臺大文史哲學報　第五十八期
2003 年 5 月　　頁 211~230
臺　灣　大　學　文　學　院

姜生「翻譯」牧歌的操作典範及牧歌文類的「翻譯現象」

張　惠　鎖 *

摘　要

本論文的預設論點是：所謂牧歌式微或枯萎的說法，乃「本質論」的演繹。從語用學或符號學的觀點而論，牧歌或其他文類，並沒有絕對本質。牧歌從遠古就是混合體或錯雜會合體，各代仿作或理論，展現一連串結構重組和「語意」重新規劃的作業。因此，從時間的視野而論，牧歌的項目其實是多次「翻譯」操作的綜合。

根據上述立論，本文建議重估姜生的牧歌論述。由建議的觀點檢閱姜生，可以發現他和他同時的牧歌參與者，其實不是如傳統評論所言，導致牧歌這個文類終結的下場，而是積極作「文類翻譯」，配合那時代暢行的「國語化」和「現代化」目標。其翻譯運作促成牧歌重組和轉向，並獲得展延生命的契機。同時，姜生鼓吹「翻譯」的修辭策略，實際上是所有語文改革企劃的操作典型。

關鍵詞：姜生；牧歌；翻譯；文類; 文化本土化；十八世紀

本文 91.11.22 收稿；92.4.9 通過刊登。

*臺灣大學外國語文學系教授。

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Samuel Johnson and Translating Pastoral

Chang Huei-keng *

Abstract

The essay has in view two mutually related projects. First, it seeks to counterpoint the essentialist approach to the pastoral genre with a performative or pragmaticist concept of literary genre. Second, it advances a re-consideration of Johnson's pastoral discourses in the alternative approach pursued in the first project. On the one hand, Johnson's pastoral engagement serves as an example for the argument that the historical presence of pastoral consists in a process of motivated 'translation.' On the other, the idea of 'translation' makes it possible to work out the historical relevance of the deconstructive operation of Johnson's pastoral discourses. Furthermore, the idea of motivated transformation sheds light on the paradigmatic value of Johnson's deconstructive operation.

Keywords: Samuel Johnson; the pastoral; translation; vernacular literacy; generic transformation; the eighteenth century

* Professor, Deaprtment of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Taiwan University.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Samuel Johnson and Translating Pastoral

Chang Huei-keng

According to Frank Kermode, with Marvell the high-noon of English pastoral came to an end. In the preface to his collection of English pastoral poetry, Kermode remarks that Marvell's handful of poems "seem to sum up the whole story of the English Pastoral," and that "the later Pastoral lived in a quite different atmosphere."[1] The difference is observed to have shown in these several aspects. First, theories of pastoral played a prominent role; second, mock-pastoral came into vogue; and third, "the literary and philosophical preoccupations of the Renaissance poets had largely given way to a new, or newly expressed, set of problems"(42). Limited by the metalanguage he employs, Kermode is prevented from voicing his very perspective observation in functional terms. Translated into a linguistic or semiotic oriented metalanguage, Kermode's remarks amount to two performative concerns. On the one hand, the new development marks a dense moment of formal consciousness, which expresses itself in the self-conscious reflection, imitation or streamlining of the genre, resulting in a highlighting of the semiotic nature of the pastoral genre. On the other, it witnesses a deliberate effort to redefine the semantic space of the genre, or the translation or transformation of its symbolization scheme, which enables the transportation of pastoral to a changed cultural climate.

The rephrasing of Kermode's comments in an alternative metalanguage allows us to see that constrained by the ideological underpinning of the metalanguage he uses Kermode conceives of the historical and performative phenomena of pastoral as

1 Frank Kermode, *"Preface,"* in *English Pastoral Poetry*, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1952) 42.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

signals of the loss of the golden age of the genre. The rephrasing, furthermore, affords a consideration of pastoral as a fluid symbolization device, subject to subjective management. On the one hand, the idea of generic fluidity configures a history of the genre as a series of displacement and transformation, resulting from altering ideological or institutional management. On the other, it encourages the idea of pastoral as a temporal interpretive scheme, which in practice undergoes circumstantial re-framing. In either context, the fluidity of the genre highlights a concept of time as experiences of the alteration of form and working frame. In this perspective, pastoral is conceived as assuming a temporal presence, a continuing translating process, or a continuing process of re-enacting the translating operation. In view of this, the Neoclassical theoretical enthusiasm or the parodic appropriations must not be read as symptoms of a situation when "the true impulse of rustic Pastoral petered out" (42); rather they signal a reawakening of the translating will, which in the eighteenth century eventually carried out the displacement of the Spenserian or Miltonic mode of pastoralization.

Johnson's strong denunciation on *Lycidas* and other as much derogatory comments, in *Lives of Poets,* on other modern appropriations of pastoral conventions have spawned dissertations on Johnson's alleged "stock antipathy to anything that savored of the pastoral tradition;"[2] on whether the pronounced aversion signals an apparent "*faux pas*"[3] or an accurately aimed critical "sharpshooting;"[4] or on how the antagonism exemplifies a dullness to the time-honored pastoral generic conventions (Kermode 9) or serves as a testimony of Johnson's critical foresight of literary trends.[5] In discussions such as these the critical attention is focused on Johnson's personality and his professional performance as a critic. Yet situated in the

2 Walter Jackson Bate, *The Achievement of Samuel Johnson* (New York: Oxford University Press,1955) 219.

3 Jean H. Hagstrum, *Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967) 45.

4 Oliver F. Sigworth, "Johnson's *Lycidas:* the End of Renaissance Criticism," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 1, no. 2 (Winter, 1967): 159-168.

5 Leopold Damrosch, Jr., "Pastoral and Epic: the Implications of Genre," chap. 4 of *The Uses of Johnson's Criticism* (Charlotteville: University Press of Virginia, 1976),78-92. Damrosch remarks that like the insightful criticism of "most other great critics—like Dryden, Coleridge, or Eliot," Johnson's theory of pastoral affords a perspective "toward the future as well as the past" (90).

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

context of translating dynamic, Johnson's disparaging remarks and his crooked recyling of *Eclogues* in differing contexts show themselves to be deliberate moves to reset the rhetorical and discursive domain of the pastoral genre. The recontextualization of Johnson's critical and rhetorical engagements with pastoral affords a view to see, firstly, that these engagements as the acting out of an impersonal tendency to reformulate the pastoral as an apparatus of cultural writing, and secondly, that the rhetorical strategy he employs in activating the momentum of change is paradigmatic of generic, literary, or cultural re-writing in general.

II

Echoing Kermode, Annabel Patterson notes, "Neoclassicism, with its emphasis on order and definition, shifted attention from hermeneutics of pastoral to its theory—the theory of the genre conceived in abstraction."[6] In *The Significance of Theory,* Terry Eagleton remarks that "theory is just a practice forced into a new form of self-reflectiveness on account of certain problems it has encountered."[7] In light of this climate of critical self- consciousness, Johnson's pastoral discourse epitomizes the attempt to formalize the tacit understandings by which the genre appears to have been automatically appropriated. The marked theoretical enthusiasm emerging in the seventeenth century and gaining increasing volume in the subsequent century indicates a questioning of the rationales which have underpinned the practice of pastoral poetry and which seem to be in need of being revised or discarded. For instance, Nathan Drake, commenting on the degeneration of the genre on the domestic literary scene, voiced the mood of interrogation: "If rural life no longer presents us with shepherds singing and piping for a bowl or a crook, why persist, in violation of all probability, to introduce such characters? If pastoral cannot exist without them, let us cease to compose it."[8]

Eighteenth-century theoretical reflections on the pastoral genre invariably made

6 Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery*(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) 194.

7 Terry Eagleton, *The Significance of Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990) 26.

8 Nathan Drake, " On Pastoral Poetry," in *Literary Hours,* 2nd edition (London, 1800) 224.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

reference to either Theocritus or Virgil, or both, as the source of formal and rhetorical authority. Theocritus was honored as the pattern of dexterous mimesis of idyllic experiences in a real landscape; and Virgil for his literary improvements on Theocritus. For those whom Congleton in *Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684-1798*[9] labels as the rationalists, Theocritus was especially preferred as the standard of rational probability. For the proponents of the causes of anglicizing or modernizing of pastoral, *Idylls* provided guidelines for linguistic reproduction of geography, community, nation and history. Theocritus's idylls are not restricted to the representation of herdsmen and the bucolic existence. Elze KegelBrinkgreve's study, among a number of studies on the intertuxtual complexity of *Idylls*, shows that it is a collection of short pieces, including such identifiable genres as mimes, monologues, songs, lyrics, epistles, epyllia, ekaphrases and epigrams, in more than one Greek dialect, on various subjects.[10] The miniature scale and the employment of hexameter aside, *Idylls* bears other distinctive features such as echoes of Greek myth and religion, allusions to Classical and contemporary authors, references to patrons, fellow poets and friends. *Idylls* is in fact distinguished with a sophisticated weaving of styles, genres and texts. Studies such as this uncover the work of textual fusion involved in Theocritus's making of a fiction of a bucolic life or a pastoral world. The alleged realistic portrayal of an objective reality at the moment of the original coding of the pastoral genre turns out to be a moment of trans-forming, hybridizing and boundary-crossing. In *Topographies* Hillis Miller uses Ruth as the figure of translation.[11] The biblical narrative of giving up the old identity so as to obtain a new existence in a new environment is retold by Miller so as to highlight the function of translation as a process of breaking up a given entity which facilitates the reconstitution of a new entity, while incorporating alternative or alien parts. Pastoralization as a process of forming and transforming of the pastoral generic sign complex, or pastoral rhetorical machinery, has in fact been carried on in diverse

9 J.E. Congleton, *Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684-1798* (New York: Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1968).

10 Elze Kegel-Brinkgreve, "Theocritus: the bucolic Idylls," chap. 1 of *The Echoing Woods* (geboren te Bunnik, 1923) 3-37.

11 J. Hillis Miller, "Border Crossing, Translating Theory: Ruth," in *Topographies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995) 316-40.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

translation practices, including the work of fusion or transformation performed by Theocritus at the alleged moment of the origin of the genre.

Virgil was credited with the transplanting of pastoral to the Latin literary tradition. To begin with, *Eclogues* was considered as a Latin translation of what Theocritus had accomplished in Greek. In *Adventurer* 92, for instance, the crossing of linguistic border is observed to have gained for Virgil a freedom for copying Theocritus in his design: "Virgil, taking advantage of another language, ventured to copy or to rival the Sicilian Bard."[12] The chance was denied to Theocritus's countrymen, who, "despairing to excel, forbore to imitate him"(*Works* 2:417). Switching to another language, Virgil is thought to have distinguished himself in "splendour of diction, and elevation of sentiment" (*Works* 2:417). Remarks such as this on the stylistic improvements of Virgil's Latin rendition of his Greek original are based on a definition of "translation" as an interlinguistic transference of a given content, meaning or spirit, which stresses the fidelity in spirit rather than the precision of letters. In the same passage in the Adventurer paper, it is further observed that "perhaps where he excels Theocritus," Virgil sometimes "obtains his superiority by deviating from the pastoral character, and performing what Theocritus never attempted"(*Works* 2:417). Interestingly, Virgil's crowning achievement is seen to have stemmed from a failure of the fidelity principle: his contribution to the pastoral genre is said to have proceeded from the practice of 'deviating from the pastoral character.' This suggests that Virgil's translation of Theocritus goes beyond the limits of mere interlinguistic transaction: it performs a deliberate change of how pastoral is recognized and how it functions to fulfill the projected rhetorical target. To be more precise, Virgil's translating operation extends the figurative complexity of herdsmen and their bucolic existence. For instance, shepherds, their singing competitions, the songs they sing, or the prizes for the singing champion assume increased metaphorical density in *Eclogues.* Virgil's pastoral performance underlines the idea that pastoral is "translatable" and the fact that it is "translating."

In "Des Tours de Babel" Derrida demonstrates that translatability signals a

12 Samuel Johnson, "The Adventurer, no. 92 ," in *The Idler and the Adventurer, eds. W.J. Bate, John M. Bullit, and L.F. Powell*, vol.2 of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963) 417.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

calculated move to shake up a symbolic economy for the purpose of opening up opportunities for historically or politically more pertinent signifying schemes, and that the task of a translator (as a deliberate reader and writer) consists in bringing about the moment of translatability and the symbolic "revolution."[13] Thus a text is always translating, for as it is read, interpreted, imitated, trans-lated, or appropriated, it revolves between translatability and intranslatability (between the deconstruction of a given spatial economy and the re-institution of a chosen alternative). As it translates, it loses its unity, on the one hand, and reactivates its hidden plurivalence or multivocalness, on the other. This means that a translating text translates as it makes an entry into the game of metaphorization, and the liberating game ends as a favored framing scheme is actively enforced. Echoing the idea of *fortleben* and *űberleben* advanced in Walter Benjamin's dissertation on translation,[14] Derrida anthropologizes the temporal dynamic of texts, or in that matter, that of signifying devices, in considering the alternating between translatability and intranslatability, or the metaphorization of texts, as the dynamic that prolongs life or enables a continuing rebirth of meaning. In light of Derrida's anthropologizing, that Virgil's "deviation" was regarded as a felix culpa becomes theoretically and politically justifiable on two counts. Firstly, it safeguards the survival of pastoral with an altered identity in a different symbolic regime; and secondly, it exalts the principle of relevance at the expense of that of strict fidelity.

The general reverence of Theocritus and Virgil in the eighteenth century certainly indicates a still standing privileging of the antiquity over the modern in literary performances. The thick references made to them in the contemporary theorizing of pastoral, however, point obliquely to a differing perception. The so-called Rationalists or the nationalists turned to Theocritus in defense of projects which inform literary use of the vernacular, the formation of the vernacular canon, the symbolic validity of domestic objects, occasions, landscapes, or persons, and the significance of contemporary issues and concerns. Those whom Congleton puts in

13 Jacques Derrrida, "Des Tours de Babel," trans. Joseph F. Graham, in *Difference in Translation* ed. Joseph F. Graham (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985) 165-205.

14 Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator," in *Illumination,* trans. Harry Zohn, ed Hannah. Adrent (New York: Schoen, 1968) 69-82.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

the classification of the Neoclassicists valued Virgil over Theocritus. Yet Virgil was invariably praised in terms of refinement or improvement, which means that he stood as an encouragement to imitate and thus to surpass the imitated model. To surpass, as has been observed, Virgil deviates. To imitate as exemplified by Virgil means to occasion a moment of translatability. In light of the implied translating impulse, Virgil served as well a paradigm for the several rationalistic, nationalistic, or modernizing programs. In a way, Theocritus and Virgil were summoned to bolster the pastoral rhetorical machine that appeared to have stalled in a changed social and cultural climate. The resort to Theorcritus and Virgil, landmarks in the process of programming and reprogramming the pastoral generic apparatus, thus signaled a compulsion for staging the moment of translatability.

III

Johnson's harsh words on *Lycidas* that the pastoral form it employs is "easy, vulgar and therefore disgusting"[15] advance an argument about the petrifaction of pastoral as a meaning-producing medium. For instance, Gay's poetic Arcadia is found to be "remote from known reality and speculative possibility" (*Lives* 2:284), and the predominant presence of "sheep," "goats," "myrtle bowers" and "purling rivulets" is dismissed as producing scenes that "please barbarians in the dawn of literature, and children in the dawn of life; but will be for the most part thrown away as men grow wise, and nations grow learned" (*Lives* 2:285). In contrast, as remarked in *Rambler 36,* "true pastoral" has always the power of exciting delight, "because the works of nature, from which [the images of pastoral] are drawn, have always the same order and beauty, and continue to force themselves upon our thoughts" (*Works* 3:196), and the satisfaction which true pastoral affords "not only begins early, but lasts long" (*Works* 3: 196). In accordance with the idea of true pastoral, Milton and Gay are taken as two cases of lazy or automatic application of a poetic language which, on the one hand, has become mechanical, and on the other, has produced a literary body that refuses to fit into the proper interpretive frame. In *Life of*

15 Samuel Johnson, *Lives of English Poets,* vol. 1, eds. George Birbeck Hill, D.C.L (Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1905) 62.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Hammond, Johnson points at these two malaises, saying that "where there is fiction, there is no passion;" and that "he that describes himself as a shepherd, . . . and talks of goats and lambs, feels no passion"(*Lives* 2:314). Hammond's naïve recycling of the bucolic and Roman imagery, Johnson concludes, "produces nothing but frigid pedantry"(*Lives* 2:315).

In the *Preface to the Dictionary,* the enumeration of excesses serves as a justification for a dictionary project, the goal of which is said to set up a formal vigilance over common linguistic performances and thus to defer the inevitable change of the living tongue. Lexicographer Johnson resorts to the discursive production of excesses as a strategy for legitimating his lexicographical authority and evoking a sense of mission of his lexicographical undertaking. The *Preface* is exemplary of how Johnson's rhetoric functions to activate a historical perspective of linguistic and literary transformation, and to lend an ethical weight to his critical performances. Shakespeare, another instance, is credited with the merit of "approximat[ing] the remote and familiar[izing] the wonderful"(*Works* 7:65); Shakespeare's work, however, leaves room for improvement, for his work, Johnson remarks, targets an audience not yet cultivated enough. The remark hints that Johnson sees his own reading of Shakespeare as a further effort of familiarization, which means that his critical performance renders Shakespeare accessible to his contemporary readers. Johnson's familiarizing enterprise proceeds by a methodic processing of Shakespeare, which performs a surgery that removes from Shakespeare the tumors of superfluities and barbarism. The work of familiarizing assumes an ethical stature as it produces relevance out of that which is remote and nonsensical. Johnson's discourses on pastoral are, as a whole, engaged in a parallel ethical pursuit of relevance, which is basically a project of cultural translation.

To translate, as defined in Johnson's *Dictionary*, is to remove, to transfer, to change or to interpret. In light of these several senses, the work of translation includes re-moving, re-placing, re-forming and re-producing. The translation of pastoral, which Johnson takes up, involves moving pastoral across linguistic and cultural boundaries, which means that it involves not only inter-linguistic, but also intra-linguistic and inter-semiotic transportation. In semiotic thoughts, these several forms of translation are forms of manipulating signs for specific purposes:

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

functionally all of them perform the formal procedure of inter- semiotic transference and pragmatically all of them enforce position-conscious framing. Johnson's definition of "translation" carries with it this very functional and pragmatic accent of the circulation of signs in cultural space. The pragmatic emphasis especially informs Johnson's argument for contemporary relevance of modern pastorals. Johnson's pastoral discourses argue for a re-forming of the generic sign structure of pastoral, by removing signifying units such as myths of golden age, fiction of sage and learned shepherds, classical allusions, and stock scenes and images, and replacing them with familiar images and scenes of the English country life. The re-forming of the pastoral signifying machine is assigned a mission of modernizing the genre, which involves giving it a new life in the enlightened age and in the English vernacular. Johnson's engagement with pastoral has in it what the *Preface to Dictionary* calls in view in the domain of philology: a commitment to the preservation or the re-functioning of an established sign system in new material circumstances.

IV

Johnson's re-programming project with its implied formal and pragmatic management proposes a form of aggressive reading or radical "re-writing." It encourages a writing off of the excesses contaminating modern pastoral poetry and also a re-evaluation of classical pastoral. In *Adventurer 92*, Dubius is presented as doing a re-reading of Virgil, which produces the verdict that of the ten eclogues the first and the last only are truly commendable. The language of these two poems is found to be "natural" and the sentiments evoked are "genuine"(*Works* 2:421). The tenth is thought to carry the palm of the species of poetic composition, for it "combines all the images of rural pleasure"(*Works* 2:422). Furthermore, both are viewed as having been "produced by events that really happened" (*Works* 2:424). Dubius's appraisal carries out a deliberate re-framing of Virgil, which removes the long established binaries for reading *Eclogues*, such as country/ city, patron/ protégé, and possession/ dispossession. Furthermore, it scrapes what Kegel-Brinkgreve terms

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

the bucolic metaphor[16](shepherds and their song-making as figures of poet and poetry-making), and religious or political allegories, for instance, which previous readings in the long passage of history have deposited on *Eclogues*. Wiping out the accumulated semantic deposits, the re-reading creates room for the introduction of alternative meaning-producing schemes. Johnson's own appropriations of *Eclogues* show a corresponding valorization of empirical and familiar re-function of Virgil's lines. Two illustrations occur in his correspondence with Mrs. Thrale. In a letter dated August 14, 1769, addressed to Hester Thrale from Lichfield, Johnson made a contracted citation from *Eclogue* 1, turning Meliboeus's nostalgia and envy into a reminiscence of casual rural delight.[17] In another letter from Ashbourne, dated Sept. 27, 1777 (*Letters* 2:41), he quoted theses lines:

-------Nives et frigora Rheni
Me sine sola vides: Ah, ne te frigora laedant!
Ah, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas![18]

-----among the Alpine snows
without me, gazing at the frozen Rhine: Ah, may the snow
not harm you! Ah, may the cragged ice not injure your
tender feet![19]

In the letter he complained that the Brighton post of the day failed to bring him any message from Mrs. Thrale. The quoted lines from *Eclogue* 10 instances a personalizing of Virgil to serve the function of intimate communication. The personal context preserves echoes of the despair of a frustrated passion from the original narrative context, at the same time conveys an anticipation of the pending reunion and a sense of witty play in the use of a shared "coded language." Apart from these personal contexts, lines from *Eclogues* are introduced as epigraphs of several

16 Elze, Kegel-Brinkgreve, "the Bucolica of Virgil," chap. 3 of *The Echoing Woods,* 79-150.

17 Samuel Johnson, vol.1 of *Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* , ed. George Birbeck Hill, D.C.L. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), 154. Johnson wrote that "I have rambled a very little *inter fontes et flumina nota."* This allusion comes from *Eclogue* 1, 52-3.

18. Virgil, *Eclogue* x, 47-9.

19 All English translations of quoted lines are mine.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Rambler papers, to highlight the didactic design of an essay. For instance, *Rambler* 5 is led by two lines from *Eclogue* 3, ll. 56-57, which emphasize the importance of moral reflection at the return of the vernal season. *Rambler* 144 cites ll. 12-15 from the same eclogue, to usher in a disquisition on envy. Singing praises of Shakespeare, Johnson finds still another context for the transplantation of line 25 from *Eclogue*1, "*Quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi*" (as a cypress tall above the bushes), giving the original analogy a differing twist.[20] Arguing against the American complaint about civil rights being deprived consequent on emigration, Johnson twists this Virgilian line, "*Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam*"(may your purest water not contaminated in the salty passage)(10: 5), in exposing the American claim as resulting from a distorted perception .[21] The refunction of the line produces a misprision which draws an implicit analogy between the delusion of Gallus by love madness and that of the British emigrants in America by false arguments.

Johnson's realignment of bits and lines of *Eclogues* exemplifies a form of aggressive re-writing that introduces new discursive framing to effect fragmentation and erasure of its original poetic and topical bonds. On the one hand, such practice gives performative support to his theorizing on formal and pragmatic transformation on behalf of a relevance program. On the other, the re-reading opens up a discursive space, in which translatability is activated, metaphorical options released, and alternative strategic management introduced. Johnson's alteration and interpolation of *Eclogues* in fact does more than collapsing the received interpretive categories in reading Virgil: it generates possibilities for *Eclogues* to be "naturalized" in contemporary intimate, moral , literary and political discourses. In running such translating program Johnson puts on a domesticating strategy, which re-reproduces the targeted "foreign" text in accordance with "domestic' values, and in light of recommended mode of intelligibility. This familiarizing work mediates a passage of *Eclogues* across the boundaries of history, geography, nation and language. In his

20 This comes from Dryden' comment on Shakespeare in *"Essay of Dramatic poesy,"* which Johnson quotes in *"Preface to Shakespeare,"* in *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson,* Vol. VII, ed. Arthur Sherbo (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968) 112.

21 Samuel Johnson, "Taxation No Tyranny: an Answer to the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress," in *The Works of Samuel Johnson: Political Writings*, ed. Donald J. Greene, Vol.X of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977) 430.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

book *Samuel Johnson*, J.C.D. Clark observes, "England's culture in Johnson's lifetime supported not only a viable Anglo-Latin tradition but an emergent and extensive vernacular also."[22] Clark places Johnson in the Anglo-Latin tradition and argues that Johnson's loyalty to the tradition was a dedication to a losing cause. Clark's observations show an oversight in two respects: he is unseeing of the intertextual link between the Anglo-Latin tradition and the emergent vernacular culture, and negligent of Johnson's participation in the shaping of the link. The rise of the vernacular tongue and the vernacular literary culture to eventually displace the classical languages and texts, formally speaking, occurred in a long process of inter-semiotic translation, which effects the de-composition of the targeted linguistic, literary and cultural signs, and results in a re-constitution of new "relevant" entities by merging the de-composed fragments with new components. In other words, the historical phenomenon underscores a process of dissemination, hybridization and assimilation. Johnson's domesticating of pastoral, indeed, assumes historical relevance in light of its participation in the active cultural and literary negotiations of his age.

Translation with a view to domesticate, as instanced by Johnson's operation on *Eclogues,* awakes possibility of new life for the translating text, by forcing it to go through mutilation and death. Johnson's reading of *Lycidas* and his other pastoral criticism subject the targeted texts to this very violence in the name of obsolescence, excess or ambiguity. His translating endeavor in these several cases turns the pastoral generic apparatus into a tool of violence, and for it to effectively serve the purpose, he theorizes and proposes radical redesigning of the machine. As he subjects the targeted texts to the projected "relevance" reform, he reviews the metaphorical functions of the pastoral symbolic apparatus, discarding those functions--mythological allusion, bucolic masquerades, religious or political allegories—by classifying them as empty and superfluous. As he re-processes the targeted texts in terms of the pastoral symbolic scheme, he produces translating texts and, at the same time, turns the conventionalized pastoral into a translating device. Johnson's familiarizing of Shakespeare effects a corresponding operation, on behalf of which

22 J.C.D.Clark, *Samuel Johnson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 21.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

he recommends a newly coded generic hybrid, tragicomedy, as a re-writing instrument. From the point of view of the translating texts and the translating genre, Johnson's domesticating strategy performs two services. It renews the hidden signifying elasticity of the texts, and keeps in view a sense of continuing validity of texts, by a reawakened awareness of how texts assume continuing relevance as they are subjected to a processing device. Moreover, enacting these translating operations, Johnson's domestication of pastoral participates, in the larger cultural program, in the process of dissemination, hybridization and assimilation, which results in the eventual substitution of the Anglo-Latin tradition by its vernacular other.

On the other hand, domesticating translation exerts two other influences on the formation of the vernacular literary tradition. Firstly, the work of hybridization and assimilation enriches the vernacular language and literature, as it introduces not only exotic ingredients that contribute to the extension of the range of the linguistic and the literary symbolic possibilities, but also alternative paradigms, for instance, classical generic classifications, as viable textual processing schemes. Secondly, in familiarizing "foreign" texts, domesticating translation contributes to the cultivation of a new refined readership, who, benefited from the contact with the learned tradition via translations, experiences an expansion of its literary horizons. This civilizing impact bears social and political significance as well. The theoretical and performative translation of pastoral texts, for example, effects a re-writing of texts in the name of the "we" community, or a putative uniform literary audience, whom Johnson addresses as a body of common readers. In *Rambler 36* Johnson censures Sannarzarius's piscatory eclogue which he points out as too singular to enjoy a "general reception" (*Works* 3:199). Sannarzarius's sea imagery is blamed for failing to perform the expected metaphorical function: the common reader can not trace, Johnson observes:

> in their own thoughts, the descriptions of winding shores, and calm bays, nor can look on the poem in which they are mentioned, with other sensations, than on a sea-chart, or the metrical geography of Dionysius (*Works* 3: 199).

Fortunately, Johnson comments, the defect is not immediately exposed, for the

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

piscatory eclogues were written in Latin. “If he had made his attempt in any vulgar tongue,” remarks Johnson, “he would soon have discovered how vainly he had endeavoured to make that loved, which was not understood” (*Works* 3:199). Johnson’s denunciation betrays who he supposes are to constitute the “we” community. To begin with, it is a community of vulgar tongue, who read literature as a medium for articulating and confirming their familiar experiences. The learned language and its literary inventory of aspects of nature and life do not uniformly merit their appreciation. A good part of the learned storage of linguistic and literary devices, found short of the criteria of familiarity, are dismissed as empty signs, artificial and meaningless. Domesticating translation, by subjecting texts, for instance, Sannarzarius and Virgil, to the measure of the “we” community, passes calculated judgment on them, giving, for instance, verdicts asserting that the piscatory is local and dumb, and Vigil’s representation of the passions of men, universal and expressive. By such judgment, domesticating translation enlists the targeted texts as tools for defining, confirming, and reinforcing the subject position of the assumed “we” community, which in turn serves as a viable paradigm of subject formation in the historical moment, which registers corresponding phenomena such as the growing supremacy of vernacular literacy and the assumption of the bourgeois centrality.

In view of the naturalizing project and the formation of subjectivity, Johnson’s translation of pastoral operates on two kinds of writing spaces: it is to write on the printed pages and on the virtual pages of the minds of the potential readers. In the first case, it provides a software for guided reproduction of pastorals and guided processing of texts by means of pastoral as a rhetorical machine; and in the second, it undertakes the task of forging a “we” community out of the medley of individual readers, by providing them with an accentuated cognitive paradigm and an assigned subject position. In either capacity, the function of “writing” is geared towards, firstly, the opening up of a space, and secondly, the inscription on it of a new text, which means the re-processing of received texts as well as the institution of new formulas for meaning, morality, legislation and identity. In this sense, “writing” is literally and metaphorically instrumental to social and cultural changes. Michel de Certeau describes the kind of aggressive function manifested in the eighteenth century as

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Scriptural Operation, which promoted literacy and national tongue as means for setting the norms of propriety and good sense for the emerging bourgeoisie. In this historical perspective, Johnson's assaults on *Lycidas* and other Baroque and modern pastorals based on the pretext of obsolescence, excess or inadequacy are not mere idiosyncrasy or critical misfire, they carry in them an underlying political unconscious of the bourgeois Scriptural Operation.[23]

V

"The standard informing Johnson's critique of *Lycidas*," Oliver F. Sigworth observes, "is a standard marking the end of Renaissance criticism in England"(Sigworth 167). Thus he concludes, "Johnson, then, is a pivot in the transition from a Renaissance to a 'romantic'—a modern—point of view," and that "modern criticism begins with Johnson"(167-8). Johnson's emphasis on "genuine passion" and "emotional truth"(167) does, as Sigworth remarks, look forward to the Romantic exultation of feelings and emotional sincerity. The sweeping conclusion, however, sounds rather simple-minded, for Johnson's accentuation on social hierarchy, submission to the collective rule, universal moral imperatives, and normative concept of language reflects a mental outlook radically different from that which informs the Romantic poetic and critical discourses. Still Sigworth's remark is valuable, for it calls attention to the relatedness of Johnson in the role of a "translator," who actively performs a domestication translation for the benefit of a relevance program, with the shift of cultural and critical climate. The relation, however, is more paradigmatic than causal: the formal and strategic processes of his translative operation brings into focus the paradigmatic correspondence of Johnson's undertaking with other cases of translating endeavors. For instance, Nathan Drake, in the name of "genuine pastoral," made the learned Bishop of Dunkeld, Gawen Douglas, the target of his critical deconstruction. "You cannot read two lines of Dawen Douglas," he pinpointed, "without seeing… that his allusions to classical

23 Michel de Certeau, "The Scriptural Economy," in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) 131-53.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

ideas are infinite."[24] "The names of almost every object he has occasion to mention," Drake went on, "are borrowed from the heathen mythology"(74). Then Douglas was found to have written in a hackneyed language with a lot of the rhetorical figures of the ancients. The attack recalls Johnson's inveighing against obsolescence, excess and opacity. The similar rhetoric is used, in Drake's case, to advance a pastoral scheme that reproduces the native effusions of the swains of the highlands of Scotland, and that serves as the measure for revising the established pastoral canon.[25] Wordsworth's debunking agenda in *Lyrical Ballads* is yet another obvious re-functioning of the paradigm for staging the moment of translatability, or the scene of (re-)writing. In such functional terms, Johnson does "look toward the future as well as the past"(Damrosch 90).

Works Cited

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator," in *Illumination,* trans. Harry Zohn, ed Hannah. Adrent . New York: Schoen, 1968.

Certeau, Michel de . *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall . Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Clark, J.C.D. *Samuel Johnson.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Congleton, J.E.. *Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684-1798.* New York: Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1968.

Damrosch, Leopold Jr. *The Uses of Johnson's Criticism.* Charlotteville: University Press of Virginia, 1976

Derrrida, Jacques. "Des Tours de Babel," trans. Joseph F. Graham, in *Difference in Translation* ed. Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Drake, Nathan . *The Gleaner*, rpt. London, 1811.

24 Nathan Drake, *The Gleaner*, rpt (London, 1811) 74.

25 Nathan Drake, *Literary Hours*. According to his emphasis on the picturesque, the pathetic and the spontaneous, Drake remarked, "in pastoral poetry, Virgil, Spenser, Pope, Gay and Philips must yield the palm to Tasso, Warner, Drayton and the two Fletchers, to Rowe, Ramsay, Shenstone, Gesner and Collins"(342).

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

_____.. *Literary Hours,* 2nd edition. London, 1800.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Significance of Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Elze Kegel-Brinkgreve, "Theocritus: the bucolic Idylls," chap. 1 of *The Echoing Woods.* geboren te Bunnik, 1923.

Hagstrum, Jean H. *Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Johnson, Samuel. *Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* , ed. George Birbeck Hill, D.C.L. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.

_____. *Lives of English Poets,* vol. 1, eds. George Birbeck Hill, D.C.L. Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1905.

_____. *The Idler and the Adventurer*, eds. W.J. Bate, John M. Bullit, and L.F. Powell, vol.2 of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

_____. *The Works of Samuel Johnson: Political Writings*, vol. 10 of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* . ed. Donald J. Greene, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

_____. *Johnson on Shakespeare*, *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, Vol. VII. Ed. Arthur Sherbo. New Haven,

CT: Yale UP, 1968.

Kermode, Frank . "Introduction" to *English Pastoral Poetry : From The Beginnings To Marvell,* ed, Frank Kermode. Freeport, N. Y. : Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Miller, J. Hillis. "Border Crossing, Translating Theory: Ruth," in *Topographies.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Patterson, Annabel. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Sigworth, Oliver F. "Johnson's *Lycidas:* the End of Renaissance Criticism," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 1, no. 2 ,Winter, 1967.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫