DRYDEN, OR THE NAME WELL LOST IN HISTORY

Burç İdem Dinçel*

Introduction:

In most cases the word history gives researchers a start and pause at once. Gives start because the immensity of history can take one by surprise, thereby swerving the researcher off the intended course of a project; gives pause because setting eyes on history from a standpoint that is more or less influenced by the critical thinking as well as the ever-changing perspectives of the present day carries the risk of divorcing the historical figures from their contexts. These two issues and decontextualising the historical subject/s in particular, can thus be taken as the main pitfalls of historical research. No matter how the researcher attempts at clinging to tackle the subject in question from a historical point of view, either in the introductory part or in the concluding section of the study, contemporary perspective inevitably comes into play. The point in undertaking a historical research, therefore, is to maintain a balance amid the modern day perspective and the historical perspective with the purpose of drawing parallels between past and present. And when that is fairly done, or even honestly sought to, these parallels are not without their interest or their use to the contemporary perspective.

The significance of historical research comes into prominence even more when it is taken into consideration from the viewpoint of Translation Studies. After all, the fundamental part that translation has played through history is undeniable. This fact alone is indicative of the enormous stock of information that history offers for Translation Studies. The way that translation has been practised in the past, the role that translation and translators acquired in the formation of cultures, nations, identities, let alone the discourses surrounding both the act of translation and translators during the course of time, compels one to deem history as a vigorous field of research for the discipline. The growing body of literature in Translation Studies concerned with translation history[1] fortifies the credibility of this idea. As it stands,

1 For a general survey of the literature devoted to translation history together with the

* Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Bölümü doktora öğrencisi

research in translation history dwells upon theoretical and practical aspects of translation. It follows that such concepts as history and historiography turn out to be the building stones of research in translation history.

Yet, glancing further at the cluster term translation history, one can be in favour of the presence of a distinction *"between history, understood as the events of the past recounted in narrative form, and historiography, which is the discourse upon historical data, organized and analysed along certain principles."*[2] Hence the difference between history of translation and historiography of translation theories, and, by extension, historiography of Translation Studies. While each of these terms has their own weight, it can be argued that historiography of Translation Studies attracts more attention owing to the fact that it seeks to document the evolution of translation theories.

Historiography of Translation Studies has an autonomous importance, but at the same time calls for re-examination. Naturally enough, the writings on translation have been the major subjects of historiography of Translation Studies. This, of course, is a matter of perspective. Each discipline concentrates on the topics and figures that are most relevant to its subject of study. And every discipline picks out certain texts produced by certain names from history that are most pertinent to its certain discussions. In this particular respect, the case of Translation Studies is by no means an exception. Just like other disciplines, Translation Studies approaches historical names from its own perspective, excluding the other viewpoints that the same name might propose for the discipline thereof. One example: to a certain extent, Translation Studies treats Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) in the light of his monumental essay "The Task of the Translator"[3] that has direct relevance to its main focus of study, which is translation. Still, when the notions of history and historiography are taken into account, this approach does little justice

current state of research in this field, see the two complementary articles written by Judith Woodsworth and James St André respectively for the first and the second editions of *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*.

2 Judith Woodsworth, "History of Translation", in Mona Baker (ed.) **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies**, London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 101

3 Walter Benjamin "The Task of the Translator", trans. James Hynd and E. M. Valk, in **Delos A Journal on & of Translation**, National Translation Center, Austin, Texas, [1923] 1968, pp. 76-99

to Benjamin. For as Tejaswini Niranjana convincingly argues, *"Benjamin's writings on the concept of history are inseparable from his work on translation, and any attempt to describe the latter must necessarily account for the force of the former concern."*[4] Niranjana's argument makes even more sense when one thinks of the prospective contributions that Benjamin's other works can make to research in translation history. Then again, the problem here is not peculiar to Translation Studies. Theatre Studies, for instance, might also regard Benjamin's such works as *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*[5] and *Understanding Brecht*[6] as perceptive ones, thus losing sight of his other writings and their implications for the discipline.

Even so, the case of Benjamin sets an example of how historiography of a given discipline can approach historical figures. In consideration of this example, one can draw an analogy between the case of Benjamin and that of John Dryden (1631-1700) in Translation Studies. In a manner evoking the situation of Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator", Dryden's writings on translation appear in almost every anthology of translation theory as important historical texts. The presentation of Dryden's views on translation within the territory of the discipline is worthy of notice. Either they are accompanied by an introductory note by the editor/s of the volume, as in the anthologies of Andrew Chesterman[7] and Douglas Robinson,[8] or they are presented among other historical texts chronologically, as in those of André Lefevere,[9] as well as Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet.[10] Along the

4 Tejaswini Niranjana, **Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context**, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, p. 112

5 Walter Benjamin, **The Origin of German Tragic Drama**, trans. John Osbourne, London: Verso, [1928] 2003a

6 This work is a compilation of Benjamin's essays on Bertolt Brecht and epic theatre. They were written between 1930 and 1939. See, Walter Benjamin, **Understanding Brecht**, trans. Anna Bostock, London: Verso, 2003b

7 Andrew Chesterman (ed.), **Readings in Translation Theory**, Finland: Oy Finn Lectura, 1989

8 Douglas Robinson (ed.), Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche, Manchester: St Jerome, [1997] 2002

9 André Lefevere (ed.), **Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook**, London and New York: Routledge, 1992a

10 Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992

same line, individual studies on translation history[11] refer to Dryden chiefly within the context of the notions that he has introduced to the study and practice of translation, that is to say, "metaphrase" (word-for-word translation), "paraphrase" (sense-for-sense translation), and "imitation" (free translation). Anyhow, one thing is crystal clear: when Dryden wrote *"all translations, I suppose, may be reduced to these three heads"*[12] in 1680, he would never ever estimate that one day in the future historiography of Translation Studies would backfire him by reducing his entire career as a dramatist and a theatre critic[13] to "these three heads".

According to Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar, *"the emphasis on certain phenomena and the indifference towards others is an inevitable part of historiography. In that sense, it would be impossible to claim the existence of a totally comprehensive and impartial translation history. However, a relatively more comprehensive and multi-faceted view of history can be attained through revealing and supplying the missing aspects of each account."*[14] Tahir-Gürçağlar's observation is significant in the sense that it pinpoints a general drawback of historiography. In view of Tahir-Gürçağlar's words, several questions can be posed in relation to "the missing aspects" of

---

11 Or rather, studies which fall back on history in order to document the historical process that Translation Studies has been through. See, for instance, Susan Bassnett, **Translation Studies**, London and New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004, pp. 64-65, and Jeremy Munday, **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**, London and New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 24-25

12 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 17

13 Add to these epithets "historiographer royal" and the irony here triples. Nonetheless, the dearth of material regarding this phase of Dryden's career makes it hard for one to build a connection between his preoccupations with the act of translation and that of histor(iograp)hy. It is interesting to note that the scant amount of scholarly work concerned with "Dryden as historiographer" revolve around his controversial "authorship" of *His Majesties Declaration Defended* (1681). In this respect, see Roswell G., Ham, "Dryden as Historiographer Royal: The Authorship of *His Majesties Declaration Defended*, 1681", in **Review of English Studies**, Vol. 11, no. 43, 1935, pp. 284-298, and Edward L., Saslow, "Dryden as Historiographer Royal: The Authorship of 'His Majesties Declaration Defended'", in **Modern Philology**, Vol. 75, no. 3, 1978, pp. 261-272

14 Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar, The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008, p. 28

Dryden's account in historiography of Translation Studies. On the face of it, translation scholars have fulfilled their duty by paying tribute to Dryden with the inclusion of his writings on translation in historiography of the discipline. But one can go further and ask: how feasible is it to reduce Dryden to three notions, namely, "metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation", whilst these concepts are, in fact, the offshoots of the views that he developed in his dramatic and critical writings? By disregarding the huge corpus of dramatic and critical works behind these three notions, doesn't historiography of translation theory, in a sense, fall into the evident trap of decontextualising Dryden? Can historicising Dryden be of any help to the contemporary understanding of the study and practice of translation? It goes without saying that the answers to these questions can be attained through a critical engagement with historiography of translation theory.

Taking this axiom as the starting point, it becomes possible to articulate a hypothesis: harping on Dryden's dramatic and theoretical works on theatre can provide a considerable amount of insight into the rationale behind his formulation of "metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation". On the basis of this hypothesis, this paper contests that Dryden's search for finding a middle ground between *"the two extremes"*[15] has its roots in his conflicting views on tragedy. As is well documented, *"Dryden prefers paraphrase, advising that metaphrase and imitation be avoided."*[16] Although Dryden is critical of "imitation" in translational activity, a look at his dramatic pieces suggests that he has taken the other way around by penning "imitative" works. A closer glance at Dryden's theoretical writings on theatre, moreover, indicates that his conflicting views on tragedy derive from *"his attempt to reconcile the antique and the Elizabethan ideals."*[17] This effort of reconciliation would force Dryden to rework on the work of one particular name among the Elizabethan playwrights: William Shakespeare. So he did. To be precise, thrice: *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1667), *All for Love, or the*

15 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 26

16 Jeremy Munday, **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 24-25

17 George Steiner, **The Death of Tragedy**. Yale: Yale University Press, [1961] 1996, p. 39

World Well Lost (1678), as well as *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late* (1679) can be regarded as the representative examples of Dryden's search for compromise between antique tradition and that of Elizabethans. Of these three plays, the title of the second one catches the eye. It bears no direct reference to its predecessor as the other two plays do. Even so, as acknowledged by Dryden himself, the play is *"written in imitation of Shakespeare's stile."*[18] In this regard, it can be claimed that Dryden's reworking of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* differs from the other two on the grounds that he specifically deploys the term "imitation" in *All for Love*.

At this juncture, it is worth underscoring the independent significance of "imitation" as a literary practice within the realm of Western literature.[19] Hence, this paper refrains from ascribing any specific function associated with "translation proper" to *All for Love*. As Anthony Pym puts it, *"what is carried over, is not the 'function' of the text as a translation or nontranslation but the* ***words*** *by which it might so be marked. As far as possible, the words should be reproduced in our own lists. If the paratext says 'imitation', 'frei nach Zola', 'wortgetreu in deutsche Prosa' or whatever, that is exactly what should appear in our corpora, quite independently of the functions we may later attribute to or construe from these terms."*[20] With respect to *All for Love*, being cognisant of the fact that the text is written on the trail of the "imitative" tradition of Western literature is imperative in sustaining a balance between the historical perspective and contemporary perspective

18 John Dryden, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, p. 285

19 The literature on "imitation" as a literary practice is gigantic. Any attempt to list the literature gathered around the notion of "imitation" would, arguably, amount to assemble a bibliography of studies dealing with the foundations of Western thought. Such an attempt, on the other hand, can become quite fruitful in terms of throwing light upon, the notion of "translation as interpretation of mimesis" which manifests itself in the raw in the translation practice of *imitatio*. The discussions as regards to this concept in Stephen Halliwell, **The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems**, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, ch.11, ch. 12, and Matthew Potolsky, Mimesis. London and New York: Routledge, 2006, ch. 3, offer some food for thought vis-à-vis the ties between *imitatio* and mimesis.

20 Anthony Pym, **Method in Translation History**, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, p. 62, emphasis in the original.

in the course of the paper. To this end, this article will develop its main arguments on two planes. In the first plane, by historicising Dryden the paper aspires to show that the author's conflicting views on tragedy in his dramatic and critical works have given rise to his search for a middle ground in his writings on translation. In the second plane, Dryden's place in Translation Studies will be problematised with the purpose of exposing into view the material that might emerge from contextualising Dryden. Later on, it will also be argued that *All for Love* can be regarded as a form of "rewriting". In line with this argument, the third section of the study provides an analysis of *All for Love* in order to demonstrate the motives that brought forth Dryden's engagement with Shakespeare's text. Needless to say, rather than disclosing the respective "beauties" and "merits" of *Anthony and Cleopatra* and *All for Love*, this analysis will place particular emphasis on the way that Dryden reworks on Shakespeare.

As the above provided outline implies, the theoretical framework of this study will derive benefit from Lefevere's notion of "rewriting". The methodology of the paper requires a brief explanation. "Historiography", in the words of Lieven D'Hulst, *"should aim at the best possible reconstruction of the past 'wie es eigentlich gewesen ist' [how it really was], taking into account the largest possible number of parameters."*[21] Even though D'Hulst's proposal for the most feasible account of history draws attention to the severity of historical awareness, at the same time it broadens the scope of a given research project. Despite the fact that it is ambitious, widening the extent in historical research puts the investigation of *"the missing aspects of each account"*[22] in jeopardy. Nevertheless, narrowing down the scope and "taking into account the largest possible number of parameters" within one particular name operating in one particular space in history can still come in handy. In terms of methodology, therefore, by limiting its scale mainly to Dryden's dramatic and critical works, as well as his writings on translation, this study will adopt a "microhistorical approach."[23] It follows

21 Lieven D'hulst, "Why and How to Write Translation Histories", in **Crop**. Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil, No. 6, 2001, p. 31

22 Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar, The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008, p. 28

23 Sergia Adamo, "Microhistory of Translation", in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.) **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press,

that the primary sources to be consulted in the first plane of the paper will also include Dryden's prefaces, namely, the paratextual materials, or what Gerard Genette would call as *"thresholds of interpretation"*[24] which accompany the author's works.

Historicising Dryden:

It would not be an overstatement to assert that the act of translation has been one of the fundamental concerns of intellectuals throughout history. Preoccupation with translational phenomena in the West goes back at least to the writings of, say, Cicero and Horace, both of whom take ancient Greek culture as their examples. Within this context, it would also not be an overstatement to assume that how to "translate" the Greek orations, the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, the philosophical statements of Plato and Aristotle, as well as the comedies of Aristophanes and Menander; in a nutshell, how to "transform" ancient Greek culture into Latin has been the primary question that Roman rhetoricians sought to answer. Out of this question emerged a never-ending quarrel over "word-for-word" and "sense-for-sense" translation. The fact that one encounters with this debate in almost every writing on translation fortifies its credibility. Indeed, from Quintilian[25] to Saint Jerome,[26] from Saint Jerome to Etienne Dolet,[27] that debate would haunt the thoughts of many people who muse upon issues generated by translational phenomena.

John Dryden was very well aware of these discussions over "literal" and "free" translation. In this particular respect, it can be said that the central

---

2006, pp. 80-99

24 Gérard Genette, **Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation**, trans. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

25 Quintilian, "On What We Should Employ Ourselves When We Write", trans. John Selby Watson, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche, Manchester: St Jerome, [96 CE?/1997] 2002, pp. 19-20

26 Saint Jerome, "The Best Kind of Translator: Letter to Pammachius", trans. Paul Carroll, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche, Manchester: St Jerome, [395 CE/1997] 2002, pp. 23-30

27 Etienne Dolet, "The Way to Translate Well From One Language into Another, trans. James S. Holmes, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche, Manchester: St Jerome, [1540/1997] 2002, pp. 95-97

terms of his tripartite "model" of translation have already been in circulation in his age for centuries of time. The innovative aspect of Dryden's approach, if there is any, was to add another dimension to the study and practice of translation: "imitation". Thus, the place of the term within Dryden's approach to translation merits further attention. In Dryden's triadic "model", metaphrase represented *"word by word, and line by line"*[28] translation, paraphrase stood for *"translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his* [sic] *words are not so strictly followed as his sense"*[29] and imitation, *"where the translator* ***(if now he*** **[sic]** ***has not lost that name)*** *assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original to run division on the groundwork, as he pleases"*[30] was a token of free translation. As was stated previously, Dryden regards "metaphrase" and "imitation" as "two extreme" poles of translational activity, and consequently favours "paraphrase". Furthermore, a close glance at the key terms of Dryden's "model" demonstrates that he disparages "imitation" to such an extent that he does not even seem to deem "imitators" as translators. Referring to the "translation" practices of Sir John Denham and Abraham Cowley, Dryden goes on to state that, *"I take imitation of an author, in their sense, to be an endeavour of a later poet to write like one who has written before him* [sic]*, on the same subject; that is not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country."*[31]

In addition to these reflections on translation, and "imitation" in particular, Dryden once again has recourse to the verb "imitate" so as to develop his arguments. In the "Preface" to *Sylvae* (1685), Dryden makes an important point: *"most of our ingenious young men* [sic]*, take up some cried-up English poet for their model, adore him, and imitate him, as they think, without knowing him wherein he is defective, where he is boyish and trifling, wherein*

28 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 17
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid., emphasis added.
31 Ibid., p. 19

either his thoughts are improper to his subject, or his expressions unworthy of his thoughts, or the turn of both is unharmonious. Thus it appears necessity, that a man should be a nice critic in his mother-tongue before he attempts to translate a foreign language."[32] To a considerable degree, the significance of this remark lies in the fact that, Dryden attributes to the act of translation a critical value and explicitly declares t/his opinion. Hence, for him, the act of translation first and foremost demands a critical engagement with the foreign text. In a similar vein, through these words, it is most probable for one to infer that Dryden regards "genuine imitation" as a critical act.

In the light of Dryden's writings on translation, it becomes possible to deduce that the middle path that he follows is that of "paraphrase." At this point, it is interesting to observe that Dryden apparently abandons the term "imitation" towards the end of his life. In his "Dedication" of the *Aeneis* (1697), for instance, Dryden thinks *"fit to steer betwixt two extremes of paraphrase and literal translation."*[33] Be that as it may, the way that Dryden articulates his opinions on translation grabs the attention: *"I have endeavoured to make Virgil speak such English as he would have himself have spoken, if he had been in England, and in this present age."*[34] Notwithstanding the fact that the term "imitation" is out of the picture, its presence can highly be felt in these words. Even the verb that Dryden uses (endeavour) harks back to his thoughts on "imitation". Dryden's—if one is permitted to rephrase the title of the opening track of Led Zeppelin's *Houses of the Holy*—"song remains the same".

Then again, there is in Dryden's writings on translation more than meets the eye. Dryden's views on translation appear to be merely the tip of the iceberg of a series of arguments that he develops in his career as a dramatist and a theatre critic. Just like Icarus, one is compelled to take chances and plunge into the icy waters of Dryden's dramatic and critical writings from the top of the icecap, so as to be able to trace back the dynamics that gave rise to his ideas on translation.

Dryden's (serious) commitment to the art of theatre coincides with the

32 Ibid., p. 24
33 Ibid., p. 26
34 Ibid.

Restoration Period (1660-1689); an era in which the English theatre was rather on the rack of producing playwrights. This was precisely the case with tragedies. And Dryden was needed to breathe life on the English stage. As one scholar would observe in the future, *"no new playwrights appeared until 1668, when Dryden became the first."*[35] For that reason, Dryden's situation was more than complicated when compared to the issues of translational activity. Dryden was not faced with the everlasting discussions over "word-for-word" and "sense-for-sense" translation, as in the time that he immersed himself into the study and practice of translation. He was on the hook of restoring—in the literal sense of the word—the English national drama tradition which had been suppressed by the ban that the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) imposed on theatres.[36] It goes without saying that the suppression of theatres in England from 1642 to 1660 had had devastating effects for the English theatre in terms of producing indigenous plays.

This is a vital point. And it takes one straight to the heart of the paradoxical position that entangled Dryden. Under those circumstances, in which the number of new plays penned was scarce, theatre practitioners of the period were to a certain extent confined to the works written prior to the Restoration Period. As a matter of fact, the works of Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights, such as William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, John Fletcher, John Webster, Ben Johnson, formed the backbone of the available plays for the theatre companies of the period. But Dryden would have none of them without a critical awareness. Dryden's prologue to his adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, is actually a critical observation on the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists:

"Fletcher reached that which on his heights did grow,

While Jonson crept, and gathered all below.

This did his love, and this his mirth digest:

35 Sandra Clark, "Shakespeare and Other Adaptations", in Susan J. Owen (ed.), **A Companion to Restoration Drama**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001, p. 274

36 An extensive account with respect to the social and political dynamics of the "story" can be found in Susan J., Owen, "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview" in Susan J. Owen (ed.), **A Companion to Restoration Drama**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001, pp. 126-139

One imitates him most, the other best.

If they have since outwrit all other men,

'Tis with the drops which fell from Shakespeare's pen.

The storm, which vanished on the neighbouring shore,

Was taught by Shakespeare's Tempest first to roar.

That innocence and beauty, which did smile

In Fletcher, grew on this enchanted isle.

But Shakespeare's magic could not copied be;

Within that circle none durst walk but he."[37]

Dryden was responsive to Shakespeare right from the start. But as a critic, he kept his eyes wide open to the huge body of drama tradition and the corpus of critical literature behind him. He was entirely aware of such names as Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristotle, Seneca, and Horace. The demands of antiquity were hard on Dryden. At the same time, he was living in an age which bore witness to the rise of French neo-classicism. Therefore, Dryden was in the position of taking into account, not only the tragedies of Pierre Corneille (1606-1684) and Jean Racine (1639-1699), but also their critical engagement with Aristotle's *Poetics*. In point of fact, the ideas that gave inspiration to the French neo-classic taste came from Italy. Lodovico Castelvetro's (1505-1571) reading of *Poetics* remains consequential in that it ascertained the unities of time and place as the "rules" of tragedy.[38] It would, however, be Corneille who shed neo-classical light upon the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides by dint of his close examination of Aristotle and Horace: *"The dramatic poem is an imitation,*

37 John Dryden, *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 3, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1667] 1808b, p. 103

38 Lodovico Castelvetro, "The *Poetics* of Aristotle Translated and Explained", trans. R. L. Montgomery, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1570] 1971, pp. 145-153, esp. pp. 149-153

or rather a portrait of human action, and it is beyond doubt that portraits gain in excellence in proportion as they resemble the original more closely. A performance lasts two hours and would resemble reality perfectly if the action it presented required no more for its actual occurrence. Let us not then settle on twelve or twenty-four hours, but let us compress the action of the poem into the shortest possible period so that the performance may more closely resemble reality and thus be more nearly perfect."[39]

Thinking that this critical literature was accessible to Dryden would not be a naive assumption. As can be inferred from the above-quoted excerpt, Corneille insists on the three unities of action, time, and place. No, argues Dryden: *"we neither find it in Aristotle, Horace, or any who have written of it, till our age the French poets first made it a precept of the stage."*[40] To a certain extent, his *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* can thus be read as a response to Corneille, of whom Dryden talks of the *"archpoet"*[41] of the French theatre. While this is the case, a deep reading of the *Essay* discloses Dryden's frosty stance against his native tradition as well. Dryden, of course, acknowledges Shakespeare's virtues by deeming him as one of the prominent examples of the English tradition in the course of the *Essay*.[42] Even so, he does not refrain from firing his sharpest arrows of criticism to the Elizabethan: *"if you consider the historical plays of Shakespeare, they are rather so many chronicles of kings, or the business many times of thirty or forty years, cramped into a representation of two hours and a half; which is not to imitate or paint nature, but rather to draw her in miniature, to take her in little; to look upon her through the wrong end of a perspective, and receive her images not only much less, but infinitely more imperfect then the life."*[43] From this perspective, it can be seen that Dryden ponders upon the so-called "irregularities" of Shakespeare's plays by taking the "precepts" of the French neo-classical taste. Later on in the *Essay*, Dryden takes one step

39 Pierre Corneille, "Of the Three Unities of Action, Time, and Place", trans. Donald Schier, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1660] 1971, pp. 223-224
40 John Dryden, *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1668] 1971, p. 235
41 Ibid., p. 243
42 Ibid., pp. 247-248
43 Ibid, p. 240

further: *"the French avoid the tumult, which we are subject to in England, by representing duels, battles, and the like; which renders our stage too like the theatres where they fight prizes. For what is more ridiculous then to represent an army with a drum and five men behind it."*[44] Throughout the *Essay*, Dryden constantly changes his critical ground, thereby making it hard for one to draw decisive conclusions. Be that as it may, one thing seems plausible: Dryden was responsive both to Shakespeare and to the neo-classic "principle" of the three unities of action, time, and place. His attitude towards French neo-classicism was indeed ambivalent.

After a decade, this mixed attitude surfaces in Dryden's "Preface" to *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*. Even though Dryden wrote the tragedy "in imitation of Shakespeare's style", the entire preface demonstrates his painstaking investigation on the three unities for a period of ten years: *"The fabric of the play is regular enough, as to the inferior parts of it; and the unities of time, place, and action, more exactly observed, than perhaps the English theatre requires. Particularly, the action is so much one that it is the only of the kind without episode, or underplot; every scene in the tragedy conducing to the main design, and every act concluding with a turn of it."*[45] Dryden's tactical move in *All for Love* is more than appealing: a poet, who has written against the three unities in his entire career as a dramatist, was setting foot on the French soil so as to be able to see what the neo-classical taste could bring into the English stage. Yet, during the course of the essay, Dryden halts to attack on the French poets because of their strict observance of the neo-classical precepts in their plays: *"They are so careful not to exasperate a critic, that they never leave him any work; so busy with the broom, and make so clean a riddance that there is little left either for censure or for praise."*[46] After a few sentences, Dryden discloses the particular name he had in mind, albeit slightly: *"Thus, their Hippolitus is so scrupulous in point of decency, that he will rather expose himself to death, than accuse his stepmother to his father."*[47] Not *their* Hippolitus but

44 Ibid, p. 241
45 John Dryden, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, p. 307
46 Ibid., p. 309
47 Ibid.

Racine's Hippolitus in his *Phédre*. Dryden, however, prefers to continue in the third person plural: *"they sent him to travel from Athens to Paris, taught him to make love, and transformed the* ***Hippolitus of Euripides*** *into Monsieur Hippolyte. I should not have troubled myself thus far with French poets, but that I find our Chedreux critics wholly form their judgments by them. But for my part, I desire to be tried by the laws of my own country."*[48] "Hippolitus of Euripides" is the key expression here in Dryden's remark because it points out the critical ground where he was heading to: the ancient Greek tradition. At this juncture, it is interesting to note that Dryden refers to his "imitation" of Shakespeare very briefly only towards the end of the "Preface": "*In my style, I have professed to imitate the divine Shakespeare; which that I might perform more freely, I have disencumbered myself from rhyme. Not that I condemn my former way, but that this is more proper to my present purpose."*[49] Dryden's present purpose was to test the neo-classical "precepts" in his "native" land, or rather, to experiment the reconcilability of the neo-classical "principles" with Shakespeare. In addition to that, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* was just a starting point for him in terms of improving his own style: *"I hope, I may affirm, and without vanity, that, by imitating him, I have excelled myself throughout the play."*[50] In the "Prologue" to the play, therefore, Dryden throws down his gauntlets:

"What flocks of critics hover here to-day,

As vultures wait on armies for their prey,

All gaping for the carcase of a play!

With croaking notes they bode some dire event,

And follow dying poets by the scent.

Ours gives himself for gone; you've watched your time:

He fights this day unarmed,--without his rhyme;--

48 Ibid., pp. 310-311, emphasis added.
49 Ibid., p. 319
50 Ibid.

And brings a tale which often has been told;

As sad as Dido's; and almost as old."[51]

Next year in his "Preface" to *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late*, Dryden moves one step ahead and gets to the "grounds of criticism". The essay that accompanies the play differs from that of *All for Love*. It is comprised of two parts: the first part serves as an introduction to the play,[52] whereas the second part of the preface is a separate essay entitled *The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy*.[53] The *Grounds* merits some attention. As the title of the essay implies, it is a huge gloss on Aristotle's *Poetics*; in other words, the ancient Greek tradition of tragedy. In the course of the *Grounds*, Dryden seeks to scrutinise his native tradition in the light of the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides within the framework of *Poetics*.[54] Amongst the two names under scrutiny surely one is Shakespeare, and Fletcher the other. But behind the thread of Dryden's arguments runs the "precepts" of French neo-classicism. Consider, for instance, this remark: *"The difference between Shakespeare and Fletcher, in their plottings, seems to be this; that Shakespeare generally moves more terror, and Fletcher more compassion: for the first had a more masculine, a bolder, and more fiery genius; the second, a more soft and womanish. In the mechanic beauties of the plot, which are the observation of the three unities, time, place, and action, they are both deficient; but Shakespeare the most."*[55] It is most probable for an adroit reader of Aristotle sense some sort of confusion in these words. Dryden not only mingles Aristotle's terms with his own (instead of using "terror" and "pity", he deliberately utilises "terror" and "compassion"), but also deploys the three unities as his criteria, albeit with a critical awareness (mechanic beauties). Hence, in the *Grounds* Dryden constantly shifts his critical grounds and vacillates between the two poles of criticism. Nonetheless, a close reading of the *Grounds* is indicative of Dryden's attempts at

51 Ibid., p. 321
52 John Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 6, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1679] 1808c, pp. 238-243
53 Ibid., pp. 243-266
54 Ibid., p. 254
55 Ibid., pp. 248-249

reconciling Shakespeare with the canons of Aristotle in order to see where the Elizabethan "erred" so that he could not only "correct" him, but at the same time impede from falling into the same "errors" while reworking on him. Still, Dryden does not refrain from praising Shakespeare by raising his ghost in the "Prologue" to the play:

"See my loved Britons, see your Shakespeare rise,

An awful ghost confessed to human eyes!

Unnamed, methinks, distinguished I had been

From other shades, by this eternal green,

About whose wreaths the vulgar poets strive,

And, with a touch, their withered bays revive.

Untaught, unpractised, in a barbarous age,

I found not, but created first the stage.

And if I drained no Greek or Latin store,

'Twas that my own abundance gave me more."[56]

With *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late* Dryden's preoccupation with Shakespeare in his dramatic works comes to an end. And a new phase of preoccupation in his career begins: translation. On the basis of the information provided regarding Dryden's career as a dramatist and a theatre critic so far, it can be deduced that his search for finding a middle ground between the two extremes, in fact, has its roots in his works on theatre. Likewise, it can be inferred that Dryden's attempts at reconciling the two extremes of critical values (i.e. antiquity and neo-classic "precepts") by means of reworking on Shakespeare gave rise to three towering poles in Dryden's dramatic and critical works: antiquity, neo-classicism, and Shakespeare. Even if these three poles are not identical with such terms as

56 Ibid., p. 267

"metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation" of Dryden's tripartite "model" of translation, they provide an insight into the rationale behind his way of critical thinking in the course of developing his arguments.

Problematising Dryden's Place in Translation Studies:

John Dryden: students of Translation Studies are familiar with the name. They come across the name in the courses on translation theory as one of the important figures in the history of translation. His writings on translation are read, analysed, discussed in detail, and criticised because of the "source-oriented" and "prescriptive" approach that he stipulates in his works concerned with the issues of translational activity. More often than not, being very well aware (and excited) of the fact that the act of translation can by no means be confined to the principles, the student of the discipline leaves the name behind in order to search for more "inspirational" figures within the realm of Translation Studies.

This is obvious.

So are the scholars of the discipline. The fact that one encounters this name in almost every anthology of translation theory regardless of the period(s) that the work covers, shows the importance that the scholars of Translation Studies attach to Dryden. Being one of the key figures in the history of translation theory, Dryden indeed occupies a certain place in the historiography of the discipline. Dryden's acclaimed place in Translation Studies, however, is confined to the terms of his triadic "model" of translation, that is to say, "metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation".

This, also, is obvious.

Then again, the case of anthologies is different. Their ambitious scope in terms of including as much work written on translational phenomena in history as possible impedes the editor/s of the volumes from taking further heed of Dryden in their introductory notes that precede his views on translation. There is, perchance, one exception. T. R. Steiner's *English Translation Theory 1650-1800* distinguishes itself from the anthologies edited by Andrew Chesterman, Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, André Lefevere, as well as Douglas Robinson. As the title of the miscellany indicates, the

volume is concerned with one specific period in history of translation and delimits itself to English translation theory alone. The anthology is divided into two parts: while the first part provides an exhaustive theoretical discussion on translational phenomena, the second section offers statements on translation. By narrowing down the scope of the anthology T. R. Steiner, in a sense, makes a room for his theoretical discussion in the volume. He, of course, does not give Dryden a miss. One particular observation of T. R. Steiner merits attention: *"Dryden's view of translation as a mimetic activity analogous to painting never changes."*[57] He goes on by quoting Dryden in length. What is striking in that quote is Dryden's words which read as, *"translation is a kind of drawing after the life."*[58] T. R. Steiner does not refer to *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* in the course of his discussion. Yet, as was demonstrated in the previous section, it is in *Essay* where Dryden actually lays particular emphasis on this act of "drawing after the life" by associating it with dramatic representation. Needles to say, Dryden would make considerable use of this image later on in *The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy* while discussing Aristotle's *Poetics*.[59] When T. R. Steiner's observation is read taken into account from this perspective, one can see where Dryden's ideas derive from.

The fact that critical observations vis-à-vis Dryden's views on translation can well be lost in the anthologies of translation theory compels one to investigate how he is tackled through individual studies on translation history. At this point, it becomes obligatory to make a distinction between individual studies on translation history and the works which fall back on history with the purpose of documenting the evolution of Translation Studies. After all, it would not be a mere supposition to consider that the latter case is more or less the same with that of anthologies of translation theory. The parts that make mention of Dryden in Susan Bassnett's *Translation*

57 T.R. Steiner (ed.), English Translation Theory: 1650-1800, Assen and Amsterdam: van Gorcum, 1975, p. 36

58 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 23

59 John Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 6, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1679] 1808c, p. 243, passim.

Studies[60] and Jeremy Munday's *Introducing Translation Studies*[61] read like "academic summaries" of his ideas on translation. As a matter of fact, after a point, these kind of individual studies take the form of an anthology of translation theory served in a different plate, personal touch of the writers being the glasses of wines that accompany the meal.

Surely, the point here is not really concerned with the amount of pages devoted to Dryden's views on translation in the individual works that document the history of translation theory. George Steiner, for one, by providing a brief yet comprehensive discussion of Dryden in his monumental study on the *"aspects of language and translation"*[62] offers an alternative way of approaching the issue. George Steiner embarks on his discussion of Dryden by making a notable observation; a vital point which lacks in the entire corpus of work that refers to Dryden in Translation Studies: *"The whole of Dryden's literary thought aims for the middle ground of common sense: as between Aristotelian dramaturgy and Shakespeare, as between the French models and the native tradition. In regard to translation he sought to trace a via media between the word-for-word approach demanded by purists among divines and grammarians, and the wild idiosyncrasies displayed in Cowley's Pindarique Odes of 1656."*[63] It is impossible not to hear the sound sense of awareness in these words as regards to Dryden's *oeuvre* and how his reflections on his dramatic and critical works surface in his writings on translation. George Steiner continues by concentrating on the key terms of Dryden's triadic "model" of translation. Apparently, what grabs George Steiner's attention is the negative connotations that Dryden attributes to his notion of "imitation". Contrary to the other scholars in Translation Studies, George Steiner does not take Dryden's references to Ben Johnson's translation of Horace's *Art of Poetry* as an example of "metaphrase"[64] for granted. He goes further. Dryden's employment of the

60 Susan Bassnett, **Translation Studies**, London and New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004, pp. 64-65

61 Jeremy Munday, **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**, London and New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 24-25

62 George Steiner, **After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,** Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1975] 1977

63 Ibid., pp. 253-254

64 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories**

term "imitation", argues George Steiner, *"seems to aim at Jonson and at what he found to be Jonson's particular renderings of Horace."*[65] He goes on by quoting Jonson's views on *imitatio* from his compilation of critical essays entitled *Timbers* (1641). According to George Steiner, *"for Jonson creative ingestion is the very path of letters, from Homer to Virgil and Statius, from Archilochus to Horace and himself. It is Dryden, who is so deeply and successfully implicated in the same descent through appropriation, who gives the word a negative twist."*[66]

This particular observation would echo itself in L. G. Kelly's *The True Interpreter*,[67] a study, which, in the words of Judith Woodsworth *"comes closest to a general history of translation."*[68] While discussing the concept of "dynamic equivalence" Kelly takes Dryden as a reference point and states that: *"texts with completely dynamic equivalence are equally uncommon, those of pre-Classical dramatists and the medieval poetic translators being clearly examples of Dryden's imitation, which he excludes from the genre of translation."*[69] One distant echo reminiscent of the point raised by George Steiner can be heard in a rather recent article by Juan Miguel Zarandona where he touches briefly upon Dryden's notions of "metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation": *"Dryden, who gave new life to very old concepts, discouraged the first and the third, and prescribed the second, via media."*[70] When these echoes are (re)listened against the backdrop of George Steiner's observation, it becomes possible for one to infer the soundness of the point

---

of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida, Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 17

65 George Steiner, **After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,** Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1975] 1977, p. 255

66 Ibid.

67 L. G. Kelly, The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979

68 Judith Woodsworth, "History of Translation", in Mona Baker (ed.) **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies**, London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 102

69 L. G. Kelly, The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979, p. 155

70 Juan Miguel Zarandona, "*The Amadis of Gaul* (1803) and *The Chronicle of the Cid* (1808) by Robert Southley: The Medieval History of Spain Translated" in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.) **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, p. 312

that he makes in his *After Babel*, a work which has, in fact, been the subject of various criticisms from the perspective of the issues of periodisation,[71] as well as from the viewpoint of feminist approaches.[72] Even so, George Steiner's concise discussion of Dryden has an independent significance within the realm of the discipline. He states that *"Dryden's analysis remains memorable."*[73] One can plausibly rephrase this expression and aver that "it is George Steiner's analysis on Dryden remains memorable in the historiography of translation theory".

In addition to these individual studies on the history of translation that have been referred to thus far, it is worth mentioning Lawrence Venuti's references to Dryden in his *The Translator's Invisibility*. During the course of his examination of the translation methods followed by Sir John Denham and Dryden respectively, Venuti draws attention to a characteristic aspect of their strategies: *"As with Denham, the domestication of Dryden's translation method is so complete that fluency is seen to be a feature of Virgil's poetry instead of the discursive strategy implemented by the translator to make the heroic couplet seem transparent."*[74] Venuti's point is as influential as George Steiner's in that it offers yet another alternative way of reading Dryden's translation practices. Venuti, too, takes particular heed of Dryden's search for a middle ground between the two extreme poles of translational activity. It is important to note that Venuti focuses on the last phases of Dryden's career where he actually abandoned the term "imitation" and thought *"fit to steer*

---

71 See Antoine Berman, **The Experience of the Foreign**, trans. S. Heyvaert, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992, p. 2, and Clara Foz, "Translation, History and the Translation Scholar", in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.) **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, pp. 139-140

72 See Lori Chamberlain, "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation", in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **The Translation Studies Reader**, London and New York: Routledge, [1988] 2000, pp. 320-322, and Sergia Adamo, "Microhistory of Translation", in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.) **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, p. 87

73 George Steiner, **After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,** Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1975] 1977, p. 253

74 Lawrence Venuti, The Translator's Invisibility, London and New York: Routledge, 1995, p. 64

betwixt two extremes of paraphrase and literal translation."[75] Venuti first rephrases these two extremes: *"between the aim of reproducing primarily the meanings of the Latin text, usually at the cost of its phonological and syntactical features, and the aim of rendering it word for word, respecting syntax and line break."*[76] And by questioning Dryden's discussion on Abraham Cowley with respect to the notion of "imitation", he problematises this search for a middle ground attitude: *"The ethnocentric violence performed by domesticating translation rested on a double fidelity, to the source-language text as well as to the target language culture, and especially to its valorization of transparent discourse."*[77] This is a crucial point which lays the ground for Michael Cronin's remarks on Dryden accompanied by a quote from one of Dryden's prefatory poems: *"Dryden's reading of translation history is explicitly agonistic and imperial: For conquering **Rome** / With **Grecian** Spoils, brought **Grecian** Numbers home; / Enrich'd by those **Athenian** Muses more / Than all vanquish'd world could yield before."*[78]

In view of this discussion regarding Dryden's place in historiography of Translation Studies, it can be seen that his views have found critical reactions in various individual studies on history of translation. Still, it is surprising to observe that amongst the studies that have been dwelt upon hitherto, only that of George Steiner establishes a link between Dryden's thoughts on translation and his views on theatre. How to relate this point to the contemporary comprehension of translational phenomena evokes another discussion that will be the subject of the next section.

Dryden Rewriting Shakespeare:

George Steiner builds the connection but does not provide a framework for delving into the issue from the contemporary understanding of translation. André Lefevere's notion of "rewriting", on the other hand, can be taken as

75 John Dryden, "On Translation", in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992, p. 26

76 Lawrence Venuti, The Translator's Invisibility, London and New York: Routledge, 1995, pp. 67-68

77 Ibid.

78 Michael Cronin, Translating Ireland, Cork: Cork University Press, 1996, p. 47, emphasis in the original.

a reference point for developing a sound approach to John Dryden's "imitation of Shakespeare's stile" in his *All for Love*. The fact that Lefevere, who deems translations as *"the most recognizable type of rewriting,"*[79] does not exclude other forms of rewritings, such as adaptations, criticisms, reviews, editions, anthologies, historiographies, and so forth, from his corpus of study is worthy of notice: *"whether they produce translations, literary histories or their more compact spin-offs, reference works, anthologies, criticism, or editions, rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time."*[80] Within this context, therefore, it becomes possible for one to regard *All for Love* as a form of "rewriting" and treat it as such.

Yet, the significance of Lefevere's approach lies in the emphasis that he places on the ideological and poetological currents of a given period. In point of fact, these two notions draw attention to the interrelated terms that Lefevere develops in his approach: "poetics" and "patronage". While *"poetics can be said to consist of two components: one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system, as a whole,"*[81] patronage refers to *"the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature."*[82] It is worth recalling here the backbone of Lefevere's framework since these two concepts have direct relevance to the case of Dryden. After all, as was demonstrated in the earlier pages of this paper, *All for Love* was a tragedy written in harmony with the dominant poetics of its time, that is to say, in line with the neo-classical principle of the three unities of action, time, and place. Additionally, one can hardly dismiss the vital role that patronage acquired in Dryden's time. Furthermore, apart from his prefaces, which are, in fact, autonomous critical statements themselves, Dryden is very well known with his "dedications" to his "patrons".

---

79 André Lefevere, **Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame**, London and New York: Routledge, 1992b, p. 9
80 Ibid., p. 8
81 Ibid., p. 26
82 Ibid., p. 15

There is a paradoxical situation here which invites consideration. According to Dustin Griffin, *"of the great English writers perhaps no dedications exceed Dryden's in the insistence of the flattery and the professions of unworthiness. But Dryden is known too as one of English literature's proudest and—at least in print—most self-assured of writers."*[83] Griffin's remark is significant in the sense that it directs attention to incompatibility between Dryden's self-assurance in his autonomous critical statements and his rather humble, self-effacing attitude in his dedications. Although Dryden acknowledges the so-called superiority of his patrons, he does not flinch from giving advices to them; to Earl of Rochester in particular, his former patron with whom he was in conflict with. In the "Preface" to *All for Love*, for instance, by giving reference to Maecenas, of whom Lefevere cites as one of the most renowned examples of the patrons throughout history,[84] Dryden offers a piece of advice to the patrons of the era: *"But finding himself far gone in poetry, which Seneca assures us was not his talent, he thought it his best way to be well with Virgil and with Horace; that at least he might be a poet at the second hand; and we see how happily it has succeeded with him; for his own bad poetry is forgotten, and their panegyrics of him still remain. But they who should be our patrons are for no such expensive ways to fame; they have much of the poetry of Maecenas, but little of his liberality."*[85] In so doing, Dryden not only questions the values of the patrons, but also resists them and adopts a stance that runs counter to his self-effacing attitude in his dedications.[86]

Nevertheless, the motive behind Dryden's rewriting of William Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* was mainly concerned with the poetics of the Restoration Period, as well as with the complicated situation that he found himself in. In the absence of indigenous playwrights, Dryden was in

---

83 Dustin Griffin, **Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 71

84 Cf. André Lefevere, **Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame**, London and New York: Routledge, 1992b, p. 15

85 John Dryden, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, pp. 314-315

86 For a full treatment of the issue, see Dustin Griffin, **Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, ch. 4, esp. pp. 76-83

the cleft stick of restoring the national drama tradition. As George Steiner maintains, *"he knew that there towered at his back the divided legacy of Sophocles and Shakespeare. To which should he turn in his endeavour to re-establish a national theatre? In seeking out to hammer out a compromise solution, Dryden imposed on his own plays a preliminary and concurrent apparatus of criticism. He is the first of the critic-playwrights."*[87] But Dryden was at the same time conscious of the poetics of neo-classicism through the works of Pierre Corneille and Jean Racine. And, as stated previously, *All for Love* was written in the wake of his meticulous reading of the three unities of action, time, and place. Needless to say, the demands of the neo-classic "precepts" would constrain Dryden to such an extent that he would efface the two names of "the triple pillar of the world"[88] from his *All for Love*.

Well, not only Octavius Caesar and Lepidus, but also a horde of other minor characters of *Anthony and Cleopatra* has been excluded from *All for Love* and represented through a single character Ventidius with the purpose of "avoiding the tumult". It is most probable for one to trace this tactical move back to Dryden's criticism of Shakespeare in his *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. As a consequence of the prerequisites of the three unities of action, time, and place, moreover, Dryden had to change the setting of the play to Alexandria, the place to the Temple of Isis, and focused on the last few hours of Anthony's death, hastening the time in the last act thereof. Hence the reduction of the thirty-four characters of *Anthony and Cleoptra* to ten dramatis personae in *All for Love*, confinement of the action within a few hours rather than a period of twelve years chronicling the events that take place in Egypt, Rome and Greece. Be that as it may, against the backdrop of Dryden's structural rewriting of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, lies Corneille's observation which reads as: *"I think, however, that the fifth act, by special privilege, has the right to accelerate time so that the part of the action which it presents may use up more time than is necessary for performance."*[89]

---

87 George Steiner, **The Death of Tragedy**. Yale: Yale University Press, [1961] 1996, p. 39. This sentence seems to be problematic though. Even if George Steiner regards Dryden as the first of the critic-playwrights, the existence of Corneille's critical writings and the way that he exercises them in his plays makes t/his last point open to debate.

88 William Shakespeare, **Anthony and Cleopatra**, M. R. Ridley (ed.) The Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks, London: Methuen, ~1607/1965, p. 4

89 Pierre Corneille, "Of the Three Unities of Action, Time, and Place", trans. Donald

Even though Dryden eliminated certain amount of dramatis personae of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, he did not hesitate to introduce new characters to *All for Love*. One of the most significant of these characters is Octavia; Anthony's legitimate wife. As Eugene M. Wraith underlines, *"Dryden was well aware that the unhistorical introduction of Octavia in Act III was his most daring innovation."*[90] Indeed, by virtue of the introduction of Octavia, Dryden not only depicts the sufferings of two female characters because of the eternal burden of the torch they carry for Anthony, but at the same time foregrounds the title of the play. Take, for instance, the confrontation scene between Octavia and Cleopatra:

"*Octav.* Thou lov'st him not so well.

Cleo. I love him better, and deserve him more.

Octav. You do not; cannot: You have been his ruin.

Who made him cheap at Rome, but Cleopatra?

Who made him scorned abroad, but Cleopatra?

At Actium, who betrayed him? Cleopatra.

Who made his children orphans, and poor me

A wretched widow? only Cleopatra.

Cleo. Yet she, who loves him best, is Cleopatra.

If you have suffered, I have suffered more.

You bear the specious title of a wife,

To gild your cause, and draw the pitying world

Schier, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1660] 1971, p. 224

90 Eugene M. Wraith, **The Herculean Hero**, New York: Columbia University Press, 1962, pp. 196-197

To favour it: the world condemns poor me;

For I have lost my honour, lost my fame,

And stained the glory of my royal house,

And all to bear the branded name of mistress.

There wants but life, and that too I would lose

For him I love."[91]

The confrontation scene between Octavia and Cleopatra is also significant from the vantage point of the conflicting attributes that two women attach to each other. As Bruce King puts it, *"Octavia considers Cleopatra little better than a trollop, whereas Cleopatra scorns the frigid, dutiful love, legitimatized by society, which Octavia represents."*[92] Consequently Octavia does not come alone; she brings Anthony's children with her. Behind the gravity of this clash between Cleopatra and Octavia, there exists Anthony's weakness for his responsibilities as paterfamilias. Prior to the confrontation scene, by firing her arrows straight through the heart of Antony's Achilles' heel, Octavia cuts him to the quick, thereby standing on a solid ground against Cleopatra:

"Methinks you should accept it. Look on these;

Are they not yours? or stand they thus neglected,

As they are mine? Go to him, children, go;

Kneel to him, take him by the hand, speak to him;

For you may speak, and he may own you too,

---

91 John Dryden, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, pp. 370-371

92 Bruce King (ed.), **Twentieth Century Interpretations of All for Love**, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968, p. 7

Without a blush; and so he cannot all

His children: go, I say, and pull him to me,

And pull him to yourselves, from that bad woman.

You, Agrippina, hang upon his arms;

And you, Antonia, clasp about his waist:

If he will shake you off, if he will dash you

Against the pavement, you must bear it, children;

For you are mine, and I was born to suffer.

[*Here the Children go to him, etc.*]

Vent. Was ever sight so moving?—Emperor!

Dola. Friend!

Octav. Husband!

Both Child. Father!

Ant. I am vanquished: take me,

Octavia; take me, children; share me all.

[*Embracing them.*]"[93]

Observe how the quadripartite stroke of epithets paves the way for Anthony's so-called ruin. The contributions of Ventidius and Dolabella are remarkable here in that they help Octavia to make an appeal to Anthony's sense of honour and family; since Anthony is simultaneously an emperor, a friend, a husband, as well as a father. Then again, it is worth handling

93 John Dryden, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, pp. 367

Anthony's ruin with care here. After all, glancing at Dryden's depiction of Anthony as such a fragile character, one wonders at this point whether the play takes the form of a domestic tragedy or not. In his "Preface" to *All for Love*, Dryden explicitly states that he has *"endeavoured in this play to follow the practice of ancients."*[94] He certainly does so by adhering to the neo-classical "precepts" through which the impulse of antiquity can highly be felt. Concordantly, Anthony's and Cleopatra's respective deaths demonstrate that Dryden leaves no room for his characters to take a step back from their ruins. Yet, in terms of the overall depiction of the dramatis personae throughout the play gives one a pause. Reading this particular sentence from Dryden's "Preface", as well as pondering upon the connotations of this particular scene within the context of the Attic tragedies, one inevitably recollects a particular work: Euripides' *Medea*, in which the heroine pitilessly murders her two children without showing a single sign of weakness towards them.[95] Attic tragedians do not permit their characters to waver.

But Dryden's intention in *All for Love* was obviously to follow merely the "practice" of the ancients; certainly not the "tragic shock" that the Attic tragedians created in their works. As was indicated earlier in this article, he was alert both to their poetics and the "precepts" of French neo-classicism. Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* served as a model for him to "excel himself". Thus Dryden rewrote it so as to be able to find a compromise between the demands of antiquity and those of Elizabethans, just as he aimed at finding a middle ground between the two extreme poles of translational activity.

Conclusion:

According to Ruth Wallerstein, *"Dryden perhaps never afterwards put into the drama such intense concentration as he put into All for Love, and his instinct, therefore, never again worked so deeply. In that play, his*

94 Ibid., p. 318

95 The argument can be fostered even more by meditating upon the catastrophic consequences of family affairs in the Attic tragedies. Sophocles' and Euripides' *Elektra*, as well as Aeschylus' treatment of the Elektra story in his *Libation Bearers* can be taken as the representative examples of the merciless attitude that the tragic characters develop towards their parents.

failure is a fable for critics. His success is his own."[96] Wallerstein's point makes even more sense when the triviality of telling a tale that has been told many times is borne in mind. Indeed, the bulk of the secondary literature dedicated to *All for Love* abounds with comparative analyses of William Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* and John Dryden's version of it to such an extent that, after a certain point, they end up with singing praises over the superiority of the former.

This study deliberately avoided undertaking a comparative analysis between the two plays. Instead, it sought to approach Dryden's *All for Love* from another direction, that is to say, from the perspective of Translation Studies. This paper argued for the presence of a hidden significance behind the place that Dryden occupies within the realm of the discipline. In tune with this argument, it has been contested that one way of revealing this importance could be attained through historicising Dryden. To this end, this article offered a rereading of Dryden's key terms of his tripartite "model" of translation in relation to his dramatic and critical writings. Additionally, after problematising historiography of Translation Studies vis-à-vis Dryden's views on translation, an attempt has been made at drawing a parallel between past and present. Therefore, this study has lent an ear to the connotations of "imitation" within the contemporary understanding of translational phenomena and treated *All for Love* as a form of "rewriting".

The existence of William Frost's *Dryden and the Art of Translation*[97] highlights the significance of individual studies that can be devoted to Dryden. Although Frost's approach falls short of extending the boundaries of linguistics, and, by extension, linguistic-oriented approaches to the study and practice of translation, it does show Dryden at work both as a translator and a theoretician of translation. On the other hand, Paul Davis, by concentrating on the alternative expressions that Dryden uses for "paraphrase", that is, "translation with latitude" and "imitation", namely, "libertine way of rendering authors", holds the opinion that they *"align the two modes respectively with the 'Latitude-men' who rose to prominence within the*

96 Ruth Wallerstein, "Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques", in **Review of English Studies**, Vol. 19, no. 74, 1943, p. 185

97 William Frost, Dryden and The Art of Translation, Hamden, Conn: Archon Books, [1955] 1969

Church of England a decade or so earlier offering liberty of opinion on a limited range of peripheral questions of doctrine, and the cadre of debauched aristocrats led by the Earl of Rochester who had lately been conducting a 'libertine offensive' in London."[98] The merit of Davis' observation lies in the fact that it offers yet another way of reading the two essential terms of Dryden's triadic "model" of translation, thereby demonstrating the rich material that can emerge from contextualising Dryden.

To conclude, this paper underscored the necessity of historicising Dryden in order to question the place that he occupies in Translation Studies. By deriving benefit from the notion of "rewriting" one might, maybe one should, develop a more comprehensive approach to Dryden's such other types of rewritings as *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* and *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late* with the purpose of monitoring his critical engagement with Shakespeare than this study attempted to build up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamo, Sergia, "Microhistory of Translation", in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.) **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, pp. 80-99.

- Bassnett, Susan, **Translation Studies**, London and New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004

- Benjamin, Walter, "The Task of the Translator", trans. James Hynd and E. M. Valk, in **Delos A Journal On & Of Translation**, Texas: National Translation Center, No. 2, [1923] 1968, pp. 76-99.

- Benjamin, Walter, **The Origin of German Tragic Drama**, trans. John Osbourne, London: Verso, [1928] 2003a

- Benjamin, Walter, **Understanding Brecht**, trans. Anna Bostock, London: Verso, 2003b

98 Paul Davis, Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 134

- Berman, Antoine, **The Experience of the Foreign**, trans. S. Heyvaert, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992

- Castelvetro, Lodovico, "The *Poetics* of Aristotle Translated and Explained", trans. R. L. Montgomery, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1570] 1971, pp. 145-153.

- Chamberlain, Lori, "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation", in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **The Translation Studies Reader**, London and New York: Routledge, [1988] 2000, pp. 314-329.

- Chesterman, Andrew (ed.), **Readings in Translation Theory**, Finland: Oy Finn Lectura, 1989

- Clark, Sandra, "Shakespeare and Other Adaptations", in Susan J. Owen (ed.), **A Companion to Restoration Drama**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001, pp. 274-290.

- Corneille, Pierre, "Of the Three Unities of Action, Time, and Place", trans. Donald Schier, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1660] 1971pp. 219-226.

- Cronin, Michael, **Translating Ireland**, Cork: Cork University Press, 1996

- Davis, Paul, **Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726**, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008

- Dolet, Etienne, "The Way to Translate Well From One Language into Another, trans. James S. Holmes, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), **Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche**, Manchester: St Jerome, [1540/1997] 2002, pp. 95-97.

- Dryden, John, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 5, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1678] 1808a, pp. 285-411.

- Dryden, John, *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 3, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1667] 1808b pp. 95-205.

- Dryden, John, *Troilus and Cressida; or Truth Found too Late*, in Sir Walter Scott (ed.), **The Collected Works of John Dryden** Vol. 6, London: James Ballantyne and Co, Edinburgh, [1679] 1808c, pp. 227-363.

- Dryden, John, *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, in Hazard Adams (ed.), **Critical Theory Since Plato**, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, [1668] 1971, pp. 228-257.

- Dryden, John, "On Translation", in Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet. (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, [1680/1685/1697] 1992 pp. 17-31.

- D'hulst, Lieven, "Why and How to Write Translation Histories", in **Crop**. Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil, No. 6, 2001, pp. 21-32.

- Foz, Clara, "Translation, History and the Translation Scholar", in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.), **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, pp. 131-144.

- Frost, William, **Dryden and The Art of Translation**, Hamden, Conn: Archon Books [1955] 1969

- Genette, Gérard, **Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation**, trans. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

- Griffin, Dustin, **Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996

- Halliwell, Stephen, **The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems**, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002

- Ham, Roswell G., "Dryden as Historiographer Royal: The Authorship

of *His Majesties Declaration Defended*, 1681", in **Review of English Studies**, Vol. 11, no. 43, 1935, pp. 284-298.

- King, Bruce (ed.), **Twentieth Century Interpretations of All for Love**, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968
- Kelly, L. G., **The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979
- Lefevere, André (ed.), **Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook**, London and New York: Routledge, 1992a
- Lefevere, André, **Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame**, London and New York: Routledge, 1992b
- Munday, Jeremy, **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**, London and New York: Routledge, 2001
- Niranjana, Tejaswini, **Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context**, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992
- Owen, Susan J., "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview" in Susan J. Owen (ed.), **A Companion to Restoration Drama**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001, pp. 126-139.
- Potolsky, Matthew, **Mimesis**. London and New York: Routledge, 2006
- Pym, Anthony, **Method in Translation History**, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998
- Quintilian, "On What We Should Employ Ourselves When We Write", trans. John Selby Watson, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), **Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche**, Manchester: St Jerome, [96 CE?/1997] 2002, pp. 19-20.
- Robinson, Douglas (ed.), **Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche**, Manchester: St Jerome, [1997] 2002

- Saint Jerome, "The Best Kind of Translator: Letter to Pammachius", trans. Paul Carroll, in Douglas Robinson (ed.), **Western Translation Theory from Heredotus to Nietzsche,** Manchester: St Jerome, [395 CE/1997] 2002, pp. 23-30.

- Saslow, Edward L., "Dryden as Historiographer Royal: The Authorship of 'His Majesties Declaration Defended'", in **Modern Philology**, Vol. 75, no. 3, 1978, pp. 261-272.

- Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet (eds.), **Theories of translation : an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida,** Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1992

- Shakespeare, William, **Anthony and Cleopatra**, M. R. Ridley (ed.), The Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks, London: Methuen, [~1607] 1965

- St André, James, "History", in Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies** (Second Edition), London and New York: Routledge, 2009, pp. 133-136.

- Steiner, George, **The Death of Tragedy**, Yale: Yale University Press, [1961] 1996

- Steiner, George, **After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,** Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1975] 1977

- Steiner, T.R. (ed.), **English Translation Theory: 1650-1800**, Assen and Amsterdam: van Gorcum, 1975

- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz, **The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960**, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008

- Venuti, Lawrence, **The Translator's Invisibility**, London and New York: Routledge, 1995

- Wallerstein, Ruth, "Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques", in **Review of English Studies**, Vol. 19, no. 74, 1943, pp. 165-185.

- Woodsworth, Judith, "History of Translation", in Mona Baker (ed.),

Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, London and New York: Routledge, 1998, pp. 100-105.

- Wraith, Eugene M., **The Herculean Hero**, New York: Columbia University Press, 1962

- Zarandona, Juan Miguel, "*The Amadis of Gaul* (1803) and *The Chronicle of the Cid* (1808) by Robert Southley: The Medieval History of Spain Translated" in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds.), **Charting the Future of Translation History**, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006, pp. 309-332.

DRYDEN YA DA TARİHTE YİTEN İSİM

Öz

Antik dönemlerden beri entelektüellerin merakını celbeden bir olgu olan çeviri eylemine dair yapılan tarihsel araştırmalar ayrı bir öneme haizdir. Çünkü çeviri eyleminin tarihsel süreç içerisinde geçirdiği süreçleri izlemek, bir bakıma, çağdaş çeviri anlayışını şekillendiren olguların da izini sürmek anlamına gelmektedir. Bununla birlikte, yapılan bu tarihsel yolculuğu salt çeviri odaklı düşünmek büyük oranda yanıltıcıdır. Zira tarih boyunca çeviriyle gerek kuramsal gerekse uygulama alanında uğraşmış hemen hemen her kişi, söz konusu edimle farklı bağlamlar dâhilinde uğraşmıştır. Hâl böyle olmakla beraber, çeviri kuramlarının tarih yazımında bu durum nedense ikinci plana itilmiştir. Gerçekten de, Çeviribilim'in tarih yazımında önemli konumlara sahip tarihsel isimler, yalnızca çeviri hakkında yazdıklarıyla anılmaktadır. Bu doğal bir sonuçtur. Bir bilim dalı—herhangi bir bilim dalı—tarihi, kendi bakış açısından mercek altına alır ve yazar. Ancak bundan daha fazlasını yapmak her zaman için mümkündür.

Bu makale, Çeviribilim ve çeviri kuramlarının tarih yazımındaki başat isimlerden biri olan John Dryden üzerinedir. Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, çeviri kuramları külliyatında adı, "motamot", "açımlama" ve "taklit" kavramlarıyla birlikte anılan Dryden tarihselleştirilmiştir. Makalenin bu kısmında, Çeviribilim alanında Dryden'ın bu üç seçenek arasında bir orta yol olarak gördüğü açımlamayı tercih ettiğini belirterek sona eren tartışmaların yüzeyselliği sorgulanmaktadır. Restorasyon Dönemi'nin önde gelen oyun yazarlarından Dryden'ın, aynı zamanda çağının en önemli eleştirmenlerden biri olduğu gerçeğinden yola çıkarak, yazarın orta yol arayışının neşet ettiği tiyatro eserlerine, kuramsal yazılarına ve tragedya kavramıyla hesaplaşmasına odaklanan makalenin bir sonraki bölümündeyse, Dryden'ın Çeviribilim ve çeviri kuramlarının tarih yazımındaki yeri sorunsallaştırılmaktadır. Çalışmanın son kısmındaysa Dryden'ın, William Shakespeare'in ***Antonius ile Kleopatra****'sı üzerinden kaleme aldığı* ***Her şey Aşk İçin*** *adlı oyunu üzerinde durulmakta ve makalenin bu bölümüne kadar yürütülen tarihsel tartışma ışığında, bahsi geçen eserin çağdaş çeviri kuramlarındaki yansımaları araştırılmaktadır.*

Anahtar sözcükler: tarih, tarih yazımı, tiyatro tarihi, çeviri tarihi, Dryden

DRYDEN, OR THE NAME WELL LOST IN HISTORY

Abstract:

Historical studies concerned with the act of translation, which had, since the Ancient times, been a subject that draws the attention of intellectuals, constitute a distinct significance. That is because, to monitor the phases in which the act of translation have gone through in the course of time, also comes to mean to trace the concepts that shape the contemporary comprehension of translational phenomena. Additionally, it would be quite misleading to assume this historical journey merely as one taken from a translational perspective, owing to the fact that almost all practitioners and theoreticians of translation operate within different contexts. Be that as it may, this multi-directional quality had for some reason became of secondary importance in historiography of translation theories. In fact, historical figures that have significant value for the historiography of Translation Studies are taken into account only by what they had written on translation. This may seem like a natural outcome. A field of study—any field of study—looks into history from the reference point of its own and works on it accordingly. Yet, it is almost always possible to exceed beyond such limits.

The present article brings John Dryden, who is one of the most prominent actors of historiography of Translation Studies and translation theories, under scope. The first part of this study sets out to historicise Dryden, whose name is well acquainted with the concepts of "metaphrase", "paraphrase", and "imitation" in the corpus of translation theory. In this section, the superficiality of arguments limited to a claim that Dryden regarded paraphrase as a middle ground amongst these three options, is called into question. Taking particular heed of the fact that Dryden, a leading dramatists of the Restoration period, is at the same time one of the most important critics of his epoch, the next part of the paper problematises the place of Dryden within the realm of Translation Studies, as well as historiography of translation theories, by lingering on his theatrical pieces, theoretical writings, and his critical engagement with the notion of tragedy which gave rise to this search for the middle ground. In the light of the historical discussion held thus far in the paper, the last section focuses on Dryden's "rewriting" of William Shakespeare's ***Antonius and Cleopatra****, namely,* ***All for Love****,*

with the purpose of investigating the reflections of the play on the contemporary translation theories.

Keywords: history, historiography, history of theatre, history of translation, Dryden