Harrison's Aeschylus
and Logue's Homer

SIMEON UNDERWOOD

In spite of (or perhaps because of) the apparent decline in classical learning, the task of translating the great works of Greek poetry continues to present a challenge to English-speaking poets. Seamus Heaney, Tom Paulin and Derek Mahon have published versions of Greek tragedies in the recent past. A collection of poems by Michael Longley published in 1995 included seven 'free translations from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* with original lines', notably a version of the camp fires simile from *Iliad VIII* which links Ilium to the landscape of Northern Ireland.[1]

Two of the most important works of this kind are the translation of the *Oresteia* by Tony Harrison and the versions of sections of the *Iliad* by Christopher Logue. Both have high public profiles. Harrison's *Oresteia* was written for the 1981 production of the trilogy by the National Theatre, described by Oswyn Murray as 'the most important theatrical event of the Eighties, and the best account of any Greek play that I have seen'.[2] And after somewhat samizdat beginnings, Logue's versions of Homer have been published by both Penguin and Faber.

Harrison's *Oresteia* was conceived and written for dramatic performance: it had no previous existence as a written text. Moreover, the preparation of the translation and the preparation of the performance overlapped from a very early stage: in a letter dated 22 December 1975 to Peter Hall, director of the production, Harrison wrote: 'the venture seems to me much more a "dramaturgical collaborative" than any conventional sequence of script, production, design etc.'[3] The fact that the dramatic outlet was the Olivier stage of the National Theatre is significant. This meant first that the translation had the responsibilities of immediate quasi-canonical status, and secondly that strategies based on intimacy were ruled out by the physical reality of the theatre it was conceived for. Another important factor influencing the translation was that the production sought to reproduce many of the performance features of the theatre of Aeschylus' time. All the actors were male, wore masks and acted in a company without the individualizing device whereby named actors take named parts. Again, 'the hallmark of the

production was its restraint in visual terms';[4] and it gave particular prominence to ritual as a force within the trilogy.

This was not Harrison's first translation for the NT; and much of his subsequent work has been translation or adaptation from a variety of languages. The works and his commentaries on them demonstrate his awareness of and self-consciousness about the writer's craft in translation, and equally his claim to knowledge of classical literature. The sonnet sequence *Continuous* contains several pieces which show his acquisition of this knowledge through a grammar school education counterpointed against a Northern working-class upbringing. The purpose of these sonnets is to address an overlapping set of issues about dead and living language, learnt language and dialect, language and class, text and the spoken word; and these are concerns he seeks to reconcile in the poetic form he chooses for his translation of the *Oresteia.*

Although the text is close to the original, the voice Harrison chooses is highly distinctive. In a heading to the printed edition (1981) he describes the work as a 'rhythmic libretto'. The sense of rhythm may be intended to reinforce the sense of ritual, as a verbal equivalent of dance and procession; and it comes across as an immediate feature on the page, even though it is now detached from Harrison Birtwistle's score and the sound of the actors' feet. Within the narrative episodes the metre is mainly anapaestic (../) or amphibrachic (./.) or dactylic (/..), with four strong beats to each line. Consider, for instance, *Agamemnon* 650-80, which Harrison translates as follows:

Flame and saltwater are scarcely a bloodbond.
This time they were though, elements merging,
and their bond-proof – smashing our ships into splinters.

Blackness. Waveforce. Sea heaving and swelling.
Fierce thrashing galesqualls whistling from Thrace,
hurricanes blasting, rain lashing and pelting,
ship-prow smashing ship-prow, horned beast goring beast,
beasts with their horns locked butting each other.
You know when a collie not used to its charges
scatters the daft sheep in every direction,
colliding, collapsing, that kind of chaos . . .
well that's how the waves were. Next morning

the Aegean had mushroomed with corpses and shipwreck.
Our ship though, amazing, still whole and undamaged.
Some god interceded, got our ship a pardon.
Our helm had been guided by the hand of some he-god.
Our ship was one which didn't get shattered.
Couldn't believe it escaping that wave-grave,
couldn't believe our life-lot so lucky.
We were shocked in the clear light of morning,
chewing the cud of the nightmare we'd lived through.
Our ship-throng had suffered a terrible thrashing.
If any of the others survived they'll be thinking
we're finished, finished, as we still do of them.
May everything still turn out for the better.
Menelaus, let's suppose that he's made it,

let's hope he's still somewhere under the sunlight.
Zeus can't want the whole bloodclan blasted.
That's the truth you wanted. You've got it all now.[5]

The strong metre is accompanied by extensive use of a strong caesura and emphatic line-end stops: of the twenty-nine lines in this passage eighteen end in full-stops or the equivalent, as opposed to twelve in the thirty lines of the Greek. But Harrison is too good a poet to allow this to become monotonous. Within the narrative sections the basic rhythm is far from regular. And there is clear demarcation between the metre used for narrative and for other purposes. Stichomythia is presented as rhyming couplets. The choruses are given a variety of treatments, including frequent use of iambic quatrains with an *abab* rhyme, each line with three or four beats like these (772ff.):

Justice shines through hovel smoke
she loves the man who's straight
Justice eats off plates of oak
scorns dainties off gold plate.[6]

The driving and repetitive force of rhythm is strikingly reinforced by alliteration and assonance. Thus, in the narrative passage above, alliteration is used in fifteen

of the twenty-nine lines, usually at the half-line level ('This time they were though, elements merging'), but occasionally across the line as a whole ('colliding, collapsing, that kind of chaos'). More striking still is Harrison's use of nonce-words in the form of disyllabic compounds comprising two monosyllabic nouns. The passage above includes 'bloodbond', 'bond-proof', 'waveforce', 'galesqualls', 'wave-grave', 'life-lot', 'ship-throng' and 'bloodclan'. This technique also forces the listener to re-evaluate established usages structured on the same model, such as 'shipwreck', 'nightmare' and 'sunlight' from the same passage. In addition, Harrison makes use of colloquialisms ('smashed into splinters', 'chewing the cud'), dialect words ('daft sheep'), oral usages (such as the dropped first-person pronoun in the sentence beginning 'Couldn't believe') and apostrophized formations ('Menelaus, let's suppose that he's made it').

It is noticeable that there is no significant differentiation of technique and register between different characters. Gods are not differentiated from humans, humans from one another, or actors from the chorus. This lack of individualization is consistent with Peter Hall's approach to characterization.[7]

How can this highly distinctive voice be accounted for? Possibly, in keeping with the production's quest for authenticity, Harrison is seeking to achieve an authenticity of his own. In a letter to Peter Hall he wrote:

> I am using such words as 'the flyways of sleep' or 'griefstrings'. These are not necessarily the same coinage as the Greek but I have accepted the Aeschylean modes of image making and neologising to use *wherever* they occur to me or seem effective in English, so that I extract a certain stylistic principle and allow it to be distributed over the version.[8]

However, Aeschylus himself 'is essentially a poet of . . . inspiration and genius' and of natural powers more than acquired skill;[9] and, most important, he is innocent of any true classicism, with its balance, impersonality, flawlessness and understatement.[10] By contrast, the language Harrison develops for his *Oresteia* is a technical artifice, with its compounds invoking existing language and literature and its use of dialect achieving the colloquial rather than the mantic. In addition, its regularity and lack of differentiation are not in keeping with the wide range and distinctive individualities of Aeschylus' style.

Instead, Harrison's effects − notably the rhythm, strong caesuras, noun-compounds and end-stopping − make the 'otherness' of his poetic voice

recognizable within the English verse tradition, as an imitation of Anglo-Saxon poetics. And this is a further aspect of Harrison's commentary on Aeschylus: the purpose of these effects may have been to remind his audience of Aeschylus' position as the first dramatist, the *Oresteia* as the first major work at the primitive beginnings of European drama. But the *Oresteia* is only the first *extant* major work of European drama. It is a late work within Aeschylus' own oeuvre; it is written within a pre-existing tragic tradition; and it contains within it the response to Homer which is an integral part of most works of classical Greek literature.

There is a further sense in which Harrison's translation seems to attempt a kind of fidelity, which is especially remarkable given the purposes for which it was intended. Most of what is in Aeschylus is in Harrison, and *vice versa*. There is only one major transposition, where the long speech Athena addresses to the men of Attica halfway through the trial scene in *Eumenides* (681ff. in the Greek) is moved to the start of the scene,[11] and one major omission (of which more later). Content, again, is subject to only minor manipulation: Harrison seems to be trying to articulate his own text on the gods and on gender[12] (although the effect is less radical than he seems to think).

Yet Harrison cannot be used as a crib. In the first place, there are passages of elaboration which seem to be intended to bring out the full nuances of metaphor. In the narrative passage under discussion, the most striking instance is where the almost Shakespearean compression of ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβῳ ('by the whirling round of a bad shepherd', 657) is turned into a three-line Homeric simile:

> You know how when a collie not used to its charges
> scatters the daft sheep in every direction,
> colliding, collapsing, that kind of chaos . . .
> Well, that's how the waves were.

Then again, though Harrison may attempt to find an equivalent for most of what is in his source, he does not necessarily follow its sequence. Thus, within the main passage under discussion, *Agamemnon* 653-657a is rendered as:

> Blackness. Waveforce. Sea heaving and swelling.
> Fierce thrashing galesqualls whistling from Thrace,
> hurricanes blasting, rain lashing and pelting,
> ship-prow smashing ship-prow, horned beast goring beast,

beasts with their horns locked butting each other.

What Aeschylus wrote was:

ἐν νυκτὶ δυσκύμαντα δ' ὠρώρει κακα·
ναῦς γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλῃσι Θρῆκιαι πνοαὶ
ἤρεικον· αἱ δὲ κεροτυπούμεναι βίᾳ
χειμῶνι τυφῶ σὺν ζάλῃ τ' ὀμβροκτύπῳ
ᾤχοντ' ἄφαντοι . . .

where the sequence is: night-time – mischief from the cruel surge – ships against one another – blasts from Thrace – gored violently by furious hurricane and rush of pelting rain – disappeared out of sight.[13]

Lefevre has graphically shown the problems which arise from any attempt at metrical translation, including the particular dangers of archaism, stylistic and syntactic patterns not in current usage, and the expression of a single notion in the source by two words in the target.[14] In Harrison's case the problems are made even more acute by the metrical forms he uses for his choruses: most extensively, the short-line iambic quatrain. Thus in the Justice chorus quoted above, Harrison uses what Lefevre would regard as padding: πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα is rendered by the tautologous 'Justice isn't put out of her stride,/Justice can't be turned aside', σέβουσα by 'Justice doesn't kneel to fame/kiss affluence's feet /isn't dazzled by a name . . .' with its three different English metaphors, and the first stanza of the lyric is rounded off by a couplet, 'Justice eats off plates of oak/scorns dainties off gold plate', which simply isn't in the Greek. And when, finally, Aeschylus' poetry, usually within choral lyrics, is at its most obscure, polysyllabic and mantic, Harrison's tendency is to break down into dismembered and spasmodic utterance. Take his version of the first choral ode of *Agamemnon* (63-7a):

πολλὰ παλαίσματα καὶ γυιοβαρῆ
γόνατος κονίαισιν ἐρειδομένου
διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις
κάμακος θήσων Δαναοῖσιν
Τρωσί θ' ὁμοίως.

Bedbond   no   not bedbond   spearclash
swordhafts shattered   hacked bones smashed
sparring   skirmish   dustclouds   bloodstorm
Trojans   Greeks   not bedbond   bloodbath.[15]

The same ode also contains Harrison's one major omission, in that the three-stanza ode to Zeus, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν (160-83), is left out. Possibly this is in part designed to overcome the problem which the verbal density and length of the parodos create for dramatic production; and it may also be prompted by Harrison's response to Greek polytheism. Either way it has profound consequences.

Compared with Harrison's *Oresteia*, Logue's Homer has a complicated publication history, whereby material has appeared piecemeal, initially in obscure journals and later through recognized publishing houses, over thirty-five years. *War Music* (comprising books XVI-XIX of the *Iliad* in the sections *Patrocleia, GBH,* and *Pax,* the first and third of which had appeared earlier) was published in 1981, *Kings* (I and II) in 1991, and *The Husbands* (III and IV, 'plus material from books 2, 5, 7 and 11') in 1994. The spasmodic publication has been accompanied by gathering critical acclaim, which may have served to validate his translation strategy, at least for Logue himself; certainly, it is possible to trace growing freedom in his methods over time, as he acknowledges in an interview: 'as the work lengthens I move further away from Homer's actual text'.[16]

Then again, the performance history of these poems is complicated too. The very first passage rendered was produced for radio; and later sections of Logue's work have been produced through other media such as disc and theatre. This has clearly affected his translation technique, encouraging, for example, a use of declamatory rather than periodic syntax. 'For me, until I have heard it read aloud, the published text is incomplete . . . Poetry is not a silent art. The poem must perform unaided, in its reader's head.'[17]

More complicated still is Logue's personal literary tradition. He was involved with some of the more radical and populist developments in English poetry of the 1960s: performance poetry, poetry and jazz, anti-war protest poetry, poster poetry.[18] He also sees his work as part of twentieth-century literary modernism, with Pound and Eliot as his teachers, and Pound particularly significant for his translations.

Like Harrison, Logue is aware of the various approaches to translation and often discusses them in relation to his work. His own approach is that, having (on

his own admission) no Greek, he uses a selection of existing translations, chosen on his own judgement of their literary merit, as his source texts:

> I was not, then, making a translation in the accepted sense of the word, but what I hoped would turn out to be a poem in English dependent upon whatever, through reading and through conversation, I could guess about a small part of the *Iliad,* a poem whose composition is reckoned to have preceded the beginnings of our own written language by fifteen centuries.[19]

In a recent interview he amplifies this comment as follows:

> Imitation in Dryden's sense of the word meant an English version of a poem in Latin aimed at people who knew Latin . . . I use existing translations and commentaries and essays to tell me what's going on; after that I'm on my own. That is why, when talking about *War Music* and *Kings* to myself, I call them my 'Homer poems'. But in public I call them 'an account', a word I chose because it has a neutral, police-file air to it.[20]

Because Logue's Homer assumes divergence from the original at all levels, detailed analysis of the kind used in discussing Harrison's *Oresteia* is not appropriate. A broader approach is needed. As a starting-point, one might identify areas of similarity to the source text.

First, one can trace the correspondence between Logue and his original in the narrative order of events and identify areas of his text which are closely based on the original. Correspondence is especially clear in the *Patrocleia* and *Pax* sections of *War Music,* where Logue follows the sequence of the original without transposition and with minimal omissions; it is less visible in the *GBH* section and the later works. Secondly, he makes extensive use of the epic simile. Some of the similes in his account are very close to the original, as with the woodcutters and drinking wolves in book XVI. Others, however, are loosely based on the original; many of the similes in his source are simply omitted; while some of those he does use are his own invention: 'as far as the long similes are concerned, they . . . came about in what I can only call a natural way. I saw that Homer used them and so when the opportunity arose I used one too. That they were not Homer's similes seems irrelevant to me'.[21] Logue also retains other aspects of the epic apparatus, such as ecphrasis and set-piece speeches; and there is a divine machinery, even if

what the gods say and do is not always in Homer.

By contrast, the areas of divergence are so extensive that Logue's work functions not just as an 'account' of the original but also as a modernist critique of it.   One major area of change is Homer's formulaic repetitions. In the introduction to *War Music* Logue describes his decision '(mostly) to omit Homer's descriptive epithets, "ten-second-miler-Achilles", "thick-as-a-pyramid-Ajax", and so forth'.[22] What he does not say is that he also (mostly) omits other forms of formulaic repetition: not just noun-epithet phrases, but repeated verses or blocks of verses, and the more indirect repetition by analogous word-groups. The only exception – its impact comes from its being an exception – is the passage where Apollo conveys Sarpedon's body to Lycia.[23]

Logue also diverges by contracting and amplifying. One of the most striking examples of contraction comes at the end of the *Patrocleia* after the dying Patroclus has taunted Hector. The original (XVI 855-63) reads:

ὣς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε·
ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδόσδε βεβήκει,
ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.
τὸν καὶ τεθνηῶτα προσηύδα φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ·
Πατρόκλεις, τί νύ μοι μαντεύεαι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον;
τίς δ' οἶδ' εἴ κ' Ἀχιλεύς, Θέτιδος πάϊς ἠϋκόμοιο,
φθήῃ ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι;
ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξ ὠτειλῆς
εἴρυσε λὰξ προσβάς, τὸν δ' ὕπτιον ὦσ' ἀπὸ δουρός.

Logue translates this as:

> Saying these things Patroclus died.
> And as his soul went through the sand
> Hector withdrew his spear and said:
>   "Perhaps."[24]

As in this example, Logue compresses most extensively in rendering speech. He amplifies in two main areas: the epic similes and then the violence of combat, especially in respect of Homer's often gruesome language. Homer's account of the death of Euphorbus is graphic enough (XVII 46-52). Logue gives him a new

name, Thackta, a fish brooch round the neck (with an invented but highly credible ecphrasis), and an even more gruesome death:

> Offhandedly the bitter Greek reached up
> And hooked the tendon round Thackta's neck
> And smashed his downwards moving cry against his knee
> And poached his eyes, and smashed and smashed
> That baby face, loose as a bag of nuts; and then –
> When Thackta's whimpering gained that fine, high shriek,
> Dear to a mind inspired by vengefulness – the Greek
> Posted his blade between the runny lips,
> Increased the number of the dead by one,
> Eased his malignant vigour with a sigh,
> And scratched . . .[25]

On a larger scale, whole sections of the original are left out. In XVIII the debate between Polydamas and Hector and the description of Achilles' shield are omitted in their entirety. In XIX Briseis' lamentation over Patroclus and the scene in which Zeus sends Athena to ward off Achilles' hunger are also cut. Perhaps the most recurrent omission is the random minor deaths in the battle scenes, where Logue overtly edits the text ('Of several incidents, consider two') and uses characters and deaths entirely of his own invention.[26]

Divergence also takes the form of ostentatious anachronism. Logue defends this ingeniously: 'Homer is full of anachronisms, so it seemed the natural thing to do.'[27] In *War Music* examples include cars, windcheaters, radium, atoms, yachts, pistons, trampolines, vampires, planes at touchdown, tungsten, and Cape Kennedy.[28] For some theorists, this is unacceptable: 'it may possess a certain shock value when the reader is first confronted with it, but it becomes irritating very soon.'[29] But anachronism is an inevitable element of translation. It cannot be avoided in translating syntax and idiom if the translation is to achieve meaning and fluency for its contemporary audience. Here it draws attention to the specific temporal location in which Logue's work exists and its difference from Homer's. And the fact that Logue uses it mainly to extend the vocabulary of motion and materials is in keeping with his project of presenting Homer as poetry of action.

With all this divergence, has Logue succeeded in rendering a recognizable Homer? Arnold's celebrated characterization of Homer serves as a useful starting

point for a comparison. Homer, Arnold said, is rapid in movement, plain and direct in syntax, phraseology and ideas, and noble in manner.[30] The artistic decisions Logue makes to emphasize action, to reduce speech and to eliminate epithet and repetition, result in a text which largely corresponds to Arnold's set of adjectives. But these adjectives sell short both Homer and Logue; and here Silk's reformulation of Arnold in terms of the alternative concepts of immediacy and stylization is useful. Homer, Silk argues, is 'immediate' in that his idiom is both frank and very concrete, as well as, in Arnold's sense, 'direct'; yet his is a highly stylized idiom too, highly conventionalized and often schematic.[31] Logue's Homer, similarly, is both immediate and stylized; but whereas his immediacy corresponds reasonably closely to Homer's, he has substituted an alternative stylization of his own.

Thus passages are added which depict atmosphere, to one side from narrative action. The language used suggests painting, more particularly Impressionism, and the technique is often a verbless shorthand: 'First sunlight off the sea like thousands of white birds./Salt haze' or 'Noon. Striped mosquitoes. Nothing stirs.' One of the most striking examples is the passage *Pax* opens with:

> Rat.
> Pearl.
> Onion.
> Honey:
> These colours came before the Sun
>   Lifted above the ocean,
> Bringing light
>   Alike to mortals and Immortals.[32]

A related technique is visualization. When Patroclus is chasing the Trojans back to Troy, Logue describes the setting as if in a panorama:

> See if you can imagine how it looked:
>
> An opened fan, held flat; its pin
> (That marks the ditch) towards yourself; its curve
> (That spans the plain) remote:
> The left guard points at Troy; the right

Covers the dunes that front the Aegean coast:
Like crabs disturbed by flame the Trojans run
This way and that across its radiants.
Patroclus thrusts his soldiers at the mid
Point of the pleated leaf; a painted sun.[33]

The first line is especially characteristic: it is not just that Logue visualizes, he also demands the reader's or listener's engagement in the process. This applies in particular to the beginning of similes, where the usual initial marker ὡς ('as') is given a number of different imaginative treatments: 'Imagine wolves', 'Try to recall the pause, thock, pause,/Made by axeblades', 'Picture a canted yacht at speed', 'Consider planes at touchdown', 'Now I must ask you to forget reality', 'Now I shall ask you to imagine how/Men under discipline of death prepare for war.'[34] In particular Logue's ways of seeing include cinema. In a few places this is explicit in his metaphor: 'Cut to the Fleet' or 'Jump cuts like these.'[35] More frequently it is implicit in his way of visualizing, as in the passage above where the panorama is presented as a panning shot. Cinema also affects action, most notably in the somewhat clichéd scene where Patroclus, struggling to stay alive, grasps an ankle, looks up and sees Hector staring down at him.[36] This bears no relation to the original, but is consistent with Logue's stylistics of multiple visualization, involving here Patroclus, the reader/viewer and Logue himself.

A more fundamental aspect of Logue's substitute stylization is in the architecture of his 'accounts'. The *Iliad* passages he reproduces are presented as rounded self-contained episodes with a particularly strong sense of ending, rather than as part of a seamless whole. Just as his *Patrocleia* closes with its abrupt 'Perhaps', his *Pax* ends with the dialogue between Achilles and his horse Xanthus:

And Achilles, shaken, says:
'I know I will not make old bones.'

And laid his scourge against their racing flanks.

Someone has left a spear stuck in the sand.[37]

This is a version of XIX 420-4 (the closing lines of the book):

Ξάνθε, τί μοι θάνατον μαντεύεαι; οὐδέ τί σε χρή.
εὖ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὅ μοι μόρος ἐνθάδ᾽ ὀλέσθαι,
νόσφι φίλου πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης
οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῶας ἅδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο.
ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἐν πρώτοις ἰάχων ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους.

Here free artistic selection overrides the source text. The principle is clear from the outset in Logue's decision not to translate the whole work; and his procedure of publishing relatively short sections out of the original sequence emphasizes the mode of compressed intensity which underpins his whole conception. Logue is using Homer as the basis of a poetry which, while retaining many of the stylistic features of epic, also goes against much of our understanding of epic architectonics.

On what basis can we judge Harrison's *Oresteia* and Logue's Homer as translations? The extensive theoretical literature on translation offers a spectrum of alternative positions. The *literalist position* is represented by Nabokov:

> The person who desires to turn a literary masterpiece into another language, has only one duty to perform, and this is to reproduce with absolute exactitude the whole text, and nothing but the text. The term 'literal translation' is tautologous since anything but that is not truly a translation but an imitation, an adaptation or a parody.[38]

This is a semantic point, for the purposes of evaluation at least: even if Nabokov is right, the work of Harrison and Logue is no better or worse for being an imitation or adaptation, rather than a translation. But Nabokov goes further:

> I take literalism to mean 'absolute accuracy'. If such accuracy sometimes results in the strange allegoric scene suggested by the phrase 'the letter has killed the spirit', only one reason can be imagined: there must have been something wrong with the original letter or with the original spirit, and this is not really a translator's concern.[39]

This approach clearly gives total primacy and privilege to the source text. Translation becomes an act of unquestioning servility, beyond any duty to produce an acceptable work of art in the target language.

Faced with the obvious problems to which this position gives rise, such as issues of polysemy and culture-specific allusions, Nabokov has a solution:

> I want translations with copious footnotes, footnotes reaching up like
> skyscrapers to the top of this or that page so as to leave only the gleam of
> one textual line between commentary and eternity.[40]

But clearly this won't do. Lefevre says that the use of extensive footnotes 'merely
amounts to a completely unjustifiable splitting up of the source text',[41] and the
examples of Harrison's *Oresteia* and Logue's Homer bear this out. In the case of
the former, in its original role as text for dramatic performance footnotes are an
impossibility: even if they could be included in a theatre programme, theatrical
conditions would preclude the possibility of the audience using them simultaneously
with its experience of the main text. In the case of the latter, footnotes would
completely undermine the case Logue is making for the dynamism and momentum
of both the source text and his version of it.

A text for the *pragmatist position* is provided by I. A. Richards:

> . . . as discourse grows less abstract and hypothetical, more entire and
> actual, the probability of loss and therefore the need for choice and
> compromise become greater. With narrative and philosophy and poetry in
> so far as the growth and history of the language and of other social and
> cultural institutions enter in, a self-denying statute is required. . . . The
> translator has first to reconcile himself to conceiving his art in terms of
> minimal loss and then to balance and adjudicate, as best he can, the claims
> of the rival functions. His question is: which sorts of loss will we take in
> order not to lose what?[42]

Richards shares with Nabokov the sense of the primacy of the source text. Unlike
Nabokov's, however, his position contains an implicit assumption that accurate
translation conveying 'the whole text' is an impossibility. He uses the metaphor
of loss, and gives it overtones of regret, as in the phrase 'reconcile himself'. The
target text is by definition inferior because something is inevitably lost.

But the central metaphor can be turned on its head. As well as loss there can
be gain; and gain can take the form of either development or improvement, not
only for the target text and culture but even for the source text. The act of
translation provides the gain for the translator's audience of carrying the original
text across to them (*trans-latio*) – which is also a gain for that text as well, as it
receives not only a reading but also a re-reading.

Thus Harrison uses the text of Aeschylus to develop a set of ideas about theology and the politics of gender; and even Logue's looseness of approach, which might seem to offer little to classical scholarship, has a critical point:

> His text is an archaeology of morality and power. Logue shows how power speaks across centuries, unmediated by poetic invention and humanizing vision. In removing the profundity and complexity of emotion, Logue also removes the mitigation of the harsh masculine ethos that ignores the humanity of women and ordinary people, and thus, with archaeology, reminds us of the cultures through which the poem emerged and has been received. His are the poetics of critique rather than invention, dissecting the material basis of the cultures which Homer transformed.[43]

We would not be evaluating the translators' works fully if we did not look for gains alongside the inescapable losses Richards emphasizes.

The *generic relativist position* is that the way we evaluate a work should be conditional on the purpose for which the work was written. Delisle, for example, devotes the opening pages of his book to establishing a distinction between pragmatic and literary texts, and goes on to suggest that translation of the former should be seen as a 'linguistic operation' and translation of the latter as a 'literary operation'.[44] Arnott takes this approach a stage further by seeking to establish the principle of genre-related evaluative criteria:

> The responsibility of the literary translator, though arduous, is limited in its terms of reference. His task is to give as faithful a rendering as possible of the original text, to present to English readers a version in their own language as close as possible to what the poet actually wrote. . . . In the theater, however, . . . there are many factors to take into account with which the literary translator need not concern himself. . . . the work of the stage translator begins where that of the literary translator leaves off.[45]

However, even if we disregard Arnott's suspect dichotomy between the literary and dramatic, this approach has its shortcomings. Genres can be subject to change. Harrison's translation may originally have been produced for dramatic purposes; but by producing it in book form Harrison and his publishers have given it an existence independent of either the production it was intended for or any future production – indeed, most audiences will now experience the text as readers

rather than spectators. Then again, apparent generic equivalence may be deceptive. Professional writers are more sensitive in this regard than scholarly commentators, because if they are to sustain their profession, they need to respond to what Lefevre and Bassnett call 'cultural reality, i.e. . . . . the way literature operates in a culture in this day and age'.[46] Thus Logue is seeking to translate epic poetry into a modern poetic that eschews extended forms; and this may be why he chooses to render it in short sections. So too, Harrison is seeking to transfer plays which were written on a historical cusp between improvised lyric and formalized drama to a theatre which does not comfortably accommodate the lyric at all.

The *functional relativist position* assumes that the way we evaluate a work should be conditional on its audience. The target audience has an importance altogether greater than has been recognized in the theoretical literature. Sommerstein, writing about the translation of Greek comedy, defines a series of audiences: the classical scholar; the specialist in other disciplines, most notably the literary scholar; the person concerned with the theatre; and the 'general reader'. A sense of hierarchy is implicit in his description of the first three of these categories as 'professional' or 'specialist': 'for various special publics, various special considerations impose themselves on the translator.'[47]

This approach seems problematic on two counts. In the first place, 'specialist' audiences are by definition narrow, whereas the 'general reader' category would seem to be wide to the point of being useless for the translator. Sommerstein admits that the 'general reader' is a 'hard-to-pin-down figure'[48] and then makes no further gesture in this direction. If these categories are to guide the translator in the act of translation and the commentator in the act of evaluation, there needs to be a closer typology and sociology of the intended audience to which the translator would have access. The second problem is that just as the function of a work can change, so can the capabilities of an audience. This point is illustrated by Pound, writing in 1916:

two causes have removed the classics from us. On the one hand we have ceased to read Greek with the aid of Latin cribs, and Latin is the only language into which any great amount of Greek can be in a lively fashion set over; secondly, there is no discrimination in classical studies. The student is told that the classics are excellent and that it is a crime to think about what he reads.[49]

How do we meet these objections? The solution may be to distinguish production and reception of a work as two different stages. Intended function will be a factor in the initial act of producing the translation. But once the translation has gone into the public domain, through performance or publication, the author loses ownership and control over the function to which the audience puts it.

The *restricted libertarian position* is set out by Delisle,

> translating is an act of judgement and co-ordination that consists in reconciling the semantic and stylistic imperatives of a discourse while respecting the rules of writing and the requirements of textual organicity.[50]

and Lefevre:

> [Literary translations are] translations which both can exist as literary works of art in their own right and can give the reader an accurate impression of what the source text is like.[51]

The common feature of these accounts is their tendency to sanction a move from literalism by giving joint status and rights to source and target. However, the freedom allowed to the target is restricted on terms which can be set by each commentator individually. Delisle insists on 'textual organicity', by which he means preserving the framework of the original as the 'inherent quality of texts, distinct from idiomaticity'.[52] Lefevre goes further. His 'inventory of competence' for the literary translator involves such demanding requirements as

> the ability to comprehend the source text as a whole, as a total structure, rather than the 'negative capability' of concentrating on a single aspect of [it] and consequently the ability to realise that time-place-tradition elements contained in [it] should receive the same attention, be transposed in the same way and with the same care, as the linguistic elements.[53]

This in turn implies that the translator must be fully conversant with both the text itself and its background culture.[54]

If we apply these principles to Harrison and Logue, we begin to see the problems they present. On Delisle's definition the later work of Logue would be discounted as translation; on Lefevre's, all the works of both Logue and Harrison

– and most other translators, for that matter – would be discounted. But although these definitions raise the issue of inclusion and exclusion, they fail to provide a basis for evaluation.

The *unrestricted libertarian position* is best illustrated by Pound, an important figure in any discussion of literary translation. The key to his importance is the short 'list of aims' he gives to the translator W.H.D. Rouse. The 'aims' are twofold: 'real speech in the English version' and 'fidelity to the original' in respect of 'meaning' and 'atmosphere'.[55] If 'fidelity' has connotations of literalism, these are qualified, to the point of contradiction, by 'atmosphere'. According to Gentzler, 'his term "atmosphere" referred to both contextual and intertextual associations'.[56] What this means in practice is explained by Kenner:

> The poem is not its language. Hence Pound's reiterated advice to translators, to convey the energised pattern and let go the words. To tie the knot you need not simulate the original fibers. 'I'd like to see a "rewrite" (he wrote W.H.D. Rouse) as if you didn't know the *words* of the original and were telling what happened.' And to Michael Reck, about a proposed Japanese *Trachiniae* (from Pound's English, from Sophokles' Greek), 'Don't bother about the WORDS, translate the MEANING.' ... But the language is responsible to the poem: hence the moral obligation laid on technique, which alone can disclose the persistent patterned energy.[57]

These principles engender a libertarianism on which, unlike Delisle and Lefevre, Pound sets no further constraints and through which, unlike any of the other commentators we have looked at, he gives the target text priority over the source. But even this is no help in a search for evaluative criteria, because the freedom Pound allows is essentially arbitrary. Evaluation is impossible, if response to the original text is wholly individual.[58]

Beyond the spectrum ... ? I have presented a spectrum of formulations for the evaluation of translation. But post-modernism, which uses translation as a laboratory for many of its ideas, would suggest that the positions described, and my own metaphor of spectrum, are misconceived. The key point is contained in a remark put forward, but not fully developed, by Lefevre and Bassnett: 'translation, like all (re)writings, is never innocent'.[59] There is no possibility of neutrality. Translation entails a continual process of choice and commitment which goes far beyond what is entailed in one-dimensional creative endeavour. For Holmes 'the

translator, whether or not he is conscious of it, establishes a hierarchy of correspondences':[60] the point being that what distinguishes Loeb from Lattimore from Logue is the differences in the correspondences they choose to promote.

Moreover, in recent post-structuralist accounts, especially Derrida's, even the apparent fixity of source text and target text is dissolved. Instead, both take their places within a continuum of production and reception, rather than standing at either end of it. Aeschylus' text is itself a translation of works which have gone before. Other translations are source texts just as much as a putative 'original', as we have seen in Logue's description of his own approach to translation. And each reading, individualized in the reader, is an act of translation itself.

On this basis the question whether to privilege source text or target text, or even to seek an imagined neutrality between the two, is irrelevant. Gentzler notes that 'translation theory has traditionally involved some concept of determinable meaning that can be transferred to another system of signification. Deconstruction questions such a definition of translation and uses the practice of translation to demonstrate the instability of its own theoretical framework.'[61] As a result, if the relativists have made evaluation theoretically impossible, the post-structuralists go further by making it redundant.

Yet though there is much to admire in the post-structuralist accounts, it is difficult to deny the instinct to evaluation, especially where the assessment of source and target text against one another and the availability of different translations of the same source seem to call for acts of judgement. I suggest two criteria which go beyond the impressionistic observations or the exercise of personal taste a reader might make in response to a work of translation.

The first is that if it is to be recognizable as a translation of the work on which it is based, it must preserve what Delisle calls the 'textual organicity' of that work. Where the writer has abandoned the basic organizational framework of the source text, he or she is moving away from the linkage which gives translation its multi-dimensional characteristics. For example, Derek Walcott's *Omeros* retains the names of Homer and some of his characters, together with some mythic traces; but he has moved so far that any choices and commitments he makes are no longer grounded in the original.

The second criterion is rarely mentioned in the literature on translation but is basic to the relationship between translator and reader: consistency in commitments once made. Because a commitment to fidelity or a claim to scholarly authority is itself not innocent, this is as important where the translator has apparently made

such a commitment or claim as where the translator has committed him or herself to a strategy at some distance from fidelity or authority. Lattimore's translations of Homer have gained canonical status for having 'the accuracy that too many translators take to be beneath themselves';[62] but his quasi-hexameters, while apparently faithful to his original, have the effect of creating a dynamic and speed wholly at odds with Arnold's postulate of rapidity or Silk's of immediacy. Fagles' *Oresteia* appears in the Penguin Classics, which, for Sommerstein's 'general reader' at least, gives it a presumption of canonical status; but within his text there are manipulations of characterization which, though minor in scale, distort Aeschylus' representation of Clytemnestra and the chorus in the *Agamemnon* and, as a result, the overall balance of the play. These are major breaches in the commitment to fidelity, made more serious by the notional standing given to the works concerned.

How then – bringing together these analyses of text and theory – should we value Harrison's *Oresteia* and Logue's Homer? When Steiner describes Logue's early versions of Homer as 'licentious but numbingly powerful',[63] the phrase 'numbingly powerful' could function as evaluation of the work as poetry, but the adjective 'licentious' primarily functions as evaluation of the work as translation. I suggest we try to keep their merits as poetry and as translation separate for as long as possible, but in the knowledge that they must eventually overlap.

Certainly both Harrison and Logue forcefully reject what they see as unpoetic translations. Thus Harrison:

> I'm plodding through the Greek and the commentaries for clues, and almost all the other versions. None of these seems even remotely actable except in the flimsiest fragments . . . My own feeling is that the 'poetry' resides in the onward sweep, the inner momentum, the arc of the whole. Reading the versions of the *Oresteia* I can't imagine any of them giving the sort of momentum the play seems to need.[64]

Logue writes in similar vein:

> I look at new translations as they come out, that of Professors Knox and Fagels [sic], for example, which is a touch sharper than Professor Lattimore's. However, these three professors have been reading Homer all their lives, but he's failed to teach them what verse is. They do not write

verse. They write blank-verse prose, sired by E.V. Rieu, via Lang, Leaf and Myers out of the King James Bible. It burbles along but it doesn't scan. Still, such things make a bomb for the publishers.[65]

Elsewhere, he is even more direct: 'what we do not want is bad modern writing (Lattimore) hiding behind efficiency in ancient languages'.[66]

The writers that Harrison and Logue denigrate tend to privilege what Venuti calls the 'valorization of transparency':

> they pursue linear syntax, univocal meaning or controlled ambiguity, current usage, linguistic consistency, conversational rhythms; they eschew unidiomatic constructions, polysemy, archaism, jargon, abrupt shifts of tone or diction, pronounced rhythmic regularity or sound repetitions – any textual effect, any play of the signifier, which calls attention to the materiality of language, to words as words, their opacity, their resistance to empathic response and interpretive mastery.[67]

By contrast, Harrison and Logue assert the poetry of their originals. If poetry is (in Steiner's words) writing which 'enlists a maximal range of linguistic means, because it articulates the code of the given language at its most incisive',[68] the works of Harrison and Logue are forcibly and extravagantly poetry. Post-modern scruples apart, how good are they in the terms they have set themselves?

Logue's poetry surely has vibrancy and dynamism of a kind which would justify the phrase 'language at its most incisive'. His work abounds in moments which are sharply focused in their observation and expression. On a more extended scale, some of the quotations given earlier illustrate the strength of his descriptive writing. But quotation cannot do justice to the cumulative momentum of his action scenes which are at their best over longer passages, notably Patroclus' assault on Troy[69] or the account, published only in anthology, of the fight between Achilles and the river Scamander.[70]

But Logue has his weaknesses. Steiner, who is fascinated by Logue's work to the point of citing it six times in *After Babel* (more often than he cites Fagles, Fitzgerald and Lattimore together), has a major theoretical reservation:

> Too often, the translator feeds on the original for his own increase. Endowed with linguistic and prosodic talents, but unable to produce an

independent, free life-form, the translator (Pound, Lowell, Logue, even Pasternak) will heighten, overcrowd, or excessively dramatise the text which he is translating to make it almost his trophy.[71]

Indeed, there is nothing modest about Logue's ambition or its execution. But this egotism is justified by the creation of a poetry of action which is without parallel in contemporary English literature. Steiner notes that some translations function 'by enriching, by extending the executive means of their own tongue'; and Logue comes into this category.[72]

Harrison's work is more difficult to assess. Certainly it has its moments. However, his successes are less concentrated than Logue's, and the style he has chosen more prone to bathos ('Our shipthrong had taken a terrible thrashing'). Moreover, the reader is never completely taken into the work as it develops. The synthetic style claims familiarity through its use of colloquialism and its strong rhythm; but it is in itself confrontational, with its vocabulary of 'otherness'. The shock of the new which is always present in Logue wears off in Harrison. What is left is an abrasive inverted snobbery. Steiner quotes MacKenna, the translator of Plotinus, quoting Herbert Spencer: 'the great rule is I suppose this: "with a dignity adequate to the subject and its mood to *avoid* (or minimise) *friction*".'[73] In Harrison there is continual friction but few sparks and even less fire.

In terms of their merits as translations, Logue's reading of Homer is at least plausible in its emphasis on dynamic movement. There can be little argument that in *War Music* he has succeeded in translating this reading into a contemporary correspondence, although the more recent works, *Kings* and *The Husbands,* are flabbier and less taut in their diction. However, Harrison's reading of Aeschylus does seem fundamentally mistaken: the poetic primitivism for which Harrison forges a hybrid equivalent is based on historical stereotyping and does little justice to Aeschylus' sophistication of dramatic technique, language and thought.

In terms of conceptual consistency, both Harrison and Logue show shortcomings. In *Kings* Logue begins the introduction by saying: 'in this book I have gone about things in the same way as I did with *War Music,* whose introduction explains the recipe in detail'. But this is misleading. First, the three-page preface to *War Music* can hardly be said to explain his technique 'in detail'. And between *War Music* and *Kings* Logue's strategy has certainly changed. In his *Oresteia,* Harrison has sought to introduce a contemporary correspondence at the level of the philosophical substance of the play, in his treatment of the Gods

and of gender; but in order to achieve this he has omitted the three stanzas from the first chorus of the *Agamemnon* which are for many commentators, as Harrison will have known, the philosophical core of the play. This may have been valid in performance, but it seems, on the kindest judgement, careless to carry it through, without comment or Nabokovian footnotes, to the printed version of the play.

The ultimate importance of these shortcomings is that they mislead the reader. The reason these works exist is that they are being written by professional writers for the 'general reader': but the 'general reader' is in no position to know that he or she is being misled – and this is the point at which the kind of critical description and evaluation I have attempted in this essay has its own justification.

NOTES

1 M. Longley, *The Ghost Orchid* (London 1995) 62, 37.

2 O. Murray, 'Tony Harrison: poetry and the theatre', in N. Astley (ed.), *Bloodaxe Critical Anthologies I: Tony Harrison* (Manchester 1991) 266.

3 T. Harrison, 'The *Oresteia* in the making: letters to Peter Hall', in Astley, *Tony Harrison,* 275.

4 Murray, 'Tony Harrison', 268.

5 T. Harrison, *The Oresteia* (London 1981) 21. This passage has been chosen so that the interested reader can continue the comparison from R. A. Brower's article 'Seven Agamemnons', in Brower (ed.), *On Translation* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959). The line spacings are as in the printed text.

6 Harrison, *Oresteia*, 24; again, following the example used in Brower.

7 The only occasion when Harrison obviously practises linguistic differentiation is the scene in *Choephori* where Orestes addresses Clytemnestra as a traveller from Phocis (674-90 in the Greek: Harrison, *Oresteia*, 72-3), which he translates into flowing speech running on over line-ends and free from obtrusive lexical effects: thus Harrison uses poetic orthodoxy to represent dramatic deception.

8 Harrison, 'The *Oresteia* in the making', 277; emphasis in the original.

9 W. B. Stanford, *Aeschylus in His Style* (Dublin 1942) 13-14.

10 See e.g. Stanford, *Aeschylus in His Style*, 13-14, also 126-7.

11 Harrison, *Oresteia*, 106.

12 See his comment in an interview: ' . . . if you're looking for social ground, I think it's in the struggles between men and women and looking at *Oresteia* in the light of feminism, feminist history, or feminist historiography': Marianne McDonald, 'Tony Harrison's interview' in *Ancient Sun, Modern Light: Greek Drama on the Modern Stage* (New York 1992) 143ff. On theology, by his repeated use of 'he-god' / 'she-god', his translation of Zeus by 'God' and his avoidance of the names of individual gods, Harrison would appear to be trying to demythologize the pantheon.

13 This phrasing is borrowed from the Loeb of H. W. Smyth and H. Lloyd-Jones (Cambridge, Mass. 1983) 58-9; the last phrase in the Greek is omitted by Harrison altogether.

14 A. Lefevre, *Translating Poetry* (Amsterdam 1975) 41.

15 Harrison, *Oresteia*, 5.

16 'Interview with Christopher Logue', *Thumbscrew* 1 (1994/5) 23.

17 'The Art of Poetry LXVI' (interview of Logue by S. Guppy), *Paris Review* 127 (1993) 256.

18 Traces of his interest in the typography of poetry remain in his Homer, for example in *War Music,*

where at the height of Patroclus' assault on the walls of Troy the word 'Apollo' is printed across a double-page spread: Christopher Logue, *War Music* (London 1981) 36-7. Other examples appear in the journal drafts but are edited out in the book-form texts.

19 Logue, *War Music*, 8.

20 'The Art of Poetry LXVI', 253.

21 'The Art of Poetry LXVI', 258.

22 Logue, *War Music*, 7. Interestingly, the only characters who seem to have epithets applied to them with any regularity are Apollo and Thetis, to whom Logue frequently refers as 'Mousegod' and 'The Source' respectively.

23 Logue, *War Music*, 33 immediately repeated with minor modifications, 33-4.

24 Logue, *War Music*, 39.

25 Logue, *War Music*, 45.

26 Logue, *War Music*, 23 and (e.g.) 31-2.

27 'The Art of Poetry LXVI', 258.

28 Logue, *War Music*, 16 ('men, armour, cars, the lot'), 19 ('a fleece-lined windcheater'), 33 ('a fleck of radium'), 38 ('every atom of His mythic weight'), 43 ('Picture a canted yacht at speed'), 49 ('The piston-kneed, blade-flailing Greeks'), 49 ('as if the ground between each clump . . . was trampoline'), 55 ('much as their posterity will spurn/Vampires with garlic'), 61 ('Consider planes at touchdown – how they poise'), 69 (of the armour Thetis provides for Achilles, '. . . tested the weight of it; and then/Spun the holy tungsten'; similarly 79), and 80 (of Achilles' team of horses 'And as in dreams, or at Cape Kennedy they rise').

29 Lefevre, *Translating Poetry,* 82.

30 M. Arnold, 'On translating Homer' in *On the Classical Tradition: The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold* , I (Ann Arbor 1960) 102-17.

31 M. Silk, *The Iliad* (Cambridge 1987) 54-69.

32 Logue, *War Music*, 18 ('First sunlight . . .'), 28 ('Noon . . . .'), 68 ('Rat . . .').

33 Logue, *War Music*, 26.

34 Logue, *War Music*, 18, 32, 43, 61, 70 and 78 respectively.

35 Logue, *War Music*, 17 and 62 respectively.

36 Logue, *War Music*, 38.

37 Logue, *War Music*, 81.

38 V. Nabokov, 'Problems of translation: *Onegin* in English', *Partisan Review* 22 (1955) 504.

39 Nabokov, 'Problems of translation', 510.

40 Nabokov, 'Problems of translation', 512.

41 Lefevre, *Translating Poetry,* 87.

42 I.A. Richards, 'Towards a theory of translating', in A.F. Wright (ed.), *Studies in Chinese Thought* (Chicago 1953) 260.

43 L. Hardwick, 'Convergence and divergence in reading Homer', in C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick and J. Purkis (eds.), *Homer: Readings and Images* (London 1992) 246.

44 J. Delisle, *Translation: An Interpretive Approach* (Ottawa 1988) 18.

45 P. Arnott, 'Greek drama and the modern stage', in W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck (eds.), *The Craft and Context of Translation* (Austin 1961) 85, 94.

46 A. Lefevre and S. Bassnett, 'Proust's grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights', in Bassnett and Lefevre (eds.), *Translation, History and Culture* (London 1990) 9.

47 A.H. Sommerstein, 'On translating Aristophanes', *Greece and Rome* 20 (1973) 143.

48 Sommerstein, 'On translating Aristophanes', 143.

49 Pound, 'Notes on Elizabethan Classicists', *Literary Essays* (London 1954) 239.

50 Delisle, *Translation: An Interpretive Approach*, 107.

51 Lefevre, *Translating Poetry*, 95.

52 Delisle, *Translation: An Interpretive Approach*, 102.

53 Lefevre, *Translating Poetry*, 101.

54 Lefevre is surely wrong in this regard. Logue's Homer is not invalidated by his lack of knowledge of the source language. An evaluative framework which would exclude Logue on these grounds seems to me to be scholarly protectionism. Logue might go further by arguing that the validity of his project is *increased* by his lack of knowledge of the source language.

55 Pound, *Letters 1907-1941,* ed. D.D. Paige (New York 1950) 263; quoted in E. Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (London 1993) 26.

56 Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, 26.

57 H. Kenner, *The Pound Era* (London 1972) 150; emphases in Pound's original. Kenner's account (152) goes on to link Pound's theory of translation to his 'method of luminous detail'.

58 Interestingly, however, both Harrison and Logue see themselves as heirs to Pound's individualism. Harrison's *Oresteia* could be seen as modelled on Pound's *Seafarer* (originally subtitled 'A translation from the early Anglo-Saxon text'). Logue's Homer may well have been influenced by the translation of *Odyssey* XI, via Andreas Divus, with which the *Cantos* begin.

59 Lefevre and Bassnett, 'Proust's grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights', 11.

60 J. Holmes, 'Describing literary translations: models and methods', in *Translated ! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (Amsterdam 1988) 86; emphasis in the original.

61 Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, 147.

62 Comment by W. Kaufmann on the back cover of Lattimore's *Odyssey* (New York 1965). On his *Iliad* see R. Fitzgerald's comment: 'The feat is so decisive that it is reasonable to foresee a century or so in which nobody will try again to put the *Iliad* in English verse', quoted mockingly in H.A. Mason, *To Homer through Pope: An Introduction to Homer's* Iliad *and Pope's Translation* (London 1972) 186.

63 G. Steiner, After *Babel* (2nd edn., Oxford 1992) 370.

64 Harrison, 'The *Oresteia* in the making', 275.

65 'The Art of Poetry LXVI', 254. In the same vein Mason, *To Homer Through Pope*, 198-9, prints passages of Fitzgerald's translation of Homer as prose. His device is copied by S. Shankman, *Pope's Iliad: Homer in the Age of Passion* (Princeton 1983) 136-9.

66 Logue, untitled response to questionnaire, in *Arion* 3 (1964) 60.

67 L. Venuti, introduction to *Rethinking Translation* (London 1992) 4.

68 G. Steiner, introduction to *The Penguin Book of Modern Verse Translation* (London 1966) 21.

69 Logue, *War Music*, 33-9.

70 It appears in Logue's *Selected Poems* (London 1996) 134-41 and two Penguin anthologies: D. Wright (ed.), *The Mid Century: English Poetry 1940-60* (Harmondsworth 1965) 220-7 and E. Lucie-Smith, *British Poetry Since 1945* (Harmondsworth 1965) 295-302. There are also extracts which are shorter but still of a representative length in A. Poole and J. Maule (eds.), *The Oxford Book of Classical Verse in Translation* (Oxford 1995) 24-6 and 33-5 and in another Penguin anthology, G. Steiner and A. Dykman (eds.), *Homer in English* (London 1996) 298-304, although in the latter two of the pieces chosen seem to have been transposed.

71 Steiner, *After Babel*, 423.

72 Steiner, *After Babel*, 429.

73 Steiner, *After Babel*, 282. Emphases in the original. Spencer's account has clear overtones of Venuti's 'valorization of transparency' quoted above.