Revisiting Hugo Friedrich's Concept of Translation as an Art

Dr. Amit R. Prajapati

Professor, Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Udhna-Magdalla Road, Surat, 395007.

Abstract

Translation has always, as it has been often argued, oscillated between a mechanical transfer of linguistic interpretation and a creative act of literary recreation. The contemporary theories challenge the formal view emphasizing interpretation, recreation of form and aesthetic responsibility of the act of translation. This research paper tries to analyse Hugo Friedrich's very famous essay "On the Art of Translation", originally delivered as a speech in German language at Heidelberg on 24th July, 1965, translated by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet into English, published in an anthology titled *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, published by The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London in 1992. Through this essay, Friedrich argues that the translation of poetry is fundamentally an aesthetic and interpretive art, not a technique. Rejecting the notion of fidelity, he affirms the inseparability of the form and meaning in a given text and thus redefines the fidelity of the translator in view of the poetic intention. This research paper, by making a close analysis, examines Friedrich's ideas of translation as an art, comparing with those of Dryden, Walter Benjamin and others. The research paper concludes stating how Friedrich established the aesthetic values of translation recognizing the translator as a re-creative agency.

Keywords: translation, art, criticism, recreation, mechanical, form, meaning

(1) Introduction:

Translation occupies the central position fundamentally in any type of literature since it allows the circulation of texts across all linguistic and cultural boundaries. However, translation has been very often regarded as a secondary and derivative activity in comparison to the creative writing. The traditional approach to Translation Studies treat translation as a technical linguistic operation driven by accuracy and fidelity to the original known as Source Language Text. This approach to translation led translation to be merely a linguistic transfer, privileging original over the translated text.

This research paper tries to analyse Hugo Friedrich's very famous essay "On the Art of Translation", originally delivered as a speech in German language at Heidelberg on 24th July, 1965, translated by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet into English, published in an anthology titled *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, published by The

University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London in 1992. The reduced significance of translation has been often challenged by the contemporary theories. An anthology of essays titled as *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, as suggested by the title of the text itself, surveys the evolution of translation from early humanism to the contemporary post-structural philosophy. Within this collection, apart from many essays by Dryden, Roman Jakobson, Goethe, Rossetti, Walter Benjamin, Ezra Pound and others, Hugo Friedrich's essay "On the Art of Translation" occupies a distinctive position. Translation as an interpretive act, rooted in literary criticism, is not a linguistic technique but is an art.

The central argument made by Friedrich is that literary translation—particularly the translation of poetry—cannot be done mechanically as the poetic meaning is inseparable from its form and stylistic tension. Therefore, the translation of poetry requires some creative characteristics, a type of creative ability, on the part of translator, associated with artistic creation. According to Friedrich, the meaning in a poem is produced out of the interaction among its formal aspects. A translation with the rejection of a form is merely an information. By redefining translator as an interpretive agency and translation as an act of redefined fidelity, Friedrich offers a theory which rejects the rigid verbatims in translation. The following is an attempt to revisit the theory of Hugo Friedrich in details.

(2) Contribution of Hugo Friedrich to Criticism:

Friedrich covers a central place in the field of criticism and translation in the 20th century. He is famous for his seminal text *The Structure of Modern Poetry: from the Mid Nineteenth to the Mid Twentieth Century* and the essay "On the Art of Translation". Emphasizing the aesthetic form, Friedrich has analysed the modern European poetry accepting that literature must be read and understood as an aesthetic structure primarily, not as a philosophical allegory or a social documentary. Though his text *The Structure of Modern Poetry*, he argues that the modern poetry demands the critical form rather than it being reduced to the social or biological or moralistic interpretative paraphrasing. Friedrich states that the modern poetry "no longer wishes to describe the world" rather it "wishes to create a new one" (Friedrich 1974: 15). By the use of the word 'structure' in the title, Friedrich means the relationship between the language and thought. The modern poetry, according to Hugo Friedrich, renders meaning through tension and fragmentation. The modern poetry does not want to explain the world rather, "it constructs a new one" and therefore, it passes through the crisis of meaning leading a reader to face the difficulty (Friedrich 1974: 15).

Various arguments made by Friedrich if applied to Translation Studies, one has to accept the fact that to translate the modern poetry is never an easy task. Sir John Denham has rightly said about the difficulty of translating a poem as quoted by Dryden in his essay "On Translation", "Poetry is of so subtle a spirit, that, in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate; and, if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *caput mortuum*" (Dryden 1992: 20). Therefore, it is not useless to say that the contribution of Friedrich to literary criticism informs us about his contribution to Translation Studies as well and, this essay occupies its central place in the area of Translation Studies. By making an analysis of the modern poetry, Friedrich has established criticism as an art of attentive reading rather than ideological explanation merely. The following is the detailed analysis of the essay "On the Art of Translation" by Hugo Friedrich.

(3) Analysis of "On the Art of Translation":

The Structure of Modern Poetry: from the Mid Nineteenth to the Mid Twentieth

Century discusses Friedrich's concern for translation as a literary act, not translation as a means of communication. Focussing on translation with reference to poetry, Friedrich declares that the language produces meaning through sound, syntax and structure. Resisting simplicity, Friedrich advocates for difficulty as an essential quality rather than a defect.

(3.1) Problem of Untranslatability: Especially in Poetry:

Friedrich begins his speech / essay being disturbed by the use of the language when he says, "literary translations continue to be threatened by the boundaries that exist between languages" (Friedrich 1992: 11). These boundaries between the two languages also extend more due to differences in culture. About culture, Katan confesses that "The rst area of controversy is in the denition of culture itself" (Katan 2009: 74) whereas Raymond Williams declares that "culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language" to define because "it has now come to be used for important concepts in several distinct intellectual disciplines and in several distinct and incompatible systems of thought" (Williams 1983: 87). Be it language or culture, but especially with reference to language, Friedrich has accepted that "the art of translation will always have to cope with the reality of untranslatability from one language to another" and when one translates a poem especially (Friedrich 1992: 11). Dryden argues, "No man is capable of translating poetry, who, besides a genius to that art, is not a master both of his author's language, and of his own; nor must we understand the language only of the poet, but his particular turn of thoughts and expression, which are the characters that distinguish, and as it were individuate him from all other writers" (Dryden 1992: 20).

Friedrich further notes very clearly that "in a poetic sense, the art of translation is affected by language boundaries" since the translator is guided by the "shades of subtlety of the original" and therefore, as a translator s/he slips into some "demands" (Friedrich 1992: 11) as while defining the concept of 'language', Saussure writes, "It is both a social product of the faculty of speech and a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body to permit individuals to exercise that faculty" (Saussure 1959: 10). "Translators" says Friedrich, "want to do justice to their own art by accommodating the literary demands on language of the original text" (Friedrich 1992: 11) because when they translate, what they translate is the language which is "a system of meanings", according to M. A. K. Halliday (Halliday 1978: 2). Friedrich very well knows that the translators are "constantly restricted by. . . language boundaries and by the pressing necessity to remain, as closely as possible, faithful to the original text" (Friedrich 1992: 11). The pressure on the translators is to be faithful to the Source Language Text, to decode, according to George Chapman, the "the spirit of the original text" to recode in the Target Language Text (Chapman 2005: 64). If the translator hankers "for likeness to the original", says Benjamin, "no translation would be possible" (Benjamin 1992:74), as Nida also rightly supports stating, "Differences in language structure often require changes in meaning during translation" (Nida 1969: 12).

(3.2) Some Questions and the Context of Literary Translation:

Though Friedrich states that "the scope of my subject is rather limited", he has drawn the outline for the larger framework of his task (Friedrich 1992: 11). He has raised some of the questions "concerning the art of translation" which he requites to be discussed (Ibid: 11). The following are the questions raised:

Is translation something that concerns the cultural interaction of an entire nation with another? Is translation just the reaction of one writer to another? Does translation resurrect and revitalize a forgotten work, or does it just keep a work alive to satisfy

tradition? Does translation distort the foreign in an old work under the pressure of specific contemporary aesthetic views? Do translators pay close attention to the differences inherent in languages or do they ignore them? Does the translation create levels of meaning that were not necessarily visible in the original text so that the translated text reaches a higher level of aesthetic existence? What is the relationship (p. 11) between translation and interpretation: when do the two meet and when does translation follow its own laws? (Ibid: 11-12).

These questions are significant, and in the following part of his essay, he has attempted perhaps to find the possible answers to these questions.

(3.3) The Roma Translation: An Act of Appropriation:

To date back the history of translation Friedrich says that "In Europe, literary translation has been known since the age of the Romans" (Friedrich 1992: 12). While offering credit to translation, Friedrich says that "the literature and philosophy of the Romans gained strength from their Greek models" by the way of their translations into the Roman. Earlier Ennius attempted "to transplant Greek texts into Latin" that often resulted into the "awkward lexical Graecisms to enter into the translations" (Ibid: 12). Over a period of time, as Friedrich has noticed, the practice of the Roman translators changed. They attempted "The appropriation of the original without any real concern for the stylistic and linguistic idiosyncracies of the original" allowing their translations not to mean the faithful imitation of the Greek style but simply the "appropriation of the original" to fit "into the linguistic structures of one's own culture" (Ibid: 12). Yes, in such translations, emphasizes Friedrich, "Latin was not violated in any form" though "original text violated the structure of its own language by deviating from normally accepted conventions through the invention of neologisms, new word associations, and unusual stylistic and syntactical creations" (Ibid: 12). Quoting Popovic, Bassnett defines the linguistic untranslatability as, "A situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation" (Bassnett, 2002: 42). This attitude makes translation an act of recreation rather than a subordinate one. To solidify his notion, Friedrich gives the example of Cicero "who with respect to his own translation of Demosthenes" wrote the following words: "I translate the ideas, their forms, or as one might say, their shapes; however, I translate them into a language that is in tune with our conventions of usage *(verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis)*. Therefore, I did not have to make a word-far-word translation but rather a translation that reflects the general stylistic features *(genus)* and the meaning *(vis)* of the foreign words" *[De optimogenere oratorum]* (Friedrich 1992: 12).

(3.4) Monopoly of Target Language: Saint Jerome's Model of Translation:

St. Jerome in the practice of translation, accepted all earlier Roman ideas on translation "almost verbatim", completely unchanged (Friedrich 1992: 12). While rendering the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible *Septuagint* into Latin, Saint Jerome "formulated his views on the art of translation in a treatise (in the form of a letter addressed to Pammachius) entitled *De optimo genere interpretandi*" (Ibid: 12). In that letter-treatise, St. Jerome argues that "it is the target language, Latin, that dictates the rules" (Ibid: 12). By citing the example of St. Jerome, Friedrich emphasizes here the role of the Target Language in translation. Friedrich states, quoting Jerome that it "reproduces the peculiar features of a foreign language with those features of one's own language" (Ibid: 12). Later on, Friedrich quotes another statement by St. Jerome that sounds like "a declaration of power by a Roman emperor" that "The translator considers thought content a prisoner *(quasi captivos sensus)* which he transplants

into his own language with the prerogative of a conqueror *(iure victoris)*" (Ibid: 12-13). That the "prerogative" is given here to translator as "a conqueror" is "one of the most rigorous manifestations of Latin cultural and linguistic imperialism which . . . appropriates the foreign meaning in order to dominate it through the translator's own language" (Ibid: 13). This view of St. Jerome asserts the monopoly of the Target Language over the Source Language.

(3.5) The Target Language Text in a Contest with the Source Language Text:

What Friedrich has said about the Romans earlier, extending the same he notes that they "developed another concept concerning the theory and practice of translation" that can "easily be seen as an extension of the one mentioned above" (Ibid: 13). The dilemma begins when the translated text and its source text are not seen as reciprocal to each other but as if they were in a type of contest with each other. Friedrich gives the example of Quintilian who was a Roman educator. Quintilian recommends "*aemulatio*" meaning 'apporpriation' as a "*certamen*" meaning 'contest' (Ibid: 13). Thus, "Translation is seen as" says Friedrich "a contest with the original text" (Ibid: 13). Friedrich further clarifies that "The goal" of the Romans is "to surpass the original" where they enter into the contest with the original, however, "in doing so" they "consider the original as a source of inspiration for the creation of new expressions in one's own language" and thus, states Friedrich, the Romans always respected that Source Language Text (Ibid: 13).

(3.6) Translation Surpasses the Original: Enrichment of the Target Language:

One type of translation believes in only transferring the meaning into the Target Language Text but argues Friedrich, "this second type of translation" actually believes differently. It aims at the "enrichment of language by surpassing the original" leading into the "third approach" (Ibid: 13). This new approach is "based on the premise" meaning a 'hypothesis' that "the purpose of translation is to go beyond the appropriation of content" (Ibid: 13). The purpose of such translation is not only to transfer the meaning but also "to a releasing of those linguistic and aesthetic energies" within the Target Language that "had never been materialized before", their potential was never realized before (Ibid: 13). One can go back to "Quintilian and Pliny" in search of the roots of this "premise" (Ibid: 13). "The beginning of this premise can be traced back to Quintilian and Pliny", says Friedrich, which later on turned out to be the "dominant characteristic of European translation theories of the Renaissance" (Ibid: 13). Its "most striking hallmark is its effort to 'enrich'" the Target Language (Ibid: 13). The translation has to move closer to the original but in this case particularly, the translation "does not move toward the original" but "The original is brought over" to the translation "in order to reveal the latent stylistic possibilities in one's own language" that are "different from the original" (Ibid: 13).

(3.6.1) Example of How Translation Surpasses the Original:

Friedrich now offers the example of this approach in Translation Studies. "Perhaps the most striking example of this way of thinking about translation theory" is the translation done by Malherbe "of the Lucilius letters of Seneca" at the beginning of "the seventeenth century" (Ibid: 13). In the translation of these letters of Seneca written to Gaius Lucilius by Malherbe, notes Friedrich, "Hardly anything remains of Seneca's stylistic features" (Ibid: 13). Malherbe "transformed" Seneca's "short unconnected sentences with their somewhat idealistic laconicisms" into "a totally different style" which was rare in the French literature, "had been unknown or little known in French

literature" (Ibid: 13). This translation of letters was "totally opposed to the spirit and the stylistic characteristics of Seneca's language" since it introduced "a new type of prose . . . into modern French" (Ibid: 13). The difference is "Where Seneca writes short sentences" Malherbe "creates chains of sentences, conversational connections and interactions, logical sequences, and explanations of meaning" (Ibid: 13-14).

Malherbe here translates as if he were the creator and not the translator. Malherbe while translating "ranks ideas according to their major and minor importance, and he repeats the same content each time in a different form" (Ibid: 14). As a result of this translation of Malherbe, "The uncertain, often chaotic, yet always colorful richness of previous French prose characteristic of writers like Rabelais, Bonaventure des Periers, and Montaigne begins to disappear" replacing and simultaneously allowing to emerge "the beauty, precision, and politeness of classical French writing" (Ibid: 14). The extra liberty taken by the translator Malherbe has made this happen. Friedrich states, "This form of writing took root as the result of a translation in which the translator felt free not only to appropriate the content of the original texts but also to create a style in opposition to that in the source language" (Ibid: 14). Octavio Paz, in his essay "Translation: Literature and Letters" notes, "In theory, only poets should translate poetry; in practice, poets are rarely good translators. . . The good translator of poetry is a translator who is also a poet" (Paz 1992: 158). This view of Paz is in the light that if a non-poet translator translates, the translation may not be alike its original in its form and structure. This attempt of Malherbe as a translator allowed "a new style of writing", of translating to emerge which was later on appreciated by, says Friedrich, La Bruyere as "well-balanced forms and transparency sufficed to lead to the natural creation of ideas" (Friedrich 1992: 14).

(3.7) Translation as Interaction:

The discussion that has taken place so far proves that translation is "an act of 'carrying over'" (Ibid: 14). And it is this "carrying over" that justifies the theory that translation is not "an interaction between two literatures" only but also "their respective cultures" in which as Friedrich notes, "the source language continuously appears in opposition to the target language" (Ibid: 14). Nietzsche emphasized in *The Gay Science* that translation, rather than simply reproducing the original, reshapes the original as the translation is "meant to conquer" (Ibid: 14).

(3.8) From Rivalry to Equality of Languages:

Friedrich argues that during the 2nd half of the 18th century, a new type of theory that appeared, helped to develop the activity of translation in Europe, apart from the cultural differences. As Friedrich notes, "beginning with the second half of the eighteenth century, a totally new type of translation and of translation theory emerged" which increased the "tolerance of cultural differences" (Ibid: 14). This tolerance "manifested itself" in the name and the sense of "history" which accepted that "a diversity of European languages existed" as these languages had their own individual "laws", each language had its own distinct characteristic and rules (Ibid: 14). As a result of that, the "rivalry between languages" reduced giving "equal standing to all languages" (Ibid: 14).

(3.9) The Problem of Untranslatability is still Persistent:

Though equality appears, the problem of untranslatability still persists. Friedrich states, "Indeed, the problem of untranslatability has always been present" (Ibid: 14). Friedrich offers the example of Dante to prove the persistence of the problem of untranslatability. Dante said, Friedrich notes, "the poetic glimmer of the original is lost in translation" (Ibid: 14). Of course, Roman Jakobson, in his essay "On Linguistic

Aspects of Translation", also accepts that "poetry by definition is untranslatable" (Jakobson 1992: 151). Though the theorists of the Renaissance were "familiar with this problem", they did not pay more attention as "it is a lesser problem" which could not hinder "the creative ambition of the translator" (Friedrich 1992: 14). It was really necessary to address the problem of untranslatability. Ultimately, "it is only in the eighteenth century that the problem begins to be discussed in a systematic manner" (Ibid: 14-15). This problem was discussed "in the larger context of historical and linguistic" framework. The problem of untranslatability was taken up, says Friedrich, in France "Diderot and d'Alembert and in Germany by Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt" (Ibid: 15).

(3.10) Im / Possible to have Adequate Translation:

This untranslatability was not free form "a sense of resignation" (Ibid: 15). This sense was based on the belief that "there is no such thing as an adequate translation" (Ibid: 15). Since no adequate translation is possible, one can only "hope for some tentative approximation" (Ibid: 15). All the translations are considered "illusory" i.e. futile, because too much of respect "for the spirit of the original source-language text" made "all attempts at translation illusory" (Ibid: 15). However, "this sense of resignation did not last very long" because the view was changed soon (Ibid: 15). Scholars later on realized that "despite the lexical and syntactical differences between languages", there existed a kind of "affinity" among the "internal structures" of these languages (Ibid: 15). This affinity surfaces evidently in "literary translation" rather than in "consecutive translation" or in the "erroneous equivalents of dictionaries" (Ibid: 15). As a result of this, the "respect for the foreign" gave a chance to a more confident approach. The shared structures of these languages, to quote Friedrich, "The affinity between the internal structures of languages" makes it possible for the translators "to adapt linguistic subtleties of the target language to its foreign original" (Ibid: 15). This adaptation "happens in the area of style" which must be understood not only "in the context of rhetoric" but also as "the total art of language" (Ibid: 15). The attitude of the translator "toward the individual stylistic characteristics of a work" indicates very clearly whether the translator "will yield to the original text or conquer it", whether the translator will "stop at acknowledging the differences between languages" or whether the translator will "move toward a possible rapprochement of styles between languages" (Ibid: 15). The last approach "a movement toward the original" was established "as the norm for the art of translation" with the theories of "Schleiermacher and Humboldt" (Ibid: 15).

(3.11) Theories of Schleiermacher and Humboldt:

Schleiermacher argues that whenever "an original text demonstrates great strength of style", that style / the translation is not only "nourished by the inherent possibilities of that language" but also "surpasses that language as 'an act that can only be created and explained by the very nature of the original language'" (Ibid: 15). Schleiermacher's "theory of translation also acknowledges a difference between languages" (Ibid: 15). Moreover, this theory also "establishes a distinction between language as reality *(Gegebenheit)* and language as act *(Tat),* that is, style" (Ibid: 15). The style of the writer / translator is produced from the tension between "the actual national language and the individual creation of language" (Ibid: 15-16). Thus, the translator is urged, what Schleiermacher has famously said, "not to leave the reader in peace and to move the writer toward him, but to leave the writer in peace (i.e., untouched) and move the reader toward the writer" (Ibid: 16).

The translator should not write in an everyday language. The translator should write in a language "that not only avoids common daily usage (just as the original

source language avoids it) but gives the impression of leaning toward the foreign sensibility" (Ibid: 16). Further, Friedrich says that in other words, "all the power is generated by the original" (Ibid: 16). This creative energy "becomes the creative impulse of the translation" that actually "escapes from the daily usage of language in the same measure as the original has done" (Ibid: 16). The translation must look like translation and this is possible when "the creative stylistic power of the original" becomes "visible in the translation" (Ibid: 16).

Humboldt advises the translators to follow the stylistic features of the original text into the translated text. Humboldt says that "a stylistic transplantation of the source language into the target language must take place" (Ibid: 16). Humboldt "points to the danger of underestimating the level of style" (Ibid: 16). He does not want the translators to simplify or smooth out the Source Language Text. Like the theory of Negative Capability given by John Keats, the creative artist has to remain in uncertainties and complexities. Defining the Negative Capability, Keats writes, "I mean Negative Capability, that is when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason" (Keats 1962: 257). Similarly, Humboldt also wishes the translators to retain the ambiguity of the original as he says, "Ambiguities of the original that are part of the essential character of a work have to be maintained" (Ibid: 16). Friedrich writes further, quoting Humboldt, "One can't afford to change something that is elevated, exaggerated and unusual in the original to something light and easily accessible in the translation" (Ibid: 16).

(3.12) Limits of Translation Practice:

The theories given by Schleiermacher and Humboldt are significant and essential to be followed by the later translators and therefore they are not negligible. These theories "can no longer be omitted from any subsequent theories of the art of translation" (Ibid: 16). The truth is, says Friedrich, that the "current practitioners of translation rarely follow these theories" (Ibid: 16). When the translators are the creative writers themselves, to follow the theories of Schleiermacher and Humboldt is almost impossible. Friedrich adds, "This is especially true for translators who are themselves distinguished writers" (Ibid: 16). Very often, as it has been found, the "writer-translators practice the opposite mistake" (Ibid: 16). Since they themselves are the creative artists as well as translators, they reform the weakness/es of the original in their translations. Friedrich notes, "instead of maintaining the style of the original" these "writer-translators" often "elevate it" (Ibid: 16). Friedrich reminds the readers of the idea of "premise" earlier talked about in this essay. If we accept that "all power comes from the original", then we have to accept as well that "the stylistic features of the translation should conform to those of the original" even if "the original text is written in an ordinary or lower-class style" (Ibid: 16). Though the "Greek and Roman rhetorical devices became an integral part of the theory of translation", the same devices the "classical antiquity had never applied to translation theories" (Ibid: 16). Towards the end of the essay, Friedrich says that this praxis of translation marks the "apex of translation theories in the time after classical antiquity" (Ibid: 16). Friedrich leaves the question unanswered: "Can one afford to ignore these theories? ..." (Ibid: 16).

(4) Conclusion:

In the conclusion, one can observe and note that the theories advocated by Friedrich by giving this speech revise the earlier thought on translation. John Dryden, in his essay "On Translation" writes:

"All translation, I suppose, may be reduced to these three heads. First, that of metaphrase, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another. Thus, or near this manner, was Horace his *Art of Poetry* translated by

Ben Johnson. The second way is that of paraphrase, or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered. Such is Mr. Waller's translation of Virgil's Fourth *Aeneid*. The third way is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he 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" (Dryden 1992: 17).

These three heads advocated by Dryden are not all approved by the later or contemporary translators of the time of Hugo Friedrich. Schleiermacher's attitude to make the reader move to the author / writer indicates toward the theory of domestication. Walter Benjamin in his essay "The Task of the Translator" refers to the concept of translation as an "echo of the original" (Benjamin 1992: 77) which is parallel to Friedrich's emphasis on the form of the source text.

The theoretical idea by Friedrich tries to restore the aesthetic value of translation. It thus confirms the unity of the form and meaning of the text. The theory by Friedrich identifies the translator as a creative agent. This theory limits itself by its focus on poetry only. Despite having limitations, the theory of Friedrich is useful as well. The theory of Friedrich in his speech-cum-essay "On the Art of Translation", is grounded in the form, interpretation and the responsibility of the translator. Friedrich has challenged the reductive model of translation elevating translation to the status of the literary criticism.

Author's Declaration:

I/We, the author(s)/co-author(s), declare that the entire content, views, analysis, and conclusions of this article are solely my/our own. I/We take full responsibility, individually and collectively, for any errors, omissions, ethical misconduct, copyright violations, plagiarism, defamation, misrepresentation, or any legal consequences arising now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall not be held responsible or liable in any way for any legal, ethical, financial, or reputational claims related to this article. All responsibility rests solely with the author(s)/co-author(s), jointly and severally. I/We further affirm that there is no conflict of interest financial, personal, academic, or professional regarding the subject, findings, or publication of this article.

Works Cited

1. Bassnett, Susan. Translation Studies. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2002.
2. Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of hicago Press, 1992.
3. Chapman, George. "Preface to Homer's Iliad." Translation Studies, edited by Susan Bassnett, Routledge, 2005.
4. Dryden, John. "On Translation" Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
5. Friedrich, Hugo. The Structure of Modern Poetry. Trans. Joachim Neugroschel. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.
6. Friedrich, Hugo. "The Art of Translation." Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
7. Halliday, M. A. K. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
8. Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
9. Katan, David. "Translation as Intercultural Communication". In Jerome Munday (ed.) The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. London/New York: Routledge, 2009.

10. Keats, John. "From the Letters." In English Critical Texts: 16th Century to 20th Century, edited by D. J. Enright and Ernst de Chickera, Oxford University Press, 1962.

11. Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

12. Paz, Octavio. "Translation: Literature and Letters." Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

13. Saussure, Ferdinand de. Course in general linguistics. Trans. By Wade Baskin, McGraw Hill, 1959.

14. Williams, Raymond. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. Revised edition, Oxford University Press, 1983.

Cite this Article-