CHAPTER EIGHT

PRINCIPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE

Since no two languages are identical, either in the meanings given to corresponding symbols or in the ways in which such symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences, it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence there can be no fully exact translations. The total impact of a translation may be reasonably close to the original, but there can be no identity in detail. Constance B. West (1932, p. 344) clearly states the problem: "Whoever takes upon himself to translate contracts a debt; to discharge it, he must pay not with the same money, but the same sum." One must not imagine that the process of translation can avoid a certain degree of interpretation by the translator. In fact, as D. G. Rossetti stated in 1874 (Fang, 1953), "A translation remains perhaps the most direct form of commentary."

Different Types of Translations

No statement of the principles of correspondence in translating can be complete without recognizing the many different types of translations (Herbert P. Phillips, 1959). Traditionally, we have tended to think in terms of free or paraphrastic translations as contrasted with close or literal ones. Actually, there are many more grades of translating than these extremes imply. There are, for example, such ultraliteral translations as interlinears; while others involve highly concordant relationships, e.g. the same source-language word is always translated by one—and only one—receptor-language word. Still others may be quite devoid of artificial restrictions in form, but nevertheless may be overtraditional and even archaizing. Some translations aim at very close formal and semantic correspondence, but are generously supplied with notes and commentary. Many are not so much concerned with giving information as with creating in the reader something of the same mood as was conveyed by the original.

Differences in translations can generally be accounted for by three basic factors in translating: (1) the nature of the message, (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and (3) the type of audience.

Messages differ primarily in the degree to which content or form is the dominant consideration. Of course, the content of a message can never be completely abstracted from the form, and form is nothing apart from content; but in some messages the content is of primary consideration, and in others the form must be given a higher priority. For example, in the Sermon on the Mount, despite certain important stylistic qualities,

the importance of the message far exceeds considerations of form. On the other hand, some of the acrostic poems of the Old Testament are obviously designed to fit a very strict formal "strait jacket." But even the contents of a message may differ widely in applicability to the receptor-language audience. For example, the folk tale of the Bauré Indians of Bolivia, about a giant who led the animals in a symbolic dance, is interesting to an English-speaking audience, but to them it has not the same relevance as the Sermon on the Mount. And even the Bauré Indians themselves recognize the Sermon on the Mount as more significant than their favorite "how-it-happened" story. At the same time, of course, the Sermon on the Mount has greater relevance to these Indians than have some passages in Leviticus.

In poetry there is obviously a greater focus of attention upon formal elements than one normally finds in prose. Not that content is necessarily sacrificed in translation of a poem, but the content is necessarily constricted into certain formal molds. Only rarely can one reproduce both content and form in a translation, and hence in general the form is usually sacrificed for the sake of the content. On the other hand, a lyric poem translated as prose is not an adequate equivalent of the original. Though it may reproduce the conceptual content, it falls far short of reproducing the emotional intensity and flavor. However, the translating of some types of poetry by prose may be dictated by important cultural considerations. For example, Homer's epic poetry reproduced in English poetic form usually seems to us antique and queer—with nothing of the liveliness and spontaneity characteristic of Homer's style. One reason is that we are not accustomed to having stories told to us in poetic form. In our Western European tradition such epics are related in prose. For this reason E. V. Rieu chose prose rather than poetry as the more appropriate medium by which to render The Iliad and The Odyssey.

The particular purposes of the translator are also important factors in dictating the type of translation. Of course, it is assumed that the translator has purposes generally similar to, or at least compatible with, those of the original author, but this is not necessarily so. For example, a San Blas story-teller is interested only in amusing his audience, but an ethnographer who sets about translating such stories may be much more concerned in giving his audience an insight into San Blas personality structure. Since, however, the purposes of the translator are the primary ones to be considered in studying the types of translation which result, the principal purposes that underlie the choice of one or another way to render a particular message are important.

The primary purpose of the translator may be information as to both content and form. One intended type of response to such an informative type of translation is largely cognitive, e.g. an ethnographer's translation of texts from informants, or a philosopher's translation of Heidegger. A largely informative translation may, on the other hand, be designed to elicit an emotional response of pleasure from the reader or listener.

A translator's purposes may involve much more than information. He may, for example, want to suggest a particular type of behavior by means

of a translation. Under such circumstances he is likely to aim at full intelligibility, and to make certain minor adjustments in detail so that the reader may understand the full implications of the message for his own circumstances. In such a situation a translator is not content to have receptors say, "This is intelligible to us." Rather, he is looking for some such response as, "This is meaningful for us." In terms of Bible translating, the people might understand a phrase such as 'to change one's mind about sin' as meaning "repentance." But if the indigenous way of talking about repentance is "spit on the ground in front of," as in Shilluk,[1] spoken in the Sudan, the translator will obviously aim at the more meaningful idiom. On a similar basis, "white as snow" may be rendered as 'white as egret feathers', if the people of the receptor language are not acquainted with snow but speak of anything very white by this phrase.

A still greater degree of adaptation is likely to occur in a translation which has an imperative purpose. Here the translator feels constrained not merely to suggest a possible line of behavior, but to make such an action explicit and compelling. He is not content to translate in such a way that the people are likely to understand; rather, he insists that the translation must be so clear that no one can possibly misunderstand.

In addition to the different types of messages and the diverse purposes of translators, one must also consider the extent to which prospective audiences differ both in decoding ability and in potential interest.

Decoding ability in any language involves at least four principal levels: (1) the capacity of children, whose vocabulary and cultural experience are limited; (2) the double-standard capacity of new literates, who can decode oral messages with facility but whose ability to decode written messages is limited; (3) the capacity of the average literate adult, who can handle both oral and written messages with relative ease; and (4) the unusually high capacity of specialists (doctors, theologians, philosophers, scientists, etc.), when they are decoding messages within their own area of specialization. Obviously a translation designed for children cannot be the same as one prepared for specialists, nor can a translation for children be the same as one for a newly literate adult.

Prospective audiences differ not only in decoding ability, but perhaps even more in their interests. For example, a translation designed to stimulate reading for pleasure will be quite different from one intended for a person anxious to learn how to assemble a complicated machine. Moreover, a translator of African myths for persons who simply want to satisfy their curiosity about strange peoples and places will produce a different piece of work from one who renders these same myths in a form acceptable to linguists, who are more interested in the linguistic structure underlying the translation than in cultural novelty.

[1] This idiom is based upon the requirement that plaintiffs and defendants spit on the ground in front of each other when a case has been finally tried and punishment meted out. The spitting indicates that all is forgiven and that the accusations can never be brought into court again.

Two Basic Orientations in Translating

Since "there are, properly speaking, no such things as identical equivalents" (Belloc, 1931a and b, p. 37), one must in translating seek to find the closest possible equivalent. However, there are fundamentally two different types of equivalence: one which may be called formal and another which is primarily dynamic.

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness.

The type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a "gloss translation," in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original. Such a translation might be a rendering of some Medieval French text into English, intended for students of certain aspects of early French literature not requiring a knowledge of the original language of the text. Their needs call for a relatively close approximation to the structure of the early French text, both as to form (e.g. syntax and idioms) and content (e.g. themes and concepts). Such a translation would require numerous footnotes in order to make the text fully comprehensible.

A gloss translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. For example, a phrase such as "holy kiss" (Romans 16:16) in a gloss translation would be rendered literally, and would probably be supplemented with a footnote explaining that this was a customary method of greeting in New Testament times.

In contrast, a translation which attempts to produce a dynamic rather than a formal equivalence is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (Rieu and Phillips, 1954). In such a translation one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship (mentioned in Chapter 7), that the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message.

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message. Of course, there are varying degrees of such dynamic-equivalence translations. One of the modern English trans-

lations which, perhaps more than any other, seeks for equivalent effect is J. B. Phillips' rendering of the New Testament. In Romans 16:16 he quite naturally translates "greet one another with a holy kiss" as "give one another a hearty handshake all around."

Between the two poles of translating (i.e. between strict formal equivalence and complete dynamic equivalence) there are a number of intervening grades, representing various acceptable standards of literary translating. During the past fifty years, however, there has been a marked shift of emphasis from the formal to the dynamic dimension. A recent summary of opinion on translating by literary artists, publishers, educators, and professional translators indicates clearly that the present direction is toward increasing emphasis on dynamic equivalences (Cary, 1959b).

Linguistic and Cultural Distance

In any discussion of equivalences, whether structural or dynamic, one must always bear in mind three different types of relatedness, as determined by the linguistic and cultural distance between the codes used to convey the messages. In some instances, for example, a translation may involve comparatively closely related languages and cultures, e.g. translations from Frisian into English, or from Hebrew into Arabic. On the other hand, the languages may not be related, even though the cultures are closely parallel, e.g. as in translations from German into Hungarian, or from Swedish into Finnish (German and Swedish are Indo-European languages, while Hungarian and Finnish belong to the Finno-Ugrian family). In still other instances a translation may involve not only differences of linguistic affiliation but also highly diverse cultures, e.g. English into Zulu, or Greek into Javanese.[1]

Where the linguistic and cultural distances between source and receptor codes are least, one should expect to encounter the least number of serious problems, but as a matter of fact if languages are too closely related one is likely to be badly deceived by the superficial similarities, with the result that translations done under these circumstances are often quite poor. One of the serious dangers consists of so-called "false friends," i.e. borrowed or cognate words which seem to be equivalent but are not always so, e.g. English *demand* and French *demander*, English *ignore* and Spanish *ignorar*, English *virtue* and Latin *virtus*, and English *deacon* and Greek *diakonos*.

When the cultures are related but the languages are quite different, the translator is called upon to make a good many formal shifts in the translation. However, the cultural similarities in such instances usually

[1] We also encounter certain rare situations in which the languages are related but the cultures are quite disparate. For example, in the case of Hindi and English one is dealing with two languages from the same language family, but the cultures in question are very different. In such instances, the languages are also likely to be so distantly related as to make their linguistic affiliation a matter of minor consequence.

provide a series of parallelisms of content that make the translation proportionately much less difficult than when both languages and cultures are disparate. In fact, differences between cultures cause many more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure.

Definitions of Translating

Definitions of proper translating are almost as numerous and varied as the persons who have undertaken to discuss the subject. This diversity is in a sense quite understandable; for there are vast differences in the materials translated, in the purposes of the publication, and in the needs of the prospective audience. Moreover, live languages are constantly changing and stylistic preferences undergo continual modification. Thus a translation acceptable in one period is often quite unacceptable at a later time.

A number of significant and relatively comprehensive definitions of translation have been offered. Procházka (Garvin, 1955, pp. 111 ff.) defines a good translation in terms of certain requirements which must be made of the translator, namely: (1) "He must understand the original word thematically and stylistically"; (2) "he must overcome the differences between the two linguistic structures"; and (3) "he must reconstruct the stylistic structures of the original work in his translation."

In a description of proper translation of poetry, Jackson Mathews (1959, p. 67) states: "One thing seems clear: to translate a poem whole is to compose another poem. A whole translation will be faithful to the *matter*, and it will 'approximate the form' of the original; and it will have a life of its own, which is the voice of the translator." Richmond Lattimore (1959, in Brower, 1959, p. 56) deals with the same basic problem of translating poetry. He describes the fundamental principles in terms of the way in which Greek poetry should be translated, namely: "to make from the Greek poem a poem in English which, while giving a high minimum of meaning of the Greek, is still a new English poem, which would not be the kind of poem it is if it were not translating the Greek which it translates."

No proper definition of translation can avoid some of the basic difficulties. Especially in the rendering of poetry, the tension between form and content and the conflict between formal and dynamic equivalences are always acutely present. However, it seems to be increasingly recognized that adherence to the letter may indeed kill the spirit. William A. Cooper (1928, p. 484) deals with this problem rather realistically in his article on "Translating Goethe's Poems," in which he says: "If the language of the original employs word formations that give rise to insurmountable difficulties of direct translation, and figures of speech wholly foreign, and hence incomprehensible in the other tongue, it is better to cling to the spirit of the poem and clothe it in language and figures entirely free from awkwardness of speech and obscurity of picture. This might be called a translation from culture to culture."

It must be recognized that in translating poetry there are very special

problems involved, for the form of expression (rhythm, meter, assonance, etc.) is essential to communicating the spirit of the message to the audience. But all translating, whether of poetry or prose, must be concerned also with the response of the receptor; hence the ultimate purpose of the translation, in terms of its impact upon its intended audience, is a fundamental factor in any evaluation of translations. This reason underlies Leonard Forster's definition (1958, p. 6) of a good translation as "one which fulfills the same purpose in the new language as the original did in the language in which it was written."

The resolution of the conflict between literalness of form and equivalence of response seems increasingly to favor the latter, especially in the translating of poetic materials. C. W. Orr (1941, p. 318), for example, describes translating as somewhat equivalent to painting, for, as he says, "the painter does not reproduce every detail of the landscape"—he selects what seems best to him. Likewise for the translator, "It is the spirit, not only the letter, that he seeks to embody in his own version." Oliver Edwards (1957b, p. 13) echoes the same point of view: "We expect approximate truth in a translation .... What we want to have is the truest possible *feel* of the original. The characters, the situations, the reflections must come to us as they were in the author's mind and heart, not necessarily precisely as he had them on his lips."

It is one thing, however, to produce a generalized definition of translating, whether of poetry or prose; it is often quite another to describe in some detail the significant characteristics of an adequate translation. This fact Savory (1957, pp. 49-50) highlights by contrasting diametrically opposed opinions on a dozen important principles of translating. However, though some dissenting voices can be found on virtually all proposals as to what translating should consist of, there are several significant features of translating on which many of the most competent judges are increasingly in agreement.

Ezra Pound (1954, p. 273) states the case for translations making sense by declaring for "more sense and less syntax." But as early as 1789 George Campbell (1789, pp. 445 ff.) argued that translation should not be characterized by "obscure sense." E. E. Milligan (1957) also argues for sense rather than words, for he points out that unless a translation communicates, i.e. makes sense to the receptor, it has not justified its existence.

In addition to making sense, translations must also convey the "spirit and manner" of the original (Campbell, 1789, pp. 445 ff.). For the Bible translator, this means that the individual style of the various writers of the Scriptures should be reflected as far as possible (Campbell, 1789, p. 547). The same sentiment is clearly expressed by Ruth M. Underhill (1938, p. 16) in her treatment of certain problems of translating magic incantations of the Papago Indians of southern Arizona: "One can hope to make the translation exact only in spirit, not in letter." Francis Storr (1909) goes so far as to classify translators into "the literalist and the spiritualist schools," and in doing so takes his stand on the Biblical text, "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." As evidence for his thesis,

Storr cites the difference between the Authorized Version, which he contends represents the spirit, and the English Revised Version, which sticks to the letter, with the result that the translation lacks a *Sprachgefühl*. The absence of literary stylists on the English Revised Committee was, however, corrected in the New English Bible (New Testament, 1961), in which one entire panel was composed of persons with special sensitivity to and competence in English style.

Closely related to the requirement of sensitivity to the style of the original is the need for a "natural and easy" form of expression in the language into which one is translating (Campbell, 1789, pp. 445 ff.). Max Beerbohm (1903, p. 75) considers that the cardinal fault of many who translate plays into English is the failure to be natural in expression; in fact, they make the reader "acutely conscious that their work is a translation .... For the most part, their ingenuity consists in finding phrases that could not possibly be used by the average Englishman." Goodspeed (1945, p. 8) echoes the same sentiment with respect to Bible translating by declaring that: "The best translation is not one that keeps forever before the reader's mind the fact that this is a translation, not an original English composition, but one that makes the reader forget that it is a translation at all and makes him feel that he is looking into the ancient writer's mind, as he would into that of a contemporary. This is, indeed, no light matter to undertake or to execute, but it is, nevertheless, the task of any serious translator." J. B. Phillips (1953, p. 53) confirms the same viewpoint when he declares that: "The test of a real translation is that it should not read like translation at all." His second principle of translating re-enforces the first, namely a translation into English should avoid "translator's English."

It must be recognized, however, that it is not easy to produce a completely natural translation, especially if the original writing is good literature, precisely because truly good writing intimately reflects and effectively exploits the total idiomatic capacities and special genius of the language in which the writing is done. A translator must therefore not only contend with the special difficulties resulting from such an effective exploitation of the total resources of the source language, but also seek to produce something relatively equivalent in the receptor language. In fact, Justin O'Brien (1959, p. 81) quotes Raymond Guérin to the effect that: "the most convincing criterion of the quality of a work is the fact that it can only be translated with difficulty, for if it passes readily into another language without losing its essence, then it must have no particular essence or at least not one of the rarest."

An easy and natural style in translating, despite the extreme difficulties of producing it—especially when translating an original of high quality—is nevertheless essential to producing in the ultimate receptors a response similar to that of the original receptors. In one way or another this principle of "similar response" has been widely held and effectively stated by a number of specialists in the field of translating. Even though Matthew Arnold (1861, as quoted in Savory, 1957, p. 45) himself rejected in actual practice the principle of "similar response," he at least seems to

have thought he was producing a similar response, for he declares that: "A translation should affect us in the same way as the original may be supposed to have affected its first hearers." Despite Arnold's objection to some of the freer translations done by others, he was at least strongly opposed to the literalist views of such persons as F. W. Newman (1861, p. xiv). Jowett (1891), on the other hand, comes somewhat closer to a present-day conception of "similar response" in stating that: "an English translation ought to be idiomatic and interesting, not only to the scholar, but to the learned reader .... The translator ... seeks to produce on his reader an impression similar or nearly similar to that produced by the original."

Souter (1920, p. 7) expresses essentially this same view in stating that: "Our ideal in translation is to produce on the minds of our readers as nearly as possible the same effect as was produced by the original on its readers," and R. A. Knox (1957, p. 5) insists that a translation should be "read with the same interest and enjoyment which a reading of the original would have afforded."

In dealing with translating from an essentially linguistic point of view, Procházka (in Garvin, 1955) re-enforces this same viewpoint, namely, that "the translation should make the same resultant impression on the reader as the original does on its reader."

If a translation is to meet the four basic requirements of (1) making sense, (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original, (3) having a natural and easy form of expression, and (4) producing a similar response, it is obvious that at certain points the conflict between content and form (or meaning and manner) will be acute, and that one or the other must give way. In general, translators are agreed that, when there is no happy compromise, meaning must have priority over style (Tancock, 1958, p. 29). What one must attempt, however, is an effective blend of "matter and manner," for these two aspects of any message are inseparably united. Adherence to content, without consideration of form, usually results in a flat mediocrity, with nothing of the sparkle and charm of the original. On the other hand, sacrifice of meaning for the sake of reproducing the style may produce only an impression, and fail to communicate the message. The form, however, may be changed more radically than the content and still be substantially equivalent in its effect upon the receptor. Accordingly, correspondence in meaning must have priority over correspondence in style. However, this assigning of priorities must never be done in a purely mechanical fashion, for what is ultimately required, especially in the translation of poetry, is "a re-creation, not a reproduction" (Lattimore, in Brower, 1959, p. 55).

Any survey of opinions on translating serves to confirm the fact that definitions or descriptions of translating are not served by deterministic rules; rather, they depend on probabilistic rules. One cannot, therefore, state that a particular translation is good or bad without taking into consideration a myriad of factors, which in turn must be weighted in a number of different ways, with appreciably different answers. Hence there will always be a variety of valid answers to the question, "Is this a good translation?"

Principles Governing a Translation Oriented toward Formal-Equivalence

In order to understand somewhat more fully the characteristics of different types of translations, it is important to analyze in more detail the principles that govern a translation which attempts to reproduce a formal equivalence. Such a formal-equivalence (or F-E) translation is basically source-oriented; that is, it is designed to reveal as much as possible of the form and content of the original message.

In doing so, an F-E translation attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, and (3) meanings in terms of the source context. The reproduction of grammatical units may consist in: (a) translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, etc.; (b) keeping all phrases and sentences intact (i.e. not splitting up and readjusting the units); and (c) preserving all formal indicators, e.g. marks of punctuation, paragraph breaks, and poetic indentation.

In attempting to reproduce consistency in word usage, an F-E translation usually aims at so-called concordance of terminology; that is, it always renders a particular term in the source-language document by the corresponding term in the receptor document. Such a principle may, of course, be pushed to an absurd extent, with the result being relatively meaningless strings of words, as in some passages of the so-called Concordant Version of the New Testament. On the other hand, a certain degree of concordance may be highly desirable in certain types of F-E translating. For example, a reader of Plato's Dialogues in English may prefer rigid consistency in the rendering of key terms (as in Jowett's translation), so that he may have some comprehension of the way in which Plato uses certain word symbols to develop his philosophical system. An F-E translation may also make use of brackets, parentheses, or even italics (as in the King James Bible) for words added to make sense in the translation, but missing in the original document.

In order to reproduce meanings in terms of the source context, an F-E translation normally attempts not to make adjustments in idioms, but rather to reproduce such expressions more or less literally, so that the reader may be able to perceive something of the way in which the original document employed local cultural elements to convey meanings.

In many instances, however, one simply cannot reproduce certain formal elements of the source message. For example, there may be puns, chiasmic orders of words, instances of assonance, or acrostic features of line-initial sounds which completely defy equivalent rendering. In such instances one must employ certain types of marginal notes, if the feature in question merits an explanation. In some rare instances one does light upon a roughly equivalent pun or play on words. For example, in translating the Hebrew text of Genesis 2:23, in which the Hebrew word *isshah* 'woman' is derived from *ish* 'man,' it is possible to use a corresponding English pair, *woman* and *man*. However, such formal correspondences

are obviously rare, for languages generally differ radically in both content and form.

A consistent F-E translation will obviously contain much that is not readily intelligible to the average reader. One must therefore usually supplement such translations with marginal notes, not only to explain some of the formal features which could not be adequately represented, but also to make intelligible some of the formal equivalents employed, for such expressions may have significance only in terms of the source language or culture.

Some types of strictly F-E translations, e.g. interlinear renderings and completely concordant translations, are of limited value; others are of great value. For example, translations of foreign-language texts prepared especially for linguists rarely attempt anything but close F-E renderings. In such translations the wording is usually quite literal, and even the segments are often numbered so that the corresponding units may be readily compared.

From what has been said directly and indirectly about F-E translations in preceding sections, it might be supposed that such translations are categorically ruled out. To the contrary, they are often perfectly valid translations of certain types of messages for certain types of audiences. The relative value and effectiveness of particular types of translations for particular audiences pose another question, and must not be confused with a description of the nature of various kinds of translations. At this point we are concerned only with their essential features, not with their evaluation.

Principles Governing Translations Oriented toward Dynamic Equivalence

In contrast with formal-equivalence translations others are oriented toward dynamic equivalence. In such a translation the focus of attention is directed, not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response. A dynamic-equivalence (or D-E) translation may be described as one concerning which a bilingual and bicultural person can justifiably say, "That is just the way we would say it." It is important to realize, however, that a D-E translation is not merely another message which is more or less similar to that of the source. It is a translation, and as such must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source.

One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message." This type of definition contains three essential terms: (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message, (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.

However, since a D-E translation is directed primarily toward equivalence of response rather than equivalence of form, it is important to define more fully the implications of the word *natural* as applied to such translations. Basically, the word *natural* is applicable to three areas of

the communication process; for a *natural* rendering must fit (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole, (2) the context of the particular message, and (3) the receptor-language audience.

The conformance of a translation to the receptor language and culture as a whole is an essential ingredient in any stylistically acceptable rendering. Actually this quality of linguistic appropriateness is usually noticeable only when it is absent. In a natural translation, therefore, those features which would mar it are conspicuous by their absence. J. H. Frere (1820, p. 481) has described such a quality by stating, "the language of translation ought, we think, . . . be a pure, impalpable and invisible element, the medium of thought and feeling and nothing more; it ought never to attract attention to itself . . . . All importations from foreign languages . . . are . . . to be avoided." Such an adjustment to the receptor language and culture must result in a translation that bears no obvious trace of foreign origin, so that, as G. A. Black (1936, p. 50) describes James Thomson's translations of Heine, such renderings are "a reproduction of the original, such as Heine himself, if master of the English language, would have given."

A natural translation involves two principal areas of adaptation, namely, grammar and lexicon. In general the grammatical modifications can be made the more readily, since many grammatical changes are dictated by the obligatory structures of the receptor language. That is to say, one is obliged to make such adjustments as shifting word order, using verbs in place of nouns, and substituting nouns for pronouns. The lexical structure of the source message is less readily adjusted to the semantic requirements of the receptor language, for instead of obvious rules to be followed, there are numerous alternative possibilities. There are in general three lexical levels to be considered: (1) terms for which there are readily available parallels, e.g. *river, tree, stone, knife*, etc.; (2) terms which identify culturally different objects, but with somewhat similar functions, e.g. *book*, which in English means an object with pages bound together into a unit, but which, in New Testament times, meant a long parchment or papyrus rolled up in the form of a scroll; and (3) terms which identify cultural specialties, e.g. *synagogue, homer, ephah, cherubim*, and *jubilee*, to cite only a few from the Bible. Usually the first set of terms involves no problem. In the second set of terms several confusions can arise; hence one must either use another term which reflects the form of the referent, though not the equivalent function, or which identifies the equivalent function at the expense of formal identity. The basic problem is treated later in this chapter. In translating terms of the third class certain "foreign associations" can rarely be avoided. No translation that attempts to bridge a wide cultural gap can hope to eliminate all traces of the foreign setting. For example, in Bible translating it is quite impossible to remove such foreign "objects" as *Pharisees, Sadducees, Solomon's temple, cities of refuge*, or such Biblical themes as *anointing, adulterous generation, living sacrifice*, and *Lamb of God*, for these expressions are deeply imbedded in the very thought structure of the message.

It is inevitable also that when source and receptor languages represent very different cultures there should be many basic themes and accounts which cannot be "naturalized" by the process of translating. For example, the Jivaro Indians of Ecuador certainly do not understand 1 Corinthians 11:14, "Does not nature teach us that for a man to wear long hair is a dishonor to him?", for in general Jivaro men let their hair grow long, while Jivaro adult women usually cut theirs rather close. Similarly, in many areas of West Africa the behavior of Jesus' disciples in spreading leaves and branches in his way as he rode into Jerusalem is regarded as reprehensible; for in accordance with West African custom the path to be walked on or ridden over by a chief is scrupulously cleaned of all litter, and anyone who throws a branch in such a person's way is guilty of grievous insult. Nevertheless, these cultural discrepancies offer less difficulty than might be imagined, especially if footnotes are used to point out the basis for the cultural diversity; for all people recognize that other peoples behave differently from themselves.

Naturalness of expression in the receptor language is essentially a problem of co-suitability—but on several levels, of which the most important are as follows: (1) word classes (e.g. if there is no noun for "love" one must often say, 'God loves' instead of 'God is love'); (2) grammatical categories (in some languages so-called predicate nominatives must agree in number with the subject, so that 'the two shall be one' cannot be said, and accordingly, one must say 'the two persons shall act just as though they are one person'); (3) semantic classes (swear words in one language may be based upon the perverted use of divine names, but in another language may be primarily excremental and anatomical); (4) discourse types (some languages may require direct quotation and others indirect); and (5) cultural contexts (in some societies the New Testament practice of sitting down to teach seems strange, if not unbecoming).

In addition to being appropriate to the receptor language and culture, a natural translation must be in accordance with the context of the particular message. The problems are thus not restricted to gross grammatical and lexical features, but may also involve such detailed matters as intonation and sentence rhythm (Ezra Pound, 1954, p. 298). The trouble is that, "Fettered to mere words, the translator loses the spirit of the original author" (Manchester, 1951, p. 68).

A truly natural translation can in some respects be described more easily in terms of what it avoids than in what it actually states; for it is the presence of serious anomalies, avoided in a successful translation, which immediately strike the reader as being out of place in the context. For example, crude vulgarities in a supposedly dignified type of discourse are inappropriate, and as a result are certainly not natural. But vulgarities are much less of a problem than slang or colloquialisms. Stanley Newman (1955) deals with this problem of levels of vocabulary in his analysis of sacred and slang language in Zuñi, and points out that a term such as *melika*, related to English *American*, is not appropriate for the religious atmosphere of the kiva. Rather, one must speak of Americans by means of a Zuñi expression meaning, literally, 'broad-hats'. For the Zuñis, uttering *melika* in a kiva ceremony would be as out of place as bringing a radio into such a meeting.

Onomatopoeic expressions are considered equivalent to slang by the speakers of some languages. In some languages in Africa, for example, certain highly imitative expressions (sometimes called ideophones) have been ruled out as inappropriate to the dignified context of the Bible. Undoubtedly the critical attitudes of some missionary translators toward such vivid, but highly colloquial, forms of expression have contributed to the feeling of many Africans that such words are inappropriate in Biblical contexts. In some languages, however, such onomatopoeic usages are not only highly developed, but are regarded as essential and becoming in any type of discourse. For example, Waiwai, a language of British Guiana, uses such expressions with great frequency, and without them one can scarcely communicate the emotional tone of the message, for they provide the basic signals for understanding the speaker's attitude toward the events he narrates.

Some translators are successful in avoiding vulgarisms and slang, but fall into the error of making a relatively straightforward message in the source language sound like a complicated legal document in the receptor language by trying too hard to be completely unambiguous; as a result such a translator spins out his definitions in long, technical phrases. In such a translation little is left of the grace and naturalness of the original.

Anachronisms are another means of violating the co-suitability of message and context. For example, a Bible translation into English which used "iron oxide" in place of "rust" would be technically correct, but certainly anachronistic. On the other hand, to translate "heavens and earth" by "universe" in Genesis 1:1 is not so radical a departure as one might think, for the people of the ancient world had a highly developed concept of an organized system comprising the "heavens and the earth," and hence "universe" is not inappropriate. Anachronisms involve two types of errors: (1) using contemporary words which falsify life at historically different periods, e.g. translating "demon possessed" as "mentally distressed," and (2) using old-fashioned language in the receptor language and hence giving an impression of unreality.

Appropriateness of the message within the context is not merely a matter of the referential content of the words. The total impression of a message consists not merely in the objects, events, abstractions, and relationships symbolized by the words, but also in the stylistic selection and arrangement of such symbols. Moreover, the standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse differ radically from language to language. What is entirely appropriate in Spanish, for example, may turn out to be quite unacceptable "purple prose" in English, and the English prose we admire as dignified and effective often seems in Spanish to be colorless, insipid, and flat. Many Spanish literary artists take delight in the flowery elegance of their language, while most English writers prefer bold realism, precision, and movement.

It is essential not only that a translation avoid certain obvious failures to adjust the message to the context, but also that it incorporate certain positive elements of style which provide the proper emotional tone for the discourse. This emotional tone must accurately reflect the point of view of the author. Thus such elements as sarcasm, irony, or whimsical interest must all be accurately reflected in a D-E translation. Furthermore, it is essential that each participant introduced into the message be accurately represented. That is to say, individuals must be properly characterized by the appropriate selection and arrangement of words, so that such features as social class or geographical dialect will be immediately evident. Moreover, each character must be permitted to have the same kind of individuality and personality as the author himself gave them in the original message.

A third element in the naturalness of a D-E translation is the extent to which the message fits the receptor-language audience. This appropriateness must be judged on the basis of the level of experience and the capacity for decoding, if one is to aim at any real dynamic equivalence. On the other hand, one is not always sure how the original audience responded or were supposed to respond. Bible translators, for example, have often made quite a point of the fact that the language of the New Testament was Koine Greek, the language of "the man in the street," and hence a translation should speak to the man in the street. The truth of the matter is that many New Testament messages were not directed primarily to the man in the street, but to the man in the congregation. For this reason, such expressions as "Abba Father," *Maranatha*, and "baptized into Christ" could be used with reasonable expectation that they would be understood.

A translation which aims at dynamic equivalence inevitably involves a number of formal adjustments, for one cannot have his formal cake and eat it dynamically too. Something must give! In general, this limitation involves three principal areas: (1) special literary forms, (2) semantically exocentric expressions, and (3) intraorganismic meanings.

The translating of poetry obviously involves more adjustments in literary form than does prose, for rhythmic forms differ far more radically in form, and hence in esthetic appeal. As a result, certain rhythmic patterns must often be substituted for others, as when Greek dactylic hexameter is translated in iambic pentameter. Moreover, some of the most acceptable translating of rhymed verse is accomplished by substituting free verse. In Bible translating the usual procedure is to attempt a kind of dignified prose where the original employs poetry, since, in general, Biblical content is regarded as much more important than Biblical form.

When semantically exocentric phrases in the source language are meaningless or misleading if translated literally into the receptor language, one is obliged to make some adjustments in a D-E translation. For example, the Semitic idiom "gird up the loins of your mind" may mean nothing more than 'put a belt around the hips of your thoughts' if translated literally. Under such circumstances one must change from an exocentric to an endocentric type of expression, e.g. 'get ready in your thinking'. Moreover, an idiom may not be merely meaningless, but may even convey quite the wrong meaning, in which case it must also be modified. Often, for example, a simile may be substituted for the original metaphor, e.g. "sons of thunder" may become 'men like thunder'.

Intraorganismic meanings suffer most in the process of translating, for they depend so largely upon the total cultural context of the language in which they are used, and hence are not readily transferable to other language-culture contexts. In the New Testament, for example, the word *tapeinos*, usually translated as 'humble' or 'lowly' in English, had very definite emotive connotations in the Greek world, where it carried the pejorative meanings of 'low', 'humiliated', 'degraded', 'mean', and 'base'. However, the Christians, who came principally from the lower strata of society, adopted as a symbol of an important Christian virtue this very term, which had been used derisively of the lower classes. Translations of the New Testament into English cannot expect to carry all the latent emotive meanings in the Greek word. Similarly, such translations as 'anointed', 'Messiah', and 'Christ' cannot do full justice to the Greek *Christos*, which had associations intimately linked with the hopes and aspirations of the early Judeo-Christian community. Such emotive elements of meaning need not be related solely to terms of theological import. They apply to all levels of vocabulary. In French, for example, there is no term quite equivalent to English *home*, in contrast with *house*, and in English nothing quite like French *foyer*, which in many respects is like English *home*, but also means 'hearth' and 'fireside' as well as 'focus' and 'salon of a theater'. Emotively, the English word *home* is close to French *foyer*, but referentially *home* is usually equivalent to *maison*, *habitation*, and *chez* (followed by an appropriate pronoun).

Areas of Tension between Formal-Equivalence and Dynamic-Equivalence Translations

In view of the fact that F-E and D-E translations represent polar distinctions, it is quite understandable that there are certain areas of tension between them. The problems are not too acute in dealing with distinctly contrastive types of translations, but when the principles governing some particular translation are about halfway between the extremes, the conflicting factors produce real difficulties. Under such circumstances the three principal areas of tension may be described as: (1) formal and functional equivalents, (2) optional and obligatory equivalents, and (3) rate of decodability.

In three principal situations a conflict occurs between formal and functional equivalents. First, there may be no object or event in the receptor culture which corresponds to some referent in the source text, but the equivalent function is realized by another object or event. For example, people may have no experience of snow, and hence no word for it, but they may have a phrase such as 'white as kapok down' which is functionally equivalent to 'white as snow'. Similarly, some people may

not be able to understand a phrase such as 'wagging their heads' as a sign of derision, since for them this function is expressed by 'spitting'. Secondly, one may find that the receptor culture does possess almost the same object or event as is mentioned in the source message, but in the receptor culture it may have an entirely different function. In Western European languages, for example, we use the 'heart' as the center of the emotions and as the focal element in the personality; but in many other languages the 'heart' may have nothing to do with the emotions. Rather, one must speak of the 'liver', 'abdomen', or 'gall'. Again, in some instances one finds no equivalent, either formal or functional. Some of the Indian tribes in South America, for example, know nothing of gambling, and hence have no words for objects with which to cast lots or even for the process of selecting by chance. In other areas there are no such objects as crowns, and nothing that parallels either the victor's wreath or the ruler's diadem.

There are four principal means of dealing with problems arising out of conflicts between formal and functional equivalents. First, one may place a term for the formal equivalent in the text of the translation and describe the function in a footnote—a characteristic procedure in an F-E translation. Second, one may place the functional equivalent in the text, with or without identifying the formal referent in the margin—the usual procedure in D-E translations. Third, one may use a borrowed term, with or without a descriptive classifier. *Pharisees*, for example, may be borrowed from the source language, but an added word such as 'sect', to be employed in a phrase such as 'sect called Pharisees', helps to provide a clue to the meaning of the borrowed word. One may also borrow so-called common nouns and add classifiers, e.g. 'jewel ruby', and 'cloth linen'. Fourth, it is possible to use descriptive expressions employing only words of the receptor language, so that a term such as *phylacteries*, in place of being borrowed (as it is so often in F-E translations), is rendered by a descriptive equivalent, e.g. 'small leather bundles with holy words in them', as is done in Navajo.

The principles governing the choice of one or another of these alternatives depend upon a number of factors. For one thing, the degree of sophistication of the receptors influences the extent to which one can use functional equivalents. In this connection it is important to note that so-called primitive peoples, whom we would regard as entirely unsophisticated, are usually quite ready to accept radical departures in the direction of functional rather than formal equivalents. Similarly, highly educated people in the Western world will gladly accept such far-reaching alterations. But partially educated persons, whether in folk or civilized societies, appear to have difficulty with anything but the most literal renderings, for their newly acquired respect for "book learning" seems to prejudice them against real comprehension and in favor of literalistic obscurantism. A little education can be a dangerous thing!

Whether one adopts borrowed words or not also depends very largely upon the cultural traditions of the receptors. In some societies it is taken for granted that one will usually borrow foreign words for new things, as

in English, while in others one finds that the people usually attempt to make up descriptive equivalents, based on their own models of words or phrase formation, as in German.

A people's cultural security also influences the extent to which they may prefer one or another solution to the problems of formal vs. functional equivalence. If, for example, the people are insecure, they often insist on borrowed words which they do not understand; they will not find acceptable any attempt to substitute more meaningful functional equivalents from their own language. On the other hand, some peoples express their grave cultural insecurity by refusing to admit any borrowed terms. In fact, to preserve their ethnic identity they feel called upon to purge their language of any foreign traces and to keep it pure. Apparently they believe that only in this way can they maintain themselves against foreign cultural domination.

The second area of tension between F-E and D-E translations involves optional and obligatory elements. At this point translators encounter some of their most difficult problems, for languages differ most in what they *must* convey, not in what they *may* convey (Jakobson, 1959b, p. 236). That is to say, the obligatory categories of various languages give them their distinctive character, and at the same time impose serious restrictions on the extent to which corresponding expressions can be made fully equivalent. For example, in Campa, a language of Peru, one must always specify the positional relationship of the grammatical subject to the event by indicating whether the person is already on the scene, has just arrived, or is passing by or leaving the scene. Such specifications of position are obligatory, and the translator cannot avoid them. On the other hand, the tense-aspect suffixes obligatory in Greek have no immediately corresponding equivalents in Campa, and all such features of an event are optionally given, if at all. Similarly, Guaica, a language of southern Venezuela, requires each sentence to indicate whether the event described has been personally witnessed by the speaker, has been told to him by others, or is legendary; but Guaica makes no such tense distinctions as we make in English. Nor are the obligatory or optional features of a language restricted to so-called morphological categories, such as tense, aspect, voice, number, gender, animate-inanimate, and alive-dead. They may also involve any formal element of the language, e.g. word order, number and arrangement of attributives, and overt specification of all possessive relationships. For example, in many languages one cannot say merely 'son', but must say 'son of so-and-so'.

When a particular feature is obligatory in the receptor language, the translator really has no alternative to employing it, for the first requirement of any adequate translation, whether F-E or D-E, is that it conform to the obligatory formal features of the receptor language. The real difficulties for the translator are to be found in dealing with the optional features. Here he is not compelled by any evident "rules," but is free to choose between alternatives, which in varying degrees reflect proximity to the source message.

The criteria which determine how to handle optional elements in the

translation involve primarily the principle of "communication load," for these optional elements are significant in the maintenance of the proper "flow" of the message. Here sensitivity to style, insight into the intent of the author, and empathy with the receptors are essential if an adequate D-E translation is to be achieved.

The serious problems posed for the translator by the existence of obligatory elements in source and receptor languages occur in general under three sets of circumstances. First, there are situations in which one must indicate in the receptor language something nonexistent in the source message. For example, a category of repetitive vs. nonrepetitive action may require one to specify whether, in Mark 1:21, Jesus had ever before visited the city of Capernaum. Presumably he had, but there is no evidence in the source message to this effect.

Second, one must frequently specify in the receptor language something only poorly defined (i.e. ambiguous, obscure, or merely implicit) in the source message. For example, a language may employ an elaborate system of honorifics which tend to classify all speakers and participants in any event; but when this system is applied to the New Testament there are many areas of doubt. One does not know in what manner the prestigeful Pharisees should be represented as speaking to Jesus, for they probably regarded him as an upstart, though he was accepted by some as a Rabbi.

Third, it is not uncommon to find that what is explicit in the source message text cannot, or should not, be expressed in the receptor language. In some of the Indian languages of Peru, for example, there are no polite vocatives of direct address. The use of a name in speaking directly to a person is either a means of summoning him from a distance or of showing contempt for him. Similarly, pluralization, which is obligatory in Greek, may be entirely out of place if used to the same extent in another language. In Bolivian Quechua, to cite an instance, the plurality of participants in an event may be indicated once, but it is quite wrong to continue specifying this plural feature by tacking on a suffix every time the equivalent plural form occurs, as in Spanish, English, or Greek.

Though one does not and should not carry everything over from one language to another in the process of translating, there is a tendency, nevertheless, toward gain in linguistic forms and loss in meaning. The gain results from the fact that we normally assume that everything in the original must be rendered in some way or another, and also because, in addition to what occurs in the source text, certain obligatory features of the receptor language must be introduced. Furthermore, while the original author can assume a good deal of background information on the part of his audience (for they are presumably full participants in the culture in which the communication is made), the translator cannot make the assumption, since the audience receiving the translation more often than not represents a very different cultural setting. Accordingly, if the message is to be meaningful, a certain number of semantic elements must be added to provide a message with a roughly equivalent communication load. That is to say, some redundancy must be built into the

message. Thus the form of the original message is almost always expanded, both as the result of differing patterns of obligatory features and because of cultural diversity. Even so, there is an almost inevitable loss of meaning, for a translator can rarely do complete justice to the total cultural context of the communication, to the emotive features of meaning, and to the behavioral elements, for a shift of setting provides a widely varying range of consequences to any communication. However, this almost inevitable loss in total meaning does provide justification for a certain amount of expansion in the formal elements of the translation. Its precise extent depends upon a great variety of considerations, including such matters as the nature of the message, types of receptors, setting of the communication, and purpose of the publication.

The third area of tension between F-E and D-E translations involves the rate of decodability, for one must consider the rate at which the message is both transmitted and decoded. In a sense we have anticipated this problem in discussing the need for expansion of the message because of cultural diversity. It is clear that unless the receptors can be provided with a text involving a satisfactory basis for decoding the message at an appropriate rate, they will soon become weary, bored, or perplexed.

As noted in an earlier chapter, the degree of decodability is dependent upon the communication load, consisting of both formal and semantic elements. In contrast with an F-E translation, a D-E translation aims at a higher degree of decodability, even if it involves a rather extensive redundancy, which expands the translation in order to make it relevant to a contemporary setting, e.g. J. B. Phillips' translation of the New Testament. In a typical F-E translation, on the other hand, little or no attention is paid to the speed with which the receptor can decode. One may argue, for example, that in Huichol, a language of Mexico, the closest equivalents to English *love*, *joy*, and *peace* are three nouns constructed from corresponding verbal forms, and capable of being used syntactically in essentially the same types of constructions as the English nouns occur. Formally, this is true. Dynamically, however, it is far from being true; for though in English *love*, *joy*, *peace* may be used as nouns, without specification as to the participants involved, the situation is otherwise in normal Huichol discourse. Accordingly, in Huichol one must use corresponding verb forms, specify the persons involved, and indicate the tense, aspect, and mode of the action. A good example of a translation which is not concerned with the rate of decodability is the American Standard Version, which in Romans 5:12-13 reads as follows:

> Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned: —for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

J. B. Phillips, aiming at a dynamic equivalence decodable by the average individual without special recourse to background study or supplementary information, translated the passage as follows:

This, then, is what has happened. Sin made its entry into the world through one man, and through sin, death. The entail of sin and death passed on to the whole human race, and no one could break it for no one was himself free from sin.

Sin, you see, was in the world long before the Law, though I suppose, technically speaking, it was not "sin" where there was no law to define it.

Some persons may object to such a free rendering of these verses, but whether Phillips' translation of this passage is the best way of rendering these difficult verses is not the question at this point. We are simply concerned with the fact that his approach is directed toward greater decodability.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE PERMISSIBLE DEGREE OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING

Certain serious restrictions of a linguistic and a cultural nature immediately confront anyone who undertakes to produce a translation with a considerable degree of dynamic equivalence. The linguistic restrictions involve both the literary forms (poetry, narration, proverbs, etc.) and the vehicle used as an accompanying instrument of transmission of the message, e.g. song or motion picture. The cultural restrictions involve attitudes about so-called "faithfulness" in translating, the pressures exerted by already existing translations, and the diversity of dialects in the receptor language. A still further type of restriction is imposed by diglot publication.

The influence of literary forms is found in two principal areas: (1) the occurrence of sound effects, e.g. puns, acrostic series, and rhyming and alliterative sequences, and (2) rhythmic speech utterances, whether rhymed or not.

As noted in previous sections of this chapter, there is little possibility of reproducing various types of sound effects; for languages differ in the types of sounds they use and the values they tend to attach to these uses, and it is largely a matter of chance if a sound effect in one language can be duplicated by an equivalent, though not identical, sound effect in another. When languages are closely related, as German is to English and Hebrew to Arabic, one can sometimes hit on a useful parallel in sound; but even in closely cognate languages sound effects can rarely be adequately translated with much formal similarity.

As already indicated, the translation of a poem in verse really involves "composing another poem" (Mathews, 1959, p. 67). When one must organize a message into periodic units, as the composition of poetry requires (Stankiewicz, 1960b, p. 77), only rarely can the content be translated by the customary equivalents. Horace sensed this problem centuries ago and warned translators against any word-for-word kind of rendering (*Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere, fidus interpres*).

Perhaps the secret to understanding the underlying problem involved in translating poetry is the fact that, as Mukařovský (in Garvin, 1955) has said, poetic language is the systematic violation of the language norm, or perhaps more rightly, the superimposition of one set of constraints upon another. However, since this poetic superstructure is so diverse in different languages, it is understandable that formal agreement is rare. Therefore, in the translation of poetry one must abandon formal equivalence and strive for dynamic equivalence. Moreover, the very purpose of poetry is to a large extent the communication of feeling, not everyday facts, and hence the translator must take the liberty of "composing another poem" capable of eliciting similar feeling.

However, the translator of poetry without musical accompaniment is relatively free in comparison with one who must translate a song—poetry set to music. Under such circumstances the translator must concern himself with a number of severe restrictions: (1) a fixed length for each phrase, with precisely the right number of syllables, (2) the observance of syllabic prominence (the accented vowels or long syllables must match correspondingly emphasized notes in the music), (3) rhyme, where required, and (4) vowels with appropriate quality for certain emphatic or greatly lengthened notes. Obviously the translator of song "toils in a strait jacket," as Peyser has rightly said (1922, p. 359).[1]

Because of the severe restrictions form places upon the song translator, he must make certain adjustments in order to accomplish anything at all. For one thing, he may take the theme of a song or hymn and adapt it to other music, as John Wesley did in translating thirty-three hymns from German into English. These hymns in German represented twenty-nine different meters, but Wesley used only six. As Henry Bett (1940, p. 290) says, "John Wesley was enough of a poet to know that many of the German metres could not be imitated successfully in English, and so he did not attempt it." But John Wesley's approach to German hymns, though certainly the simpler way of dealing with the problem, is not the usual one, for in general it is the music that is preserved, and not the words or theme. Accordingly, since the form must be maintained, the translator must make certain sacrifices in content. This he does by radical alterations in arrangement of themes, omission of certain elements and addition of others, and even alteration of the themes themselves. All this is quite proper, if words and theme are to fit the music. One requirement, however, is essential in any lyric, namely, that the words be completely natural. Nothing so completely spoils the charm of a song as awkward words or unnatural grammar. But these adjustments, which are perfectly possible in individual songs, cannot be employed in the same way in opera, in which the dramatic sequences and the total plot usually demand much greater conformity to the musical vehicle.

TRANSLATING MOTION PICTURES

If the translator of poetry or songs is hemmed in by the limitations of the communication medium, the translator for motion pictures is subject

[1] For further significant articles on the special problems of song translating see: A. H. Fox-Strangways, 1911; Carl F. Price, 1944-45; E. J. Dent, 1921; Sigmund Spaeth, 1915; Jacob Hieble, 1958; and Elaine T. Lewis, 1960.