

Tichý, Aleš

[Newmark, Peter. Approaches to translation]

Brno studies in English. 1983, vol. 15, iss. 1, pp. 162-163

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/104008>

Access Date: 18. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

The present extent of the dictionary records the pronunciation of approximately 59,664 words. It was impossible to record all the neologisms in the English word-stock, especially terms and words that cannot yet be regarded as well established in the language.

The revised edition of *Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary* is a valuable reference book for all speakers of English, both native and foreign.

Ludmila Urbanová

Peter Newmark, **Approaches to Translation**. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1981. 200 pp.

Professor Newmark's book on the theory and practice of translation is a selection from his papers published between the years 1969 and 1980 and arranged in such a way that discussions of related topics are grouped together. The first nine chapters, assembled under the heading "Aspects of Translation Theory", are followed by "some propositions on translation" in 145 sections, varying in length from one sentence to several pages of print. They display the author's principal ideas on numerous theoretical and practical aspects of the translator's work. This arrangement of the book results in some overlapping and, in some instances, in slightly unsystematic presentation of problems, but the reader can always find his way to the principal issues by consulting the name and subject indexes. A bibliography of over 230 items greatly enhances the value of the publication, for it includes, besides some philosophical and linguistic writings that are relevant to the matter considered, a highly representative list of books and articles illustrating various approaches to translation.

In the author's view, "all translation remains a craft requiring a trained skill, continually renewed linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge and a great deal of flair and imagination, as well as intelligence and above all common sense" (p. 63). At the present early stage of the development of translation theory the last attribute is equally important for those who write about translation as for those who practice it, and Professor Newmark displays it to a degree not too frequently found in books on the subject. In addition, his long experience of teaching how to translate has provided him with innumerable examples of happy and less happy renderings of source-language texts into English. On these foundations the author erects a structure of practical comments which are of lasting value for all those who need assistance in such matters as the translation of proper names, punctuation, the choice of a stylistic variant, etc. In constructing a hierarchy of values concerning translation he adopts a functional approach, though he never formulates it as principle and himself uses the word "functional" in a severely restricted sense. This approach, apparent behind his observations on specific subjects, makes his book very useful and instructive reading for translators even outside the English-speaking world, even for those who may already be well acquainted with the linguistic background explained by Professor Newmark as well as those who may find his practical suggestions inapplicable in their own languages.

The author's view of translation as a craft rather than a science is reflected in his cautious treatment of the theoretical problems in the first part of his book. He is never tired of warning against a dogmatic approach and even goes so far as to reject the possibility of a general theory of the subject. He believes that the purpose of translation theory is to elaborate the methods of translation for the benefit of the practical worker in the field, for the critic and, last but not least, for the linguist. This proposition, together with the author's emphasis on linguistic analysis, and his suggestion of the translatability of all texts, shows that his basic ideas spring from the linguistic approach to translation, as exemplified especially by Eugene Nida (the author of the *Foreword* to this book) and the Leipzig School. However, Professor Newmark makes continual efforts to develop, on this foundation, a more comprehensive view of the matter and to bring the specific problems of imaginative literature into the picture. This approach leads to positive results, not so much in his paper on the translation of metaphor as in his rejection of the principle of dynamic equivalence in texts in which "the culture is as important as the message" (p. 11), and in his original dichotomy of semantic translation, offering the precise contextual meaning of the author, and communicative translation, aiming at full dynamic equivalence.

The limits of the linguistic approach to translation make themselves felt when Professor Newmark tries to define the specific features of literary texts. He sees the differences between literary, scientific-technological and political-journalistic writings in the terms of Bühler's expressive, informative and vocative functions of language rather than in the terms of their different overall communicative purposes and the corresponding structures and, consequently, finds the principal distinction between literary and non-literary texts in the presence and degree of their expressivity. Starting from this proposition, he freely mixes literary and non-literary utterances of the same expressive force in examples illustrating various points of his arguments. The result is not too satisfying, for in many instances he is obliged to provide additional specific comments on each group separately. Moreover, for translations of true works of art his suggestion of approaching the problem will not do. Below the surface of "careful, sensitive and elegant writing," which Professor Newmark passionately defends (he deserves our unqualified praise for doing so), the cultivated reader will look for a deep-seated correspondence between the thematic structure and the language used to bring it out and will regard the correspondence, where it exists, as the ultimate criterion of the translator's choice of language in literary texts. It should be added that this applies not only to poetry but also to prose, which is the most frequently translated (and, in the theory of translation, so much neglected) literary medium.

The fundamental soundness of the author's general observations is, however, impressive and numerous quotations, such as "the translator should produce a different type of translation of the same text for a different type of audience" (p. 10), could be adduced here to demonstrate this. It is thus a great pity that Professor Newmark has so far refrained from discussing the first principles of translation in a more comprehensive way, taking into account the function of the whole work translated; our hope is that he will do so in some of his next publications. In the meantime his book, reflecting the present state of translation studies, a period in which the interdisciplinary nature of the subject has been fully recognized but the gaps between the disciplines have not yet been successfully bridged in practice, will remain an invaluable companion for the translator and offer a seabed rich in pearls for anyone interested in the theory of the subject.

Aleš Tichý

Re-VIEWING VICTORIAN LITERATURE

J. M. Gray. *Thro' the Vision of the Night. A Study of Source, Evolution and Structure in Tennyson's Idylls of the King*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1980, pp. 179. Geoffrey Tillitson. *A View of Victorian Literature*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1978, pp. 396.

The above two volumes illustrate two very different approaches to the evaluation of literature. That of Dr J. M. Gray, as is clear from the sub-title, is severely limited and specific in theme and purpose, whereas the posthumously published work of Professor Tillitson is as wide in scope as it is in intellectual conception, being in fact originally planned as a volume in the *Oxford History of English Literature*, and now revised and prepared for separate publication by the distinguished Victorian scholar, his widow Kathleen Tillitson.

Claiming that the *Idylls of the King* has been too generally condemned as lacking in structure, Dr Gray sets out to demonstrate by way of close textual explication and analysis that Tennyson's work, drawing on "the best of Arthurian tradition" as well as "elements from a great range of heroic literature", is the result of the poet's "years of brooding over the whole theme" (p. 1), and of "a narrative drive or progression in the overall design" (p. 5).

In discussing Tennyson's use of the Arthurian legend (Ch. II), Dr Gray employs the theory of archetypes and Jungian formulations, but apart from demonstrating conclusively that Tennyson, in many respects, even details of presentation, closely follows Malory, fails to tell us why the closeness is of significance. I would suggest that one reason for his failure to present a convincing demonstration of dynamic relationship between Malory and Tennyson is contained in the assertion that "In the story of Balin and Balan, Malory is not concerned with opposing and complementary