

Sammlaren

Tidskrift för forskning om
svensk och annan nordisk litteratur
Årgång 141 2020

I distribution:
Eddy.se

Svenska Litteratursällskapet

REDAKTIONSKOMMITTÉ:

Berkeley: Linda H. Rugg

Berlin: Stefanie von Schnurbein

Göteborg: Åsa Arping

Köpenhamn: Johnny Kondrup

Lund: Erik Hedling

München: Joachim Schiedermaier

Oslo: Elisabeth Oxfeldt

Stockholm: Anna Cullhed, Thomas Götselius

Tartu: Daniel Sävborg

Uppsala: Torsten Pettersson, Johan Svedjedal

Zürich: Klaus Müller-Wille

Åbo: Claes Ahlund

Redaktörer: Niclas Johansson (uppsatser) och Karl Berglund (recensioner)

Biträdande redaktör: Magnus Jansson

Inlagans typografi: Anders Svedin

Utgiven med stöd av Vetenskapsrådet

Bidrag till *Samlaren* insändes digitalt i ordbehandlingsprogrammet Word till info@svelitt.se. Konsultera skribentinstruktionerna på sällskapets hemsida innan du skickar in. Sista inlämningsdatum för uppsatser till nästa årgång av *Samlaren* är 15 juni 2021 och för recensioner 1 september 2021. *Samlaren* publiceras även digitalt, varför den som sänder in material till *Samlaren* därmed anses medge digital publicering. Den digitala utgåvan nås på: <http://www.svelitt.se/samlaren/index.html>. Sällskapet avser att kontinuerligt tillgängliggöra även äldre årgångar av tidskriften.

Svenska Litteratursällskapet tackar de personer som under det senaste året ställt sig till förfogande som bedömare av inkomna manuskript.

Svenska Litteratursällskapet PG: 5367–8.

Svenska Litteratursällskapets hemsida kan nås via adressen www.svelitt.se.

ISBN 978–91–87666–40–7

ISSN 0348–6133

Printed in Lithuania by
Balto print, Vilnius 2021

met” (106). Den framskjutna position som textanalys fått i kunskapskraven har sannolikt betydelse för vilka läspraktiker som blir aktuella. Relaterade förklaringar diskuteras med hänvisning till tidigare forskning, till exempel att närläsning med fokus på formaspekter fortfarande dominerar inom svensk litteraturvetenskap. Andra läspraktiker får då mindre utrymme i lärares utbildning vilket kan leda till att de saknar vetenskapliga begrepp för att beskriva arbetet med estetiska läsning.

Sigvardssons avhandling motiveras väl och fångar i sitt syfte ”att ge en fördjupad förståelse för gymnasieelevers poetiska läspraktiker i skolan och på fritiden” (2) avhandlingens centrala tema. Kappan fyller en viktig funktion i relation till de fyra artiklarna genom att den vidgar perspektivet och kontextualiserar de fyra artiklarna. De teorier och metoder som används är relevanta och får en produktiv tillämpning i analyserna. Avhandlingen är välskriven och präglas av noggrannhet och tydlighet, vilket gör det lätt att följa tillvägagångssätt i analyser, resonemang och diskussioner.

Lotta Bergman

Claes Wahlin, *Att anlita översättning. Chaucer, Dryden, Arnold, Pound*. Ellerströms. Lund 2020.

Claes Wahlin’s doctoral thesis discusses how four writers make use of translation as input for their creative writing and thinking, in different ways. We have Chaucer translating Boethius, Dryden translating Chaucer, Arnold responding to Newman’s translation of Homer, and Pound translating Bertran de Born. The emphasis is on the first two, who are both given about 130 pages, Arnold has rather less, about 90, and Pound about 60. I will start by outlining the work itself, and then step back to assess its contribution.

The short introductory chapter starts with a delightful citation from the bibliophile English bishop Richard de Bury (ca. 1345), in which books complain bitterly about the way they are translated by “barbarous interpreters”. In effect, Wahlin will show that this negative view of translation is far from the whole picture.

He opens with a brief account of how he came to select the four writers to be studied, and then there is a short section entitled “Metod”. This offers Descriptive Translation Studies as a general conceptual framework for the thesis. (There are some

problems here, which I will come to later.) The introduction closes with a brief look at some classic general surveys of translation history.

The first main chapter, “Grant translateur, Noble Geoffrey Chaucer”, starts with aspects of the background to Chaucer’s writing, with an “excursion” to his *The House of Fame*, which introduces a discussion of the medieval views of originality, authorship and authority, and the notion of “*Translatio studii*”. After reporting on the state of the English language in the 14th century, and the contemporary practice of literary translation, the chapter then focusses on two Chaucerian translations of Boethius. The first one, a translation of *De consolacione philosophiae*, follows the original fairly closely, but Chaucer’s version of *Troilus and Criseyde* is more of an adaptation. Wahlin distinguishes these two translation methods in terms of Rita Copeland’s concepts of primary and secondary translation. The former is described as a form of exegesis, while the latter is more of an *inventio*. Chaucer’s source texts for *Troilus and Criseyde* were multiple: different versions and fragments of the original story in several languages; besides Boethius, sources include Dante, Petrarch and Ovid. In other words, Chaucer used a compilatory translation method. The result is not “just” a translation, but a new work of fiction, given authority by virtue of its origins (sometimes masked) in classical antiquity. Chaucer is not just a compiler but sometimes a commentator and sometimes a *skriptor*. And, of course, the father of English literature.

In the Dryden chapter, entitled “Restaurering”, Chaucer takes on the role of source-text provider. The opening citations are again well chosen: among others, we have Pope declaiming that “such as Chaucer is, shall Dryden be”; and Swift, in typical satirical mode, commenting that Dryden, “by large deduction of Genealogies, made it plainly appear, that they [i.e. he and Homer] were nearly related”. This points to the trope of metempsychosis, the transmigration of souls. The idea is made particularly explicit by the Earl of Roscommon, in his well-known advice to budding literary translators (cited by Wahlin): “choose an Author as you choose a friend. / United by this Sympathetick Bond, / You grow Familiar, Intimate, and Fond; / Your Thoughts, your Words, your Stiles, your Souls agree, / No Longer his Interpreter, but He.” This idea is one of the leitmotifs of this chapter, and recurs in the later discussion of Pound. (I can add that the metempsychosis metaphor has also been

used in translation history to describe the Indian attitude to translation, seen metaphysically as re-birth. This expresses a notably more positive view of translation than the western Babel myth, where translation is eternally relegated to the status of a second-best solution. See e.g. Ganesh Devy, "Literary History and Translation. An Indian View", *Meta*, 42, 1997:2, pp. 395–406.)

But before we get to translation issues, there is an extensive and wide-ranging presentation of the social, political and linguistic background. This contextualization covers such topics as the Restoration of the English monarchy after a period of huge political unrest; the state of the English language; the importance of decorum; attitudes to reading (a potentially risky pursuit, especially for the lower classes, because it might lead to social unrest); passions, especially enthusiasm (also risky); and the foundation of the Royal Society, with its ideal of plain language. Of particular interest here is the influence of Francis Bacon and the aspiration to create a "perfect language". The churchman and historian Thomas Sprat, a member of the Royal Society, is said to have believed that there once was a time when language exactly matched reality, so that the number of "things" matched the number of words. This sounds like iconicity taken to an extreme. Swift satirized Sprat's position in a hilarious section of *Gulliver's Travels*, cited of course by Wahlin, where Gulliver comes across a Grand Academy where people converse simply by exchanging things, carried by servants if necessary, instead of laboriously exchanging words.

A particularly interesting subsection discusses the relation between plagiarism and imitation. Dryden's classic typology of translation, with the three categories of metaphrase (word by word), paraphrase (freer: "with latitude") and imitation, is of course highly relevant. Then the focus shifts to Dryden translating Chaucer, whom Dryden enshrines as the classic English writer, in accordance with his overall aim of strengthening the English literary system.

Dryden justifies his free "imitating" approach to translating Chaucer, which goes as far as including omissions and extensive additions, by explaining that he had "a Soul congenial" to Chaucer's. In special focus is an extract selected from the Prologue to *The Canterbury Tales*, introducing the Good Parson. This is stated by Dryden to be "Imitated from Chaucer, and Inlarg'd," and is clearly based on a domesticating strategy, with due attention paid to de-

corum. A final excursion shows how Dryden's version of the Good Parson suggests his preference for a clerical attitude that maintained a discreet distance from political issues such as the secession of the English monarchy. Dryden expresses this view partly by means of incorporating allusions to the character and life of his widely admired contemporary, Bishop Thomas Ken.

Chapter 3, "Vad en klassiker är", moves to the 19th century, and the debate about how to translate Homer. At the centre is the well-known argument between Francis Newman and Matthew Arnold: a clash that is itself a classic item in translation history, and one that has been much studied. There is therefore quite a bit of background research to be reported on.

The chapter opens with a taste of Newman's translation, which Arnold strongly criticizes, but then moves away to outline the Hellenistic tradition in England, the influence of European philological scholarship, and the question of whether "Homer" was one poet or several. Then Newman is presented in detail, with his pedagogically motivated translation that deliberately adopts an archaic, " quaint " style, aiming to transport the reader into Homer's primitive world. Newman chooses a ballad metre of iambic tetrameters, which some critics will scorn. His translation is intended for ordinary people who want to learn about the epic, not academics or professionals.

Arnold's view is very different. In a series of public lectures, he uses Newman's translation as a springboard to present and defend his own view of Homer, and of how Homer should be translated. For him, Homer is not quaint or primitive, but above all noble, and this characteristic should be preserved in a translation. The grandeur of the style produces a moral effect, argues Arnold; the style is "the expression of the nobility of the poet's character". For this, the ballad metre is not appropriate: the English Homer should be in hexameters.

Newman replied to Arnold's criticism, defending his decisions. One point he makes is to underline his intended readership: "Scholars are the tribunal of Erudition, but of Taste the educated but unlearned public is the only rightful judge; and to it I wish to appeal," as Wahlin cites.

Arnold responds in turn, adding an argument for founding an Academy in England, on the French model, which would promote "a public force of correct literary opinion." Wahlin points out that the majority of Victorian, and especially

more recent, critical opinion tended to agree more with Arnold, although some critics are in sympathy with Newman's aim to reach non-academic readers. Several other Homeric translations appeared soon after Arnold's critical lectures, using hexameters.

Both Newman and Arnold agreed on Homer's greatness, however. Newman wanted his translation to be a means of educating the Victorian public, but in a sense Arnold shared this goal: he wanted to see a domesticated Homer serving as a moral and aesthetic ideal, to inspire cultured intellectuals in general. However, unlike Chaucer, Dryden and Pound, Arnold did not engage in translation himself.

This chapter ends with a discussion of Arnold's cultural eclecticism, as expressed in his lectures and essays. Faced with what they felt to be a cultural decline, Arnold and others sought out models of "sanity" wherever they might be found, first and foremost in classical Greek culture. Arnold's idea of culture, explains Wahlin, was "selfculture", in the sense of a person's "best self", raised above his "ordinary self". It is the task of the critic, as a member of the cultural elite, to find, and propagate, "the best that is known and thought in the world". The classics represent the high norms of excellence, to be aspired to.

Chapter 4, on Ezra Pound, is introduced as a kind of appendix. It is curiously entitled "En kväll på operan", but the significance of this becomes clear later. It focusses on two translations by Pound, of a medieval Occitan poem by Bertran de Born. We start with the French literary background, and a survey of the renaissance of interest in Occitan and medieval culture there and in England, during the 18th and 19th centuries. A section on Bertran de Born presents the poet (described as a violent and martial troubadour), and the poem, a *sirventes* (a form of troubadour lyric poetry), that will be Pound's inspiration. The poem is not a long one, which it makes it possible for Wahlin to include the source text and its target texts *in toto*: an obvious advantage. To prepare for Pound's two versions, we are first shown John Rowbotham's translation of the same poem. This is a domesticated translation, remaining semantically fairly close to the original.

A brief survey of Victorian translation mentions, among others, Fitzgerald's very free adaptation of the "Rubáiyat of Omar Khayyám", and then we return to Bertrand de Born, Pound's interest in him, Pound's studies of Occitan literature, and his early book on this: *The Spirit of Romance*. Pound

did not have philological ambitions, but saw his standpoint as that of an artist. Pound was evidently drawn by de Born's infatuation with "My Lady Battle", and this poet's energy, naivety and idealism. Pound's first translation of the de Born poem is intended to be pedagogical, or "merely exegetic" in Pound's words. Apart from one clear error of interpretation, commented on by Wahlin, this first translation is semantically fairly close, although formally very different, being half in prose.

The second version, called "Sestina: Altaforte", is discussed as an early example of Pound's "mask" poems or dramatic monologues, where the poet adopts the role of another poet or character. This technique was not new, and had already been used e.g. by Browning. Close semantic equivalence is now abandoned, and priority given to the complex rhyme structure of the sestina form and the persona of the source poet. The source text is no more than a source of inspiration for a new poem. Pound was eclectic in selecting elements from which to create a new poem: the source text was far from being a stable entity. The theme of metempsychosis returns, as a way of describing what Pound felt he was doing, identifying with the source poet. Pound's view of poetry, and himself as a poet, is a strikingly mystical one. Yet he also felt that at least part of his task was to shake up the English literary system, with a new kind of poetry.

The chapter ends with a consideration of Pound's heritage, his place in history, and the relation of these poems to some of his later work, especially his late poem "Near Perigord". Here, he recounts how he visited the home ground of Bertran de Born, retracing his steps along the local paths, in mystical touch with him, moving across time, in some sense merging his own self with that of the Occitan poet.

We are finally brought back to Pound's visit to the opera in Venice, alluded to in the chapter's title, where Pound seems to have experienced some kind of epiphany, a sense of being in the company of Browning, Verdi, and other cultural giants from the past.

The brief concluding chapter sums up the big picture. Examining the role played by translation, in the work of the four writers studied, reveals an astonishing amount about English cultural history. Literary translation has not just been a process of transferring the meaning of source texts; it has also served other functions, as a major source of inspiration, in many ways.

Claes Wahlin's book displays remarkable erudi-

tion, extending over a wide range of material. The depth of detail throughout is striking. Some details are entertaining and relevant, but sometimes there are digressions, even quite lengthy ones, that come at the cost of distracting focus from the central research topic. Some small points are unnecessarily repeated, such as the derogatory comparison of Newman's ballad metre to the popular song "Yankee Doodle". Some cuts could have improved the readability of the volume as a whole.

The fact that the book is in Swedish is in itself interesting. As such, it is not addressed to an international audience. The writers studied are all central figures in English literature, and have all been much studied by scholars of this literature. It would seem, then, that Wahlin sees himself as a kind of interpreter or mediator of this literary tradition for a Swedish readership. Indeed, he does not claim to bring radically new insights; rather, he seeks to expound on a considerable body of literary and cultural history, from a particular perspective: the role played by translation. The work thus overlaps two fields: literary history and translation studies.

The writer shows a mastery of the literary background and its context, and the textual analyses are well done: clear, and to the point, although much more space is given to the literary and cultural contexts than to actual textual analysis. There are in-depth discussions of genetic and other intertextual relations of many kinds.

As a study which is explicitly given a translation-theoretical framework, however, there are a number of problems. Wahlin makes good use of the major classics on the history of literary translation, especially Copeland's work. But his view of translation studies is rather restricted, and not always justified. Contrary to the impression given in the text, the contemporary discipline of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), as pioneered by James Holmes, Gideon Toury and others, is not limited to literary translation. DTS does not itself constitute a method: DTS research has made use of dozens of different methods, from corpus studies to eye-tracking. The point of the term "descriptive" is just to distinguish it from the earlier research tradition, which was largely prescriptive, i.e. pedagogically oriented; descriptive research, on the other hand, aims to describe and explain what translators actually do, not prescribe what they should do. DTS thus distances itself from a concept of equivalence that is defined *a priori*; rather, it is a research goal (e.g. for Toury) to discover what a given translator's

concept of equivalence is, and perhaps also why, by analysing the relation between the source text and the translation, and also the contextual conditions.

One of the conceptual frameworks used by DTS is norm analysis, which Wahlin highlights in his "Metod" section. But what is a norm? It has been much debated in translation research: some scholars have found the concept so vague as to be useless, others have made use of a working definition of some kind. However, there is agreement that the term has two basic senses, which are often confused. One sense is "what people tend to do" (i.e. common, normal practice) and the other is "what people think they ought to do". This second sense is the one that is relevant to the work of Toury and others in DTS. Its component of obligation makes it more complex. People might tend to act in a certain way because they think they ought to, but there may also be other reasons: perhaps they have not stopped to think about what they are doing, or perhaps they are constrained by cognitive limitations, for instance. In the case of translation, translators are often influenced by the form of the source message, resulting in interference; there is no norm here, in the obligation sense. There has been much discussion on what kind of textual and extratextual evidence there can be for the existence of an obligation norm. One good example is criticism of norm-breaking, criticism that is seen (by members of the community concerned) as justified: this seems to be good evidence of the existence of a norm. It is well illustrated by Arnold's response to Newman's translation: Arnold saw himself, and was widely recognized, as a norm-authority, and in his view Newman had broken certain norms: hence his criticism.

A problem in Wahlin's work is that he does not define explicitly what he means by a norm, and he does not problematize the concept; the term is used rather inconsistently. He writes, for instance (page 20), that Toury's norms do not take account of individual subjectivity. True, since for Toury (and in DTS generally) norms are by definition social: they express correctness notions held by a community or culture, at a given time. The concept is, after all, a sociological one. Yet Wahlin nevertheless uses Toury's norm typology (but not his model of translation analysis), even though he is interested in individual writers. Norm-theoretically, we could refer here to the distinction between social norms and individual attitudes to them. The important concept of decorum in Dryden's time can be easily

glossed as a set of norms, but elsewhere in the book the intended meaning is often less clear.

The notion of a translation strategy also needs defining: this is another term used rather loosely by Wahlin. In DTS, there are quite a number of definitions and typologies of translation strategies, and disagreements about what to call them. Wahlin does not define the term, and uses it in different ways, sometimes meaning a global, general strategy (such as domesticating) and sometimes a local, specific one (such as whether or not to use loanwords from the source). The metaphor of metempsychosis is also described as a strategy, which makes the meaning of the term opaque indeed.

Another theoretical framework within DTS is polystem theory, as developed in particular by Even-Zohar. His book is mentioned, but the theory is not used. It might have been a good choice as a way of conceptualizing changes in the English literary system. Reference could also be made to translation research with respect to a number of other issues raised in the book. These include the notion of unstable source texts; other forms of translation (apart from imitation) that do not prioritize semantic fidelity, such as phonemic translation; the “cannibalistic theory” of literary translation promoted by the de Campos brothers in Brazil; and seeing translation in terms of risk management.

More generally, there has been growing critical debate on the use of binary oppositions in conceptual analyses of translation issues. This might have been relevant to the author’s adoption of Cope-land’s distinction between primary and secondary translation, and Venuti’s domesticating vs foreignizing. It is increasingly recognized in DTS that all such polar oppositions risk oversimplifying a complex concept into a single opposition or parameter. Better analyses might be offered by multidimensional models.

Wahlin’s work is thus less well anchored in Translation Studies than it is in English literary history. It would have been interesting to see how he would define the concept of translation itself (a hugely debated issue in DTS, of course). On p. 425 he quotes Pound as saying that FitzGerald’s “Rubáiyát” is not a translation, nor is his own “Altaforte”. Yet Wahlin refers to both as translations. So what counts as a translation? What criteria are relevant? What definition is Wahlin using? What kind of concept is “translation”? It is hard to find a consensus in the discipline, but this means that at least a stipulative definition is needed.

Wahlin’s general discursive style is expository rather than argumentative. He tends to remain neutral and avoid critical comments. But there are always concepts that can be problematized and positions that can be criticized. For instance, Arnold’s idealistic belief in the morally uplifting influence of classical literature could surely be queried from today’s standpoint: what about George Steiner’s “brutal paradox”? In the Nazi concentration camps, writes Steiner, “Men could come home from their day’s butchery and falsehood to weep over Rilke or play Schubert” (*George Steiner. A Reader*, New York 1984, 11). I would have appreciated more argumentative engagement with the many sources Wahlin refers on.

Notwithstanding these critical comments, I salute Wahlin’s manifest erudition and wide reading. The book deserves to become a major reference work for Swedish scholars of English literary history, and for Swedish-reading scholars of translation history. It illustrates some of the wide-ranging relations that can exist between a source and a translation, and thus implicitly tests the boundaries of the concept of what a translation can said to be. The book sets out to explain the relation between contextual conditions and the ways selected writers made use of translation. I first took the intended sense of “explanation” here to be causal, loosely speaking: i.e. showing how contextual conditions affected the writers’ attitudes to translation and its functions. However, I came to realize that what the work really offers is a hermeneutic explanation, in considerable depth. It explains *what it means* to say that these writers used translation for their own purposes, each in the cultural context of his time. In this endeavour, the book is a striking achievement.

Andrew Chesterman

Elżbieta Żurawska, *Parabeln i Stig Dagermans novellistik*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Kraków 2019.

Elżbieta Żurawskas doktorsavhandling försvarades offentligt 2017 vid Jagellonska universitetet i Kraków och har därefter reviderats till den slutliga version som nu föreligger i tryckt form. Undersökningen är väl förankrad i tidigare svensk och internationell dagermanforskning, men intar lika fullt en ny och intressant position i en huvudsakligen biografiskt, tematiskt, politiskt och psyko-