In any time and space in human civilization, cross-cultural situations, fictional or factual, are arguably present for writers. Even as agent or agency of the society, I might add. They want to cope with it, but there are times, abundantly manifested in literatures all over the world—such as English literature in the Renaissance—when they feel that their mother tongue is inadequate in many ways, and this sense of difference (in other terms, inferiority) makes them feel, either out of a desire for socio-political mobility, or a suffering conscience to achieve proximity of the self, or a sense of social duty thrown on them by the community that makes them, an anxiety to improve their own tongue and hence enrich the culture that defines their nation-state.⁵

One may object that it is a little far-fetched to argue that Shakespearean Ovidianism should be burdened with this much implication. But in present investigation, I believe I have discovered an interesting phenomenon that probably can explain why writers in Renaissance England such as Shakespeare would see translation in the way they did:

Were the world mine, Demetrius being bated,
The rest I'd give to be to you *translated*.

(*A Midsummer Night's Dream* 1.1.190-1)

To put the wording in order, the speaker, Helena, means “Even if I have the whole world, without Demetrius’ love, I’d give it to you to be ‘translated.’” That means the receptor *could* do whatever she wants with words. This is a typical Shakespearean humor. The speaker suffers from unrequited love from a courtier, Demetrius, in Theseus’ court. Without his love, the world simply means nothing to her. The word “translated” here makes the concept of translation in Renaissance England appear rather puzzling. To find a satisfactory answer for this, even just a part of it, I resort to the idea of borrowing. In the Renaissance, if one was to be a writer, he needed to borrow things from classical writers, and “borrowings provide the raw material which he moulded into an artistic whole, shaping it to maintain interest through variety in accordance with principles of construction” (Bolgar 320-1). Almost all of Shakespeare’s contemporary writers took Latin, Greek, French, or Italian lexicons and turned them into English, not having to worry about being accused of plagiarism or disingenuity. Today, translation and creative writing belong to different disciplines and are analyzed as such with disparate theoretical underpinnings (See Venuti’s selections). To the Renaissance writers, who seem to have “domesticated” too much (to use Venuti’s word), these two fields seem to be curiously one and the same. Helena’s use of “translated” seems to mean exactly this: You can use your own will to make other people’s things “become” yours through translation—and this crystallizes the etymology of the concept of translation for our puzzle. Our

⁵ Roger Ellis says that the “nation” in the title of his 2001 book is “always being constructed out of pre-existing material found in other cultures and languages” (5).

assumption is that Shakespeare was reminiscing his youthful school training in rhetoric, with a great deal of intellectual wit that aimed at communicating with the audience that shared the same experience.

In my 2002 essay, I also gave a part of the answer to this puzzle, particularly concerning Shakespeare. I explained how Ovidianism could serve as an agent that wrought influences on Renaissance English society:

I want to see Ovidianism...as a statement, a semiotic code, or as an agent to reflect, mediate, intervene, contain, and subvert the historical development of economic production, a sociocultural sector of the micro-physics of power, and a logico-narrative of the culture itself. I believe that Shakespearean Ovidianism should be so investigated because we can better understand its more precise status in both Shakespeare's *oeuvre* and in Renaissance culture in general. (8)

"[T]he structure of literature is similar to the structure of language" so structuralism would say (Bressler 109), and I think we have many reasons to inscribe in this linguistic view of interpretation and representation, later in postmodern era turned into a Lacanian theoretical venture into psychoanalysis. The language of Ovid was the language of love to writers in Renaissance England. And this language functioned as a foundation that erected its social structure:

The language of love [is] symbolic, veiled and safe though politic, mysterious, omnipotent, and powerful; resourceful and in perspective, and most importantly, it's provided by renowned humanist educators such as Roger Ascham, Thomas Elyot, Erasmus, and Richard Mulcaster. It was this language that was most capable of describing the wish for a continued social order, the sociopolitical situation. (10-11)

Granted the writers had many choices, according to their school of training in rhetoric and Latin, it all came down to Ovid:

They had a few options to choose from, Neoplatonism, Petrarchism, Courtly love, and so on. But most expressive and sophisticated of all, as far as the classical authors and genres were concerned, was Ovid and his mythological tales of love and passion. In George Puttenham's generic hierarchy, Ovid practically influenced all. These genres included what he called the Heroick, Lirique, Eligiack, Comicall, Tragicall, Satyres, which we should probably understand as epic, romance, pastoral poetry, the epyllion, sonnets, and a sub-genre of Elizabethan drama that attempted to include all above: the city comedy such as Shakespeare's. (10-11)⁶

⁶ Puttenham writes, "As the matter of Poesie is diuers, so was the forme of their poemes & maner of writing, for all of them wrote not in one sort, euen as all of them wrote not vpon one matter." Then he points out ten genres of Renaissance literature : Heroick, Lirique, Elegiack, Comicall, Tragicall, Eglogue, Satyres, Epigrammatistes, Mimistes, and Pantomimi (26-28). The spelling is distinctly his own.

In Renaissance England, “[a]ll the writers who received a humanist education set themselves at some time or other to imitate the ancients, and when they did so *they consciously or unconsciously transferred to their vernacular efforts some of the methods they had been taught for imitating in Latin*” (Bolgar 326, emphasis mine). We must remember that for writers such as Shakespeare, Greco-Roman culture, though not necessarily deemed “foreign” at the time, was nevertheless conveyed in a linguistic medium utterly foreign to the general public. Hence efforts must be made to understand the cultural transference that took place. I proposed to see Ovidianism not only as an archeological site serving as a manifestation of semiology for understanding the culture of Renaissance England that demands meticulous study. I also want to insist that that culture was a translation culture that furnished fertile grounds for understanding the appropriation, embodiment, and representation of relevant “pattern, situation, structure, nature, person, object, act, role, process, [and] event” embedded in the languages writers such as Shakespeare employed (Burke 503-4). The writers and the cultural symbols they represented, no doubt, were products of a world that had diligently ploughed through what Ascham termed *imitatio*, but that’s an *imitatio* that relied more on rhetorical wits than on what we know today as translation. Kenneth Burke used to broach, a little derogatively, a term “scientific realism” to explain how we perceive linguistic reality (503-4). Indeed, compared to our scientific realism, the Renaissance self was given a different, if not broader, horizon to dig deeper into the reading and writing culture they lived in. And I want to argue that they really knew how this worked. As Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown on the construction of the English subject rightly argue: “the translator and the translated text, thoroughly absorbed in issues of signifying systems and difference, are pivotal in constructing, and deconstructing, the subject” (Ellis & Oakley-Brown 2001: 48). Shakespeare, the ingenuous “imitator,” was a reader reading extensively, extremely liberal about his sources (at least as we understand it), but, indeed, “fragments which others excerpted from the classics had come to him along a thousand devious paths to form the essential fabric of his outlook” (Bolgar 327). For Shakespeare, and most probably for his contemporaries, to write seems to mean using classical sources—Ovidianism for example—as linguistic codes to structure their disparate identities, or the subjects that served the cultural-political community they lived in.

Definitions of “Translation” in *Oxford English Dictionary* (1968)

There are three definitions recorded in *Oxford English Dictionary*.

- I. To transfer, transport in religious terms: a) To bear, convey, or remove from one person, place, or condition to another; to transfer, transport; *spec.* to remove a bishop from one see to another, or a bishop’s seat from one place to another; also, to remove the body or relics of a saint (or a hero) from one place of

interment or repose to another. b) To carry or convey to heaven without death; also, in later use, said of the death of the righteous, late ME.

II. To translate one language into another; therefore to “interpret”: 1. a) “To turn from one language into another; to change into another language retaining the sense” (J.); to render; also, to paraphrase Middle English. b) *absol.* To practice translation; also *intr.* for *pass.*, of a language, speech, or writing: To bear or admit of translation 1440. 2. *fig.* To interpret, explain; also, to express (one thing) in terms of another 1509.

III. To change in either form or content; therefore, to transform one’s feelings or inner spirit: 1. To change in form, appearance, or substance; to transmute; to transform, late Middle English. 2. To re-transmit (a telegraphic message by means of an automatic repeater.) 3. To transport with the strength of some feeling, to enrapture, entrance, *arch.* 1643.⁷

The first use of the above three definitions is basically irrelevant to our topic, but we see the second and the third uses in Renaissance England fairly often, and the third use, referring to change of form and nature, is most interesting to our topic. This use is not directly related to what modern scientific realism practices as “translation,” but the second use does refer to what we know as “translation” today. Judging from the evidences we are to present here, Renaissance translation culture actually refers to a very different idea. In this paper, I want to argue that what Renaissance writers believed to be “translation” in fact should probably refer to what Douglas Robinson calls “representational translation” (1991: 137) instead of the pragmatic practices from SL (source language) to TL (target language) that many a today’s translational practitioner have inscribed in, and that without distinguishing what “debt” they should pay (Venuti 426).⁸ Renaissance writers’ concept of translation has more to do with cross-cultural rhetorical adaptation, which at the time was propagandized as “*imitatio*,” it is not simply “translation” of one language into another. It emphasizes variation (Erasmus called *copia*, meaning “plenty” or “abundance”), focusing on ways of variation in discourse.⁹

Thomas Wilson (1524-1581)

Baldwin in several important occasions of his now classic *William Shakespeare’s Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* mentions how Thomas Wilson’s *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1560) must have exerted tremendous influence on Renaissance writers’ rhetorical training. According to Thomas Wilson, an orator must tell his story in plain English, so his hearers can fully comprehend his points (30). Among the five categories to be

⁷ See the 1968 edition of *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*.

⁸ “Debt” is Derrida’s word. We assume he did not mean it to only signify commercially.

⁹ See Wikipedia’s definition.

considered as significant in oration—invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and utterance (i.e. delivery, 33)—he believes elocution is closely knitted in with what he calls “translation.” He divides the performance of an oration into seven steps: introduction, narration, proposition, division, confirmation, confutation, conclusion (35)—all fairly accessible to the argumentative writings today. “Confirmation” and “confutation” actually refer to reasoning in both directions, equal to pros-and-cons in an argument. The three occasions in broaching a “matter” are the sites that concern our theme: “Either the matter consisteth in praise, or dispraise of a thing or els in consulting, whether the cause be profitable, or vnprofitable: or lastly, whether the matter be right or wrong” (35). These he entitles “Oration demonstrative,” praising and dispraising people and things; “Oration deliberative,” analyzing things that are in or not in the interest of the public; and “Oration iudicial,” evaluating things in moral terms (36-7).

For Wilson, elocution means to find the best words to explain or further exemplify invention, “[so] that reason semeth to be clad in Purple, walking affore both bare and naked” (38). There are four things to consider in elocution: plainness, aptness, composition, exornation (38). This last concept, “exornation,” seems to be most taxing but, for some reason, has become obsolete today. Our conjecture, however, is that it probably referred to “choice of words,” the most important of which is related to using tropes for decorum and understanding—“Wee may boldly commende and *beautifie* our talks with diuers goodly colours, and delitefully *translations*, that our speech may seeme as bright and precious as a rich stone is faire and orient” (40, emphasis mine). Polonius in *Hamlet* gives the word “beautifie” a very interesting evaluation, and to think of rendering translations as employing beautiful words is certainly alien to modern linguists.¹⁰ A trope for Wilson is “an alteration of a worde or sentence, from the proper signification, to that which is not proper” (42). “Proper” here means “one’s own,” as “my proper son” in *The Tempest* 3.3.60 and “my proper life” in *Hamlet* 5.2.66. Wilson explains why the concept of trope can become important in oration and in “translation.” There are four things to be observed in “choise of words.” First, the words must be suitable “vnto the tongue wherein wee speake.” Then, he says, “they bee plaine for all men to perceiue;” and then “they be apt and meete, most properly to sette out the matter;” and, lastly, they must be “*translated* from one signification to an other (called of the Grecians *Tropes*)” (40, emphasis mine). This is a curious concept. Why must choice of words be “translated”? According to the second definition of Oxford English Dictionary, this must mean “To turn from one language into another; to change into another language retaining the sense.” But we are still in a loss. To understand the precise meaning of the word “translate” used in Early Modern England—and thus in writers—we must return to Wilson. Wilson mentions borrowed words and “change of sentence or speech with much

¹⁰ In *Hamlet*, “beautified” is said by Polonius to be “an ill phrase, a vile phrase” (2.2.111).

varietie” (40). Therefore, in “exornation,” the use of what is known as “figures of speech” today becomes important, which means “a certain kinde, either of sentence, Oration, or worde, vused after some newe or straunge wise, much vnlike to that which men commonly vse to speake” (41). Wilson’s taxonomy of figures of speech is quite different from that of the formalist approach developed in the second quarter of the twentieth century—any dictionary of literary terms will reveal this. There are, he continues, three kinds of figures. One is “when the nature of wordes is changed from one signification to an other, called a *Trope*, of the Grecians.” A second are those that “serueth for words when they are not changed by nature, but only altered by speaking, called of the Grecians *Scheme*.” The third kind is “when by diuersitie of inuention, a sentence is many wayes spoken, and also matters are amplified by heaping examples, by dilating arguments, by comparing of things together, by similitudes, by contraries, and by diuers other like, called by Tullie *exornation* of sentences, or colours of *Rhetorike*” (41, emphasis mine).

Just like Stephen Greenblatt’s “poetics of Purgatory,”¹¹ what we have discussed so far is in effect a version of “poetics of translation” developed in Renaissance England, for the terms “trope” and “figures” obviously have much to do with the concept of translation owing to which Shakespeare and his contemporaries could properly be called playwrights and poets. It’s sometimes quite difficult to distinguish between elocution, “exornation,” figures, tropes, and “*Rhetorike*” programmed in Renaissance rhetorical or oratorical skills. Suffice it to say that after “invention,” all that follows in oration seem to focus on the “iudgment” of “figures” or “tropes,” e.g., “vse translation of words” (41). In sum, it all boiled down to “choise of wordes.”

To explain “translation of words,” Wilson gives a very vivid example on how to describe a biblical Pharisee. If we are to observe the law of rhetoric, what we should do, he says, is to construct dispraise via the law of metaphor. For example: “Yonder man is of a crooked iudgement, his wittes are cloudie, he liueth in deepe darknesse, dused altoghether with blinde ignorance, and drowned in the raging sea of bottomlesse Superstition” (41). This expression is actually pure hyperbole, but page after page Wilson teaches this use of tropes, or, shall we say, figures, or probably even clearer for today’s literary historians, *metaphor*. But for Wilson, a metaphor is “an alteration of a worde, from the proper and naturall meaning, to that which is not proper, and yet agreeth thereunto by some likenesse, that appeareth to be in it” (43). You want to make use of metaphor but you still want to be plain and apt when telling a tale in the style of an oration. Making yourself easily understood is a *sine qua none* in Renaissance rhetoric.

¹¹ In *Hamlet in Purgatory* Greenblatt mentions this term to denote a cultural industry that aimed at profit-making: “[The Protestants] who attacked the doctrine of Purgatory had worked out an account of Purgatory. They charted the ways in which certain elemental human fears, longings, and fantasies were being shaped and exploited by an intellectual elite who carefully packaged fraudulent, profit-making innovations as if they were ancient traditions” (45).

Without help of metaphor, you're not to be regarded as a successful orator—and hence writer. And it is important for an orator to obey the principle of *Rhetorique*, using figures, tropes, and metaphors to make things plain and “beautified”—and that is considered the central techniques of elocution and “exornation.” When Polonius says “beautified” is “an ill phrase, a vile phrase,” he may not be taken for his words.

Probably the best manifesto of the contemporary belief of translation in the Renaissance can be found in the following paragraph:

And not onely doe men vse *translation* of words (called *Tropes*) for neede aske, when they can not finde other: but also when they may haue most apt words at hand, yet will they of a purpose vse *translated* wordes. And the reason is this. Men coupt it a point of witte, to passe ouer such words as are at hand, and to vse such as are farre fetcht and *translated*: or els it is because the hearer is ledde by cogitation vpon rehearsall of a Metaphore, and thinketh more by remembraunce of a worde *translated*, then is there expressly spoken: or els because the whole matter seemeth by a similitude to be opened: or laste of all, because euery *translation* is commonly, and for the most part referred to the senses of the bodie, and especially to the sense of seeing, which is the sharpest and quickest aboue all other. For when I shall say that an angrie man fometh at the mouth, I am brought in remembrance by this *translation* to remember a Bore, that in fighting vseth much foming, the which is a foule and lothly sight. (42, emphasis mine)

In this short paragraph, the using of “translation of wordes” or “translated wordes”—i.e., the use of metaphors—occurs six times. Wilson is saying that need cannot be the only thing that requires using it, for most of the time you have a purpose in mind. For example, when you want to show “wit,” when you want to impress the hearers with a metaphor, when similitude requires, or when you want to appeal to the five senses, particularly to the visual faculty, for the sake of impressing your audience, you want to employ words with the idea of being “farre fetcht and translated.”

According to Wilson, trope can be a word, or “a long continued speeche or sentence.” His so-called “worde” is interesting because he insists that it is many things, such as “intellection” (i.e., synecdoche—part standing for whole), “abusion” (catechresis—“that which is most nigh vnto it”), “transmutation of a worde” (metonymia—the name of an attribute substituting the thing itself), “transumption” (when we by degrees wee goe to that, which is to be shewed), “change of name,” and “circumlocution” (periphrasis, i.e., using many words to describe a simple object). But the first thing for a trope to be a word is when it is written in the form of metaphor or “translation of wordes.” What he sees as “a long continued speeche or sentences” he explains as “An Allegorie, or inuersion of worde, mounting, resembling of things, similitudes, examples” (42-3).

For Wilson, to enrich an oration we depend on “apte Metaphore” that is “applied to the matter.” And to be persuasive, orators must use “the helpe of wordes altered and *translated*” (43, emphasis mine). What is in the skill of translation that makes Wilson put so much weight on? According to him, there are at least three kinds of translations we can use, as follows: The first kind is to “alter a word from that which is in the mind, to that which is in the bodie.” The second is “we goe from the creature without reason, to that which hath reason, or contrary from that which hath reason, to that which hath no reason.” The third kind is to change “the liuing to the not liuing.” His conclusion is that “in obseruing the worke of Nature in all seuerall substances wee may finde translations at will” (43-4). Thus we have a fairly complete picture of the Renaissance poetics of translation.

Ascham, Chapman, Brinsley, Hoole, and Walker Define Translation

For today’s translation community, Wilson’s idea is curiously bound to use of rhetorical metaphors, but investigating Renaissance humanist educators and other “author-translators” working with the classics will probably provide a more satisfactory clue to why this was so. We are most interested in knowing who looked at translation in the same terms, or who remind us of the culture that framed their thoughts. Here I enlist Roger Ascham, George Chapman, John Brinsley, Charles Hoole, and William Walker as further examples to trace the concept in the Renaissance. Put simply, except Brinsley, who seem to work more with student’s language proficiency level from the perspective of grammar that emphasizes acquisition pragmatism, these educators are still thinking of how to advance students’ rhetorical skills, whose objective reveals a good degree of political ambition. Their teaching objective, the jargons they utilize, the materials they employ, all show that the signification of translation practice lies not only in advancing oration, but also far beyond.

Roger Ascham (1515-1568)

I. Double Translation

In *The Scholemaster* (1570), probably the most important textbook on the humanist education in the sixteenth century for today’s cultural historians, Ascham sees *translatio linguarum* (translation of languages) as the first and most important exercise in a language learning program, i.e. in “making of Latins” (13). “Translation, is easie in the beginning for the scholer, and bringeth also moch learning and great iudgement to the Master.... It is most common, and most commendable of all other exercises for youth” (83). He even goes so far as saying that translation should be the most important exercise in the grammar schools. There should “be nothing els but translations” (83). Through

translation (“making of Latins”) one not only can better both Latin and English, but also achieve eloquence.

Ascham’s concept of translation can be easily detected in the beginning, where he explains how the schoolmaster can conduct a “double translation” of the classical works with young pupils after they have had enough practice with understanding and parsing:

But, to go forward, as you perceiue, your scholer to goe better and better on awaie, first, with vnderstanding his lesson more quicklie, with parsing more readelie, with translating more spedelie and perfittlie then he was wonte, after, giue him longer lessons to translate: and withall, begin to teach him, both in nownes, & verbes, what is *Proprium*, and what is *Translatum*, what *Synonymum*, what *Diuersum*, which be *Contraria*, and which be most notable *Phrases* in all his lecture. (Ascham 18)

Obviously, the first two tasks of working with “longer lessons” were “*proprium*” and “*translatum*,” which, noted by Ascham’s 1968 editor Lawrence Ryan, in effect means literal and metaphorical work respectively (Ascham 18). This metaphorical work goes nicely with what has been defined by Wilson, who says that metaphor is “an alteration of a worde, from the proper and naturall meaning, to that which is not proper, and yet agreeth thereunto by some likenesse, that appeareth to be in it” (43). For Ascham, as well as for Wilson, doing work on translation means using metaphors, though not necessarily dealing with all the properties of metaphor as a whole. So going back to Helena’s use of the word “translated” a little, I would insist that she means that—drawing from school experiences of working with double translation as Shakespeare did—one can use whatever metaphors she likes to interpret the world she just acquired (the world without Demetrius in it because it is no longer precious to her).

As long as double translation is diligently done, the pupils will learn to write and speak Latin. The first reason why Ascham passionately recommends Latin is that it is “fitte for euerie matter” and the second reason is that Latin expression is “proper for euerie tong:”

Ye perceiue...that by this exercise of double translating, is learned, easely, sensiblie, by litle and litle, not onelie all the hard congruities of Grammer, the choice of aptest wordes, the right framing of wordes and sentences, cumlines of figures and formes, fitte for euerie matter, and proper for euerie tong, but that which is greater also, in marking dayly, and folowing diligentlie thus, the steppes of the best Autors, like inuention of Argumentes, like order in disposition, like vtterance in Elocution, is easelie gathered vp: whereby your scholer shall be brought not onelie to like eloquence, but also, to all trewe vnderstanding and right iudgement, both for writing and speaking. (85-6)

This practical process help diligent pupils achieve all the most important parts of rhetorical training, e.g., invention, disposition, elocution, and, of course, translation. In

the Renaissance, to perfect one's language art one must studiously resort to rhetorical training. To achieve any meaningful depth in translation exercise the schoolmasters should teach writing through double translation because it is "the onely thing that breedeth deepe roote...for good vnderstanding, and in ye memorie, for sure keeping of all that is learned" (18). Ascham highly recommends "iudgement of all authors," which refers to free rendering of the source language, i.e., Latin. He suggests exercising paraphrasis and metaphrasis, though with qualifications.¹² Paraphrasis is "to take some eloquent Oration, or some notable common place in Latin, and expresse it with other wordes," i.e., paraphrase today (84). In another occasion, he says that it is "not onelie to expresse at large with moe wordes, but to striue and contend...to translate the best latin authors, into other latin wordes, as many or thereabouts" (87). Metaphrasis is basically the same as paraphrasis, except that it works more on poetry, "to take some notable place out of a good Poete, and turn the same sens into meter, or into other wordes in Prose" (84).

Ascham has great confidence in the method of double translation, for he believes that it would speedily facilitate language learning: The "waie of double translating, either onelie or chieflie" is most fit "for the spedy and perfit atteyning of any tong" (86). He bets that students receiving the training of double translation can be expected to have a better result than those who just take great pains in memorizing the grammar rules: "for spedy atteyning, I durst venture a good wager, if a scholer, in whom is aptnes, loue, diligence, & constancie, would but translate, after this sorte, one litle booke in Tullie...that scholer, I say, should cum to a better knowledge in the Latin tong, than the most part do, that spend foure or fiue yeares, in tossing all the rules of Grammer in common scholes" (86). He gives a pupil of his as an example to attest the validity of this method—Elizabeth Tudor: "Queene Elizabeth...hath atteyned to soch a perfite vnderstanding in both the tonges, and to soch a readie vtterance of the latin, and that wyth soch a iudgement, as they be fewe in nomber in both the vniuersities, or els where in England, that be, in both tonges, comparable with her Maiestie" (87). His conclusion is that translation, or double translation, advances six goals in rhetorical training: First, the cause and matter, second, "the wordes and phrases," third, "the order and composition," fourth, "the reason and arguments," fifth, "the formes and figures of both the tonges," and sixth, "the measure and compas of euerie sentence" (87).

II. Translating Cicero

Confidence leads to attention to details—to authors, and in the rest of *The Schoolmaster*, Ascham introduces a great deal of details about Latin authors who,

¹² Ascham qualifies the practice of paraphrasis in the classroom, saying that it is "is not meet for grammar schools nor yet very fit for young men in the university until study and time have bred in them perfect learning and steadfast judgment" (94). In other words, student's proficiency level must be first taken into consideration.

according to him, in turn did a great deal of imitating work of Greek authors. For instance, Cicero's "cunning in his owne tong" but "not his owne tong able it selfe" stands out as one of the best models (Smith I: 16). Cicero is usually called Tully (Tullie) by Renaissance Humanists. His most imitated works are *Orator* and *De Officiis*. Ascham argues that as long as these two works are taught and used wisely and constantly, pupils will surely learn to lose their fear of Latin, and will quickly learn to use this new language with ease. Pupils will learn the following: "a true choice and placing of wordes, a right ordering of sentences, an easie vnderstandyng of the tonge, a readines to speake, a facultie to write, a true iudgement, both of his owne, and other mens doinges, what tonge so euer he doth vse" (14). This language training program reveals its intrinsic relation with translation work in Latin. The program Ascham mapped out is like this: The schoolmaster first teaches "the cause, and matter of the letter," and then translate it into English, "so oft, as the childe may easilie carie awaie the vnderstanding of it," and lastly, the child must "parse it ouer perfitlie," which equals today's EFL grammar work. He then says: "This done thus, let the childe, by and by, both construe and parse it ouer againe: so, that it may appeare, that the childe douteth in nothing, that his master taught him before. After this, the childe must take a paper booke, and sitting in some place, where no man shall prompe him, by him self, let him translate into Englishe his former lesson" (14-5). This is a strengthening process, because after this self-reviewing double translation, the master shall have to work with him: "let the master take from him his latin booke, and pausing an houre, at the least, than let the childe translate his owne Englishe into latin againe, in an other paper booke. When the childe bringeth it, turned into latin, the master must compare it with Tullies booke, and laie them both together: and where the childe doth well, either in chosing, or true placing of Tullies wordes, let the master praise him, and saie here ye do well" (15).

III. On *Imitatio*

Ascham defines *Imitatio* as "*dissimilis materiei similis tractatio*" and "*similis materiei dissimilis tractatio*," which means "similar treatment of dissimilar matters and dissimilar treatment of similar matters" (Hardison 61-2).¹³ Translating and imitating Cicero require learners to work according to these two cross-referencing lines. Ascham's program of language learning lies in three matters; therefore, he believes that there are three kinds of *imitatio*. Drawing on Book Three of Plato's *The Republic*, he says that the first matter is about the "doctrine of Comedies and Tragedies," in which we will see "faire liuelie painted picture of the life of euerie degree of man."¹⁴ We take this to mean

¹³ According to Ascham, the best example of this *imitatio* is Virgil in *The Aeneid* imitating Homer's *Odyssey*, obviously hardly a product of modern sense of translation.

¹⁴ Plato, in Socrates' voice, is talking about the forms of poetry: "[A]ll poetry and story-telling may be said to be in one of three forms: the first, where imitation is employed throughout, is...tragedy and comedy; in the second, the poet tells his own story—the best example of that is perhaps the dithyramb; in the third, both imitation and simple narration are used—it is found in epic and in several other kinds of poetry" (94).

imitating life. But he seems not very interested in this kind. Rather, he is most interested in building up young generations' cultural strength by establishing their reading and writing base, which he believes can not be found if not "to folow for learning of tonges and sciences, the best authors." In this second kind, he says, we should choose a handful of classical authors to follow: "*Seneca, or Cicero: Salust or Cæsar, and so forth in Greeke and Latin*" (Hardison 61). The third kind of *imitatio* is actually the same as the second kind, but Ascham obviously gives more weight to it, because it is in here we see him describe the pragmatics that makes *imitatio* work: We are to determine who to follow, then decide to follow one or more, in what way, learning what passages, "by what meane and order," "by what tooles and instrumentes," and, finally, "by what skill and iudgement" (Hardison 61). I will here give a passage of Ascham that records the list of authors to imitate:

A booke thus wholie filled with examples of Imitation, first out of *Tullie*, compared with *Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes*, and *Aristotle*, than out of *Virgil* and *Horace*, with *Homer* and *Pindar*, next out of *Seneca*, with *Sophocles* and *Euripides*, lastlie out of *Livie*, with *Thucydides, Polibius*, and *Halicarnassæus*, gathered with good diligence, and compared with right order, as I haue expressed before, were an other maner of worke for all kinde of learning, and namely for eloquence.... (Smith I: 20)

Such an all-encompassing claim about learning of eloquence, called *imitation*, certainly brings us back to all of Wilson's doctrines of oration. In short, the whole idea of *imitatio* derives in effect from a poetics of translation not seen in British literary and translational history. Put simply, it curiously focuses on skills of rhetoric.

George Chapman (1559-1634)

When discussing his translation of the *Illiad*, George Chapman in *The Preface to the Reader* (1611) expresses his complaint against those who believes he has used too much "periphrasis," i.e., paraphrase with circumlocution, in his translation, saying, "If any tax me for too much periphrasis or circumlocution in some places, let them read Laurentius Valla and Eobanus Hesus, who either use such shortness as cometh nothing home to Homer, or, where they shun that fault, are ten parts more paraphrasticall than I" (Robinson 1997: 136). This statement, of course, will not be understood only as a defense of "using too many words." The point is that he was completely against literalism in translation, because it would appear that one pays too much attention to details and grammar, particularly when rendering such an important classic as *Illiad*. Translating word for word, he argued, would be "pedantical and absurd," an "affectation." Therefore, one should follow not "the number and order of words," but things that are more practical and more "dynamic." This reminds us of Nida. The belief in translational reality Chapman himself

describes as “material” but I would describe as “metaphorical,” following the Renaissance concept of translation we have been discussing so far: We should follow, he says, “the material things themselves, and sentences to weigh diligently, and to clothe and adorn them with words and such a style and form of oration as are most apt for the language into which they are converted” (Robinson 1997: 137). For Chapman, translation requires both imagination and rhetorical training, i.e., metaphorical training.

Charles Hoole (1609-1667)

The Fourth Form of the English Grammar School in the Renaissance approximately began when pupils were about nine to eleven years old. It was the beginning of the Upper Form and was to last for another three or four years. Baldwin reports that during this stage of language learning (Greek, Latin, and English), pupils must gradually be given heavy work on the classics. Charles Hoole, the humanist educator in Milton’s time who was even more concerned with the organization of the curriculum than Brinsley of King James’ time (below), wrote this curriculum for the Fourth Form. The pupils are to do exercises in the following order:

1. In reading out of the Latine Testament every morning, till they be able to go on with the Greek which may then take place.
2. In repeating a Grammar part every Thursday morning.
3. In Learning the Rhetorick when they have done that.
4. *Camdens Greek Grammer* on Mondaies, Tuesdaies, and Wednesdaies for morning parts.
5. In using Terence on Mondaies, Tuesdaies, Wednesdaies and Thursdaies for fore-noon lessons.
6. In *Ianua Latinae Linguae* for after-noon parts on Mondaies and Wednesdaies.
7. In some of Sturmius, or Textor’s Epistles, on Tuiesdaies and Thursdaies after-noons, and Shirley’s *Introductorium* after taxes ended.
8. In Ovid *de Tristibus* on Mondaies and Wednesdaies in the after-noon for the first, and in Ovids *Metamorphosis* for the second half Year; They may translate four Verses every night out of *Wits Common-wealth*, and say lessons on Saturdaies in the *Assemblies Catechisme*; and by the diligent improvements of these books to their several uses, they may first become perfectly readie in the Latine and Greek Grammar, and the Elements of Rhetorick.
9. They may get Coppy of words and learn to know their derivation and differences, as also how to varie phrases.
10. They may gain the right way of double translating and writing a pure Latin

stile.

11. They may be helped in their invention, and easily taught to make all sorts of English and Latine Verse, and to write familiar and elegant Epistles upon all occasions. (Baldwin I: 455-6)

Baldwin writes: “His [Hoole’s] models for grounding the boys in verse are Ovid’s *De Tristibus*, followed by the *Metamorphoses*, as was the Eton practice by 1560” (I: 456). The vogue of Ovidianism lasted long not without a reason. Grammar school children left schools with lines after lines of Ovid firmly impressed in their minds. When they became writers, they treated their childhood learning of Ovid with the concept of “translation” as explained by Thomas Wilson and Roger Ascham. That turned to tropes, figures, metaphors—in a word, the rhetorical skills the *homo rhetoricus* needed after they leave schools and universities for the social and political status they aspire to have (see below).

William Walker (1623-1684)

According to Baldwin, pupils in grammar school must memorize expressions from Terence’s *Floures*, which explains quite conclusively how Shakespeare learned his colloquial Latin expressions. It “furnished him [Shakespeare] impeccable phrases for conversation,” Baldwin says, “and at the same time served the purpose of a partial construe [sic] and translation of Terence” (I: 745). But for Shakespeare, and thus for Baldwin, translation should never be literal. In *Phraseologia* published in 1650, John Clarke¹⁵ for the first time describes translation practice using the word “equipollent,” explicitly pointing out the limit of literalism in face of the vernacular language (I: 745). Later, like Brinsley (below), William Walker (1669) gradually developed a system of translation training not relying so much on literary concept as on linguistic concept, campaigning for idiomatic translation and introducing the methods of Brinsley’s work on Cicero’s *Officiis* and Hoole’s work on *Corderius’s Coloquies* as follow:

Every Language hath its *Idiotismes* and Proprieties, Phrases and Forms of speaking, peculiar to its self, which cannot be rendered word for word into any other Language but with much barbarity and baldness of expression. Thus however it is in English and Latine: insomuch that either way to be *mimum fidus interpres*, *To stick too close to the Verbal Translation will betray a man into ridiculous absurdities*. Therefore to take the Learner off again from his nice insisting on Verbal Translating, and remedie those inconveniences that come by his sticking too close thereto, it will be necessary to acquaint him with

¹⁵ John Clarke was a schoolmaster famed for setting up the standards of schoolboy conducts: “In 1633, John Clarke, of Lincoln School, published his *Dux Grammaticus*. He gives there a Dialogue of Duties, or Scholar’s Manners. It is, in Clarke’s own opinion, a comprehensive account of what was to be expected in the conduct of a schoolboy at school and at home” (Watson 109).

Idiotismes of both the English and Latine, and shew him how to express himself in either Language according to the respective Proprieties thereof. (I: 745, emphasis mine)

Like Chapman, Walker suggests that the students must “heed the Sense, more than the Words.” “Expression” is everything. Here our attention is brought to pay to the language through which the message of Latin is fully conveyed. “Observation,” Walker says, “indeed hath the main stroke in this business,” referring, I think, to personal judgment. In order to render the SL into good English, the propriety of both Languages is heeded unto and observed by the Translator. Walker insists that the translator must be allowed “the use of the Translation,” tellingly points out the significance of rhetorical training in Renaissance translation (I: 745). Renaissance masters were not striving for “verbal” but what one might call “equivalent” and what John Clarke later called “equipollent” translation. Thus students memorized a Latin phrase and the English equivalent ideas for it, and vice versa.

John Brinsley (1581-1624)

John Brinsley in his *Ludus Literarius* (1612)¹⁶ broached his time’s “Grammar Translation Method”¹⁷ for acquiring Latin which, I would argue, in Britain set up a standard of second/foreign language acquisition for the centuries to come. His method is quite different from what we have seen in other humanist educations such as Wilson and Ascham, and is influential in formulating a part of Hoole’s and Walker’s translation programs, particularly in its pragmatic portions. According to Brinsley, a systematic method of translation must be developed through grammar translation, for “Many poor country schoolmasters who found it difficult to translate, themselves, in propriety of words, phrase and sense” (Watson 349). His “Golden Rule of Construing,” not so much a translation doctrine as a skill of language acquisition, is developed in four steps:

1. Take the Vocative case, or whatsoever is instead of it or hangs upon it, serving to make it plain.
2. The Nominative case of the principal Verb, or whatsoever is instead of it, or depends of it to make it plain.
3. Then the principal Verb, and whatsoever hangs of it serving to expound it; as an Adverb or Infinitive mood.
4. Lastly, the case which the Verb properly governs and all other cases after it, in order. (Watson 351)

¹⁶ In English, this Latin title was translated to *Reading and Writing in Elementary Schools*. This book was published in 1612.

¹⁷ GTM is a teaching methodology discussed in the discipline of ESL/EFL. According to Diane Larsen-Freeman, this method used to be called the Classical Method because “it was first used in the teaching of the classical language, Latin and Greek” (11).

Unlike Ascham who has attempted to map out a visionary program on language acquisition, Brinsley is a pragmatist working from the experience of the classroom (Watson 360-5). Although this method reminds us of how diligently Shakespeare might have worked in his grammar-school years, the philosophy of language learning seen in Wilson and Ascham, it seems to me, has already been lost. This, of course, gradually takes the concept of translation away from the self-voluntary metaphorical training of the Renaissance towards the scientific realism of the modern times in which we live in.

From Wilson to Brinsley it seems that the idea of metaphor—the idea of making vivid pictures with comparative languages, as can be detected in the “figuring forth” of “speaking picture” Sir Philip Sidney broaches in “The Defense of Poesy”¹⁸—plays a critical role in the development of the concept of translation. This compels us to think about its implications. Consider Kenneth Burke’s theory of metaphor (1966). In his *Language as Symbolic Action*, he says that metaphor is a linguistic device for “seeing something in terms of something else” (503). With use of metaphor, we are given the benefit to bring out one language’s quintessence to bear on another, and in this way we are to “perspectivize” the reality of both. But then use of metaphor also encourages “the shifting of perspectives” in both ways which in turn help us establish reality for both objects being contemplated on. In reflection, moved by this view of shifting realities, we believe that it seems to agree more with Wilson’s theory of translation and Ascham’s theory of *imitatio* than with “modern scientific realism.” This is probably why Burke broaches the standpoint of “degrees of being:”

Indeed, in keeping with the older theory of realism (what we might call “poetic realism,” in contrast with modern “scientific realism”) we could say that characters¹⁹ possess degrees of being in proportion to the variety of perspectives from which they can with justice be perceived. (503-4)

This view of metaphor comparing two realities with voluntary figurative languages is influential in twentieth-century theoreticians such as Douglas Robinson (1991), who sees the Greek and Latin roots of metaphor and translation, *Metapherein* and *transfere*, as cognates sharing the same implications. Robinson believes that *Metapherein* is the participle form of *translatum*, which means “transferred,” *transfere* in Latin. This gives Robinson adequate reason to see Burke as a philologist working his English brand of the theory of translation. Hence, commenting on Burke’s concept of metaphor, he broaches the idea of “representational equivalence” and “metaphorical equivalence” to espouse his version of the theory of translation that reminds us of Wilson’s and Ascham’s training program on rhetoric and translation. Robinson employs the image of “bridging” to

¹⁸ The text goes like this: “Poesy therefore is an art of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in the word *mimesis*—that is to say, a representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth—to speak metaphorically, a speaking picture—with this end, to teach and delight” (Greenblatt 2006: 958).

¹⁹ According to Burke, “character” refers to “anything, pattern, situation, structure, nature, person, object, act, role, process, event, etc” (503). Obviously, these terms belong to the realm of representation.

illustrate this theory, saying that this image would help us see more clearly the “representational connection with reality” when working with two texts composed of different languages (Robinson 1991: 136). His argument comes at a word, “supertrope,” implying a transcendental maneuvering of the metaphors, as we have already seen in humanist educators’ appropriation of this idea for their more fortunate audience who, according to historians, mostly derived from the wealthier classes:

[I]t is not surprising that the rough *imagistic equivalence* (between translation and a road, say) set up by metaphor runs roughly parallel to the rough *linguistic equivalence* aimed at by most Western translation. I want to argue, in fact, that metaphor is the supertrope driving the Western impulse toward *translational equivalence*: the attempt to bring two radically different texts, written in two different times and places, in two different languages, by two different people for two different cultures, into a mutually defining relationship. (Robinson 1991: 137, emphasis mine)

If this is true, then I would argue that the concept of translation in Renaissance England should be considered more profoundly significant than Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown are willing to inscribe in their essay on the “British Tradition” written for Mona Baker’s *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, published in 1998. Here they believe that, as opposed to bible translation, “secular translations” in Renaissance England were both about “the adequacy of the vernacular to transmit the riches of classical learning” and about promoting a patriotic act to improve the cultural position of the English nation (Baker 338-339). This view seems to have ignored the innate socio-cultural dimension of, to use Robinson, the representational translation promoted by the humanist educators.

Let’s enlist Greenblatt’s concept of translation to further differentiate the concept of translation in Renaissance England from today. For Greenblatt, self-fashioning has always since probably the dawn of human culture meant “a sense of personal order, a characteristic mode of address to the world, a structure of bounded desires—and always some elements of deliberate shaping in the formation and expression of identity” (1980: 1). But in his research, later characterized as “new-historical” by many literary historians, he discovers one interesting phenomenon that distinguishes the loss of “self-autonomy” of the Renaissance: “[I]n the sixteenth century,” he writes, contemplatively, “there appears to be an increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process” (2). And for the poets he studies he enumerates ten characteristics that he believes would impart the significance of “self-fashioning”—the impact of agency²⁰—to the motifs of their works. One of these he states thus: “Self-fashioning is always...in language” (9). Thinking of the fact that “men went to the

²⁰ Agency means a socio-cultural apparatus that has the primacy over the subject.

stake in the early sixteenth century over the rendering of certain Greek and Latin words” (Greenblatt 1980: 115), we begin to take the concept of translation in Renaissance England more seriously than ever.

The purpose of education has always been different in history, though mostly it was created to serve contemporary politics. In the Middle Ages, the purpose usually was theological, but the Renaissance changed it to the rhetorical, “from the training of priests and scholars,” says G. R. Elton, “to the training of accomplished gentlemen serving the state” (431). Take learning of Cicero for example. Reading and translating Cicero did not begin with the Renaissance, but what makes the difference, what makes the translation movement new, is “that it demanded intellectual attainments in the lay leaders of society” (431). In the age of Shakespeare, all through the age of Milton, literate people were expected to combine “classical learning with medieval knighthood,” to give language and politics a double-header for both advancing English culture and creating social mobility. The effect, as Elton argues, is that “it created the ideal of the gentleman, that powerful civilizing influence of the next 400 years” (431).

To give another example. Renaissance education was mainly about putting the aspiring young gentlemen’s linguistic expressions in both oral and written styles. It was a game of “verbal play”—at least this is how Richard A. Lanham styles it (2-3). Lanham further proposes the concept of “the rhetorical man,” the *homo rhetoricus*, saying “that rhetorical man must have felt an overpowering, self-consciousness about language...[whose] attention would fall, first and last if not always, on the verbal surface, on words not ideas. No matter about detail, about whether you had been taught to order your oration in seven parts, or five, four, three, or two...no matter whether there were four levels of style, three, or two. Much more important, you had been taught to look at language in a certain way. You would be nominalist to the end of your days. Whatever sins you might enregister, stylistic naivete would not be one” (3). Therefore, he says that “Rhetorical man is an actor; his reality public, dramatic.... The lowest common denominator of his life is a social situation. And his motivations must be characteristically ludic, agonistic.... Rhetorical man is trained not to discover reality but to manipulate it. Reality is what is accepted as reality, what is useful.... The rhetorical view of life, then, begins with the centrality of language” (4). Lanham’s observations of the rhetorical man remind one of what Derrida says of the function of a “name” in *Of Grammatology*: “[T]he name, especially the so-called proper name, is always caught in a chain or a system of differences” (89). The nominalist simply doesn’t care why and what signifiers have trapped him, because the signifieds, or the referents, are also signifiers anyway.

And as I have argued in the previous pages, the center of this linguistic reality is translation—a cultural activity that consumed the life and energy of generations of

intellectuals who attempted with their whole heart to absorb the alienness in the language that held them brain-captives. Rhetorical training, language training, translation training—they are one and the same thing for these rhetorical man. It seems that Benjamin's philosophy of "pure language" and Venuti's utopian "heterogeneous communities" can anachronistically help us peek at the concept of translation in Renaissance England, because if we blend them together, cross-referencing with literary commentators such as Bolgar, Manley, Greenblatt and social historians such as Elton and Wrighthson, we begin to understand the socio-cultural consciousness that moved Wilson's and Ascham's "translation program." We are thus finally reminded of the possible gist of Benjamin's "suprahistorical kinship of languages" that will correct "the hall mark of bad translation:"

Yet any translation which intends to perform a transmitting function cannot transmit anything but information—hence, something inessential. This is the hallmark of bad translation.... A real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not black its light, but allows the pure language, as reinforced by its own medium to shine upon the original all the more fully. This may be achieved, above all, by a literal rendering of the syntax which proves words rather than sentences to be the primary element of the translator. For if the sentence is the wall before the language of the original, literalness is the arcade. (Venuti 76-81)

And of Derrida's concept of "good translation" that stipulates

a translation that does what one expects of it, in short, a version that performs its mission, honors its debt and does its job or its duty while inscribing in the receiving language the most *relevant* equivalent for an original, the language that is the *most* right, appropriate, pertinent, adequate, opportune, pointed, univocal, idiomatic, and so on. The *most* possible, and this superlative puts us on the trail of an "economy" with which we shall have to reckon. (Venuti 426)

Works Cited

- “Rhetoric.” *Wikipedia*. Retrieved March 20, 2010 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rhetoric>.
- Adamson, John William. *Pioneers of Modern Education, 1600-1700*. 1905. Retrieved http://www.archive.org/stream/pioneersofmodern00adamiala/pioneersofmodern00adamiala_djvu.txt.
- Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster* (1570). Ed. Lawrence V. Ryan. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1967.
- Baker, Mona, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Baldwin, T. W. *Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 1944.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. London and New York: Clarendon P, 1993.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of the Age: A Biography of the Mind of William Shakespeare*. New York: Random House, 2009.
- Berry, Ralph. *Shakespeare and Social Class*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1988.
- Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate, Luise Von Flotow, and Luise Von Flotow-Evans. *The Politics of Translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, Vol. 233. Perspectives on translation, Vol. 233*. Eds. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Luise Von Flotow, and Daniel S. Russell. University of Ottawa Press, 2001.
- Boas, Frederick S. *Ovid and the Elizabethans*. London: The English Association, 1947.
- Bolgar, R. R. *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*. London: Cambridge at the UP, 1954.
- Bressler, Charles. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. Fourth Edition. Pearson Education, 2007.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1966.
- Clarke, John. *An Essay upon the Education of Youth in Grammar Schools*. 1720.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins, 1976; originally published in Paris as *De la Grammatologie* in 1967.
- Eagleson, Robert D. *A Shakespeare Glossary: C. T. Onions*. London & New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Ellis, Roger, and Liz Oakley-Brown. *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness*. Clevedon, UK: Cromwell, 2001.
- Ellis, Roger. *The Medieval translator 4*. Eds. Roger Ellis and Ruth Evans. *Medieval & Renaissance texts & studies, Vol. 123*. State University of New York, 1994.
- Elton, G. R. *England Under the Tudors*. New York: Routledge, 1955.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of

- Chicago P, 1980.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Eight Edition. New York: Norton, 2006.
- Harbage, Alfred. *Shakespeare's Audience*. New York & London: Columbia UP, 1941; rpt., 1969.
- Hardison, O. B. ed. *English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance*. London: Peter Owen, rpt. 1967.
- Harrison, George B. *England in Shakespeare's Day*. Second Edition. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1928.
- Hoole, C. *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole*. 1660.
- Krieger, Elliot. *A Marxist Study of Shakespeare's Comedies*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Kushner, Eva, and Paul Chavy. *Translation in the Renaissance*. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 8.2 (1981).
- Lanham, Richard A. *The Motives of Eloquence: Literary Rhetoric in the Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Morini, Massimiliano. "Sir John Harington and the Poetics of Tudor Translation." In Pincombe. 120-136.
- Neuhaus, Ronald LeRoy. *English Renaissance Translation*. University of Iowa, 1965
- Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*. Librairie Droz, 1984.
- Noss, Philip A. *A History of Bible Translation*. Edizioni de storia e letteratura, 2007
- Oakley-Brown, Liz. "Translating the Subject: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in England, 1560-7." In Ellis & Liz Oakley-Brown. 48-84.
- Oakley-Brown, Liz. *Ovid and Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate, 2006.
- Otis, Brooks. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.
- Perng, Huizung. "The Generic Influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* upon *The Faerie Queene*." Diss. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 1995.
- Perng, Huizung. *Shakespearean Ovidianism: A Sociocultural Study of the Comedies*. Taipei: Bookman, 2002.
- Pincombe, Mike, ed. *Travels and Translation in the Sixteenth Century: Selected Papers from the Second International Conference of the Tudor Symposium (2000)*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- Plato. *The Republic of Plato*. Trans. A. D. Lindsay. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1957.

- Polezzi, Loredana, Martin Stannard, and Greg Walker. *Translating Travel: Contemporary Italian Travel Writing in English Translation (Studies in European Cultural Transition, 12)*. Ashgate, 1999.
- Rand, Edward Kennard. *Ovid and His Influence*. Boston: Marshall Jones, 1925. Rpt. New York: Cooper Square, 1963. 108-56.
- Rashkow, Ilona Nemesnyik. *Upon the Dark Places: English Renaissance Biblical Translation*. University of Maryland, College Park, 1988.
- Robinson, Douglas. *The Translator's Turn*. The Johns Hopkins P, 1991.
- Robinson, Douglas, ed. *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome, 1997.
- Rose, Marilyn Gaddis. *Translation in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: the Survival of Culture*. Binghamton University, 2005.
- Seznec, Jean. *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*. Trans. Barbara F. Sessins. New York: Pantheon, 1953.
- Shanker, Sidney. *Shakespeare and the Uses of Ideology*. Paris: The Hague, 1975.
- Smith, G. Gregory, ed. *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Vol. I & II. London: Oxford UP, 1904.
- Solodow, Joseph B. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel: The U of North Carolina P, 1987.
- Tyler, Alexander Fraser. *Essays on the Principles of Translation (1790)*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research P, 2007.
- Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Walker, W. *Some Improvements of the Art of Teaching*. 1669.
- Warren, R. Michelle. "Medieval Translation and Postcolonial Theory." *21st-Century Approaches to Literature: Middle English*. Ed. Paul Strohm. Oxford UK: Oxford UP, forthcoming. March 15, 2010 <<http://www.btes.wisc.edu/Translation.pdf>>.
- Watson, Foster. *The English Grammar School to 1660*. London: Frank Cass, 1968.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique (1560)*. In *English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance*. Ed. O. B. Hardison. London: Peter Owen, rpt. 1967. 24-57.
- Wrightson, Keith. *English Society 1580-1680*. New York: Routledge, 1982.