

A Slave? A Genetic Study of Dryden's Views on the Translator's Role Based on His Metaphors of Translation

Xinwei Zhan and Shengbing Gao

Southeast University

Under the guideline of genetic studies of translation thoughts, a diachronic analysis of the genesis and development of John Dryden's translation thoughts and theories is conducted based on the metaphors of translation in the paratexts of his works, with focus on his views on the translator's role in translation. It is revealed that, in his views of the translator, Dryden thinks highly of imitating the author's different styles and exploring his/her philosophical values. If supposing two "authors" are equally "sweet," the translator needs to make a distinction in sweetness, as in that of "sugar," and that of "honey"; meanwhile, the understanding of the original author enables Dryden to have much liberty and creativity in translation. When translating Chaucer, he feels "soul congenial" to the author, and he is conversant with Chaucer's ideas; although he claims that the translator works like a "slave," Dryden, as a translator, is inferred to have a relatively high social status and income.

Keywords: John Dryden, metaphors of translation, translator's role in translation, paratext, genetic studies of translation thoughts

John Dryden (1631–1700) is an English poet, playwright, and translator. He published his first translation in 1680, and at that time, he was one of the most important poets during Restoration and was crowned the first Poet Laureate of England. Meanwhile, he is also a translation theorist, discussing his translation thoughts in the prefaces and dedications. In the preface of *Ovid's Epistles* (Dryden, 1680), he proposes the tripartite division of translation (metaphrase, paraphrase, and imitation), which has brought about a far-reaching influence upon the translation circle. Translation became his dominant mode of literary activity when he lost the title of Poet Laureate and political prospects in 1688. This turning point has a considerable influence on Dryden's translation thoughts.

A considerable amount of literature has been published on Dryden and what is important to this research are the materials revealing or identifying his process of translation. Basically, there are two kinds of resources focusing on or referring to the

contexts hidden behind the translations—one is biographical works telling what happened in Dryden's life as a translator, and the other is papers investigating particular perspectives of his life (like his philosophical thinking, political and religious elements, financial affairs, interpersonal relationship, etc.). They are essential literary archives to explore what affects the genesis of Dryden's thought of translation.

Cordingley and Montini (2015) first propose the concept of "genetic translation studies" in *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, to analyze the psychological activities of translators during the process of translation. Instead of focusing on the translation practice like the genetic translation studies, Gao (2019) centers on the translation thoughts under the genetic studies. He puts forward the idea of "genetic studies of translation thoughts" to trace the genesis of translation thoughts, inspired by the methodologies of other genetic studies in humanities. Then Gao et al. (2021) provides the principles of "practicality," "social-historicity" and "subjectivity" based on the nature and development of thoughts, with the hope of establishing an analytical framework of applying genetic method to the translation thoughts.

Dryden attaches great importance to "maintaining the character of an author" (Dryden, 1685) in his translation by attempting to present the different styles and philosophical

Xinwei Zhan and Shengbing Gao, School of Foreign Languages, Southeast University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Shengbing Gao, School of Foreign Languages, Southeast University, 2 Southeast University Road, Jiangning, Nanjing, 211189, China. E-mail: shbgao2010@163.com

values of each author. His aim is to make the author appear as “charming” (Dryden, 1685) as possible, so he adapts some original parts in translation. Unconsciously, what he translated affects his philosophical thinking; thus, his mind also influences the manipulation and the statement of a translation. It echoes that one’s thoughts originate in practice while the formed thoughts guide the future practice (Gao et al., 2021). The emergence of his self-consciousness, together with the context of metaphors, contemporary evaluation and other evidence, could induce that Dryden’s social status as a translator is relatively high, not like the “slave” in his image (Virgil, 1909, p. 67).

The translation thought is an abstract understanding formed by the translator-theorist during practice, which could also reflect the translator’s performance of subjectivity and the influence of a specific social and historical context. Therefore, this paper is to explore under the three principles above, Dryden’s views about the translator’s role in translation through his understanding of original readers, the reoccurrence of individuality and the analysis of the status of the translator.

“Sweetness” and Understanding of the Original Author

Understanding of the original author is of great importance in translation practice. The process by which knowledge of the author is productive in translation, which is how thoughts act upon the practice. Dryden thinks highly of the comprehensive studies of authors and source texts. He cares much about the styles of different authors, and he not only practices in translation but also expresses them vividly in the paratexts. In the preface to *Sylvae* (Dryden, 1685), he shares an interesting simile discussing the different styles of poets before his translation. “Suppose two authors are equally sweet... as in that of sugar, and that of honey” (Dryden, 1685). As the sweetness of sugar could be differentiated from that of honey, the characteristics of one work also have a great distinction from the other. In the work published in 1700, he uses degree to compare Virgil and Homer: “One warms you by degrees; the other sets you on fire all at once, and never intermits his heat” (Dryden, 1700a). Dryden thinks that Homer’s verses are of more vigor than Virgil’s though both of them could bring the heat to readers. These metaphors give readers direct feelings about the different power of authors and also show Dryden’s familiarity of the source texts.

He aims to let readers be able to judge by the translations,

for example, who is Virgil, and who is Horace. Being the master of both languages is just the starting point for a good translator, and the harder task is to differentiate authors by his/her thoughts, styles and verification. He has repeatedly mentioned in his prefaces and letters that he spends much of his time considering the distinct character of his authors before undertaking them: “[the original authors’] beauties I have been endeavoring all my life to imitate” (Dryden, 1685); “His character indeed is very hard to hit” (Dryden, 1942, p. 48). However, from Dryden’s perspective, his mission as a translator is to maintain the original characteristics to make authors be themselves and appear charming to the maximum extent (Dryden, 1685).

Dryden analyzes in the preface that what distinguishes Horace’s style from others is “his briskness, his jollity, and his good humour” and “of the more bounded fancy” (Dryden, 1685) in his numerous verses. He has the similar exactness of word choice as Virgil, but the different “sweetness” is “a greater spirit” in Horace’s poems (Dryden, 1685); theocritus is special in the “inimitable tenderness of his passions” (Dryden, 1685) with simple, natural but sincere words. He is “softer than Ovid” and his eclogues have better standing than Virgil’s. The difference suggests that the translator needs to be able to detect different authors and shape different styles when translating different works, rather than only one style—the translator’s; this is a vital concern for the translation of a miscellany. In contrast to his first statement in the preface of *Ovid’s Epistles* (Dryden, 1680), “metaphrase” stands more for a faithfulness to style than to meanings (O’Sullivan, 1980, p. 156).

While preserving the original style, Dryden does not hesitate to adapt the original and add annotations to make an exposition of his authors. It seems to conflict with his idea which is to make translation wholly like the original. Harth (1968, p. 57) thinks Dryden modifies the structure for “argumentative purpose” so that he could produce organized ideas. Dryden is also outspoken in his remarks that he sometimes “very boldly” added or omitted for a better English version to make his author “charming” (Dryden, 1685). Therefore, the reason why Dryden devotes much space to describing his reflections on the author is to gain his credibility in the translation. As a translator of miscellanies, Dryden believes that it is his foremost task to be familiar with every poet and provide necessary knowledge for readers. However, in practice, a translator has other perspectives to consider: how to make the author speak idiomatic language, how to organize the loose arguments, and so on. What he wants to preserve is the style he considers in his mind from a

relatively macro perspective; meanwhile, he also makes some micro modifications to add or omit to provide the reader with understandable English.

In Dryden's last translation in 1700, he felt more emboldened to paraphrase his authors. What breaks the pattern is that he judges the source text first and cuts what he thinks unnecessary or of no dignity appearing among the better thoughts, especially for Chaucer. Chaucer writes in English, but why Dryden needs to "translate" his works? He thinks Chaucer is in the dawning age of English and his verse is not "harmonious" to the seventeenth-century readers, so a refined and modern language needs to be applied to better understand his wit. He cares not only about the language itself but also the logic and coherence. He thinks authors easily lose themselves when writing, so a translator could present the translator's ideas fluently. The subjectivity of a translator is clearly presented. There is no doubt that objections are lodged towards Dryden's practice. He thinks they are not confident enough and quite old style (Dryden, 1700a), and the public will make their own judgments.

Why Dryden has such confidence to translate "very boldly"? On the one hand, he is of higher prestige though he is not a government spokesman. The previous success proves the reader's eagerness for Dryden's translation, and he is not like "a slave" (Virgil, 1909, p. 16) following every step of the author but credible enough to act on his own. It's proved by the high subscription fees and a large number of readers. A more relaxing atmosphere provides him with larger freedom to employ his agency and individuality, and he is also confident enough to leave them for readers to judge. Dryden finds spiritual consent with his authors, and he believes other poets will adopt similar strategies of liberal translation once they reach the same level of congeniality with the original (Dryden, 1700a).

On the other hand, the goals of these miscellanies he collects and translates are both for the introduction of Latin classics and the improvement of the English language. Dryden introduces the Latin classics to the seventeenth-century England, and through translation, he also aims to refine the English language. At that time, readers of classical translations were increasing, and possession of a miscellany was a symbol of knowledge or gentility (Belle, 2011). Dryden's goal also includes the refinement of English. Though English is their mother tongue, "the proprieties and delicacies of the English are known to few" (Dryden, 1685). The translator is needed to distinguish the good writers from the bad ones and the pure part (in one work) from the corrupt part. His aim is to

help them gain access to the great source text and spread the improved English usage.

Dryden requires himself and other translators to have clear and penetrating understandings of the author so that it could have two functions: on the one hand, the translator more or less forms epistemic knowledge of the original author and text, which shapes his/her translation thoughts; on the other hand, these newly formed thoughts could guide the translator in new practical activities. The translator needs to have at least basic understandings of the original author so that the cognition could guide the translator's practice when he/she manipulates the source text.

"Soul Congeniality" and Awareness of the Translator's Individuality

Thought is the psychological reflection of people's practice, and translation is an activity that relies on individual psychology and behavior. Therefore, the emergence of thoughts is inevitably intertwined with the personal opinions or ideas of the subject (Gao et al., 2021). To some extent, the translator's subjectivity is inevitable in practice. For Dryden, when he translates Chaucer, he claims "I found I had a soul congenial to his, and that I had been conversant in the same studies. Another poet, in another age, may take the same liberty with my writings" (Dryden, 1700a). He thinks he achieves the spiritual agreement with the author so that he could perform the best part of the original texts. To better achieve the original characters, Dryden chooses to explore the author's mind when translating and, subconsciously, presents some of his personalities in translations.

Before translating, Dryden attempts to refer to author's various philosophical values to gain invisible power, though sometimes he does not agree with some values. When dealing with the disagreements, he "lay'd by [his] natural diffidence and scepticism for a while, to take up that dogmatical way of his... Character, as to make him that individual poet" (Dryden, 1685). The author's inner worlds are important because they are the key to the works. Every time Dryden translates, different poets provide him with distinct views: some he does not believe, some unconsciously influence him, and some of them even help to reshape his own philosophy.

A qualified translator needs to retain the inner world and original ideas of the author's, even though he/she is not in favor of them. Only in this way, the translator could reflect the real sentiments in translations and make reasonable choices.

When talking about Lucretius's opinions about the mortality of the soul, Dryden thinks they are too "absurd" (Dryden, 1685) to believe; and he criticizes Horace for using "Gods and providence only to serve a turn in poetry" (Dryden, 1685). Though some views of Lucretius and Horace conflict with Dryden's, he has to engage with Epicurean philosophy when translating them. Hopkins (2004, p. 90) appreciates that Dryden has achieved "empathy... with the characteristic style and manner of his originals."

In the translation of *Sylvae*, though he keeps distancing himself from the relevant sentiments, Dryden's attraction to Epicureanism of Lucretius and Horace is explicit (Hopkins, 2004). What he translated has become an inseparable part of his mind. Epicureanism is a classic school founded by Epicurus around 307 B.C. (Mastin, 2009). It advocates pleasures as the greatest good and absence from physical pain and fear of death. The philosophy of "materialist and mortalist" (Hopkins, 2004, p. 90) denies the role of gods in the natural process, like senility, illness, death and other human affairs. When dealing with the odes imbued with Epicureanism, Dryden also considers the significance of these philosophies and more or less absorbs some. He discovers that, paradoxically, his "imaginative sympathies" (Hopkins, 2004, p. 36) could exist with the Catholicism which he just converted to; he somehow finds some places for the spirits of Epicureanism.

What is translated also influences the translator's other works. *Ovid's Epistles* is the first translation of Dryden. Hopkins points out that Ovid's description of "larger processes of nature" (Hopkins, 2004, p. 102) echoes Dryden's later acts in translation, like a never-ending process of destruction and rebirth. Dryden's discussion in the preface to fables in 1700 reinforces this statement. "Material impermanence" is seen as the aesthetic center of Dryden's fables (Gelineau, 2012) and his remark of "nothing lost out of nature" (Dryden, 1700a) is affected by Pythagoras's school (Hopkins, 2004). All things are altered but nothing lost. Dryden's view of translation as metempsychosis follows this philosophy. His discussion of the poetic rebirth is also the focus of Pythagoras's later work. Dryden's philosophical view is unconsciously influenced: the "congenial" souls of poets who he once translated also reborn in his body (Hopkins, 2004).

In his translation, readers could find the author living afterlife. The rebirth connects the author with the present age and a different language through the translator, just like a transfusion. It is said that Dryden's treatment of the originals is enlightened by a French writer, Montaigne, who is one

of Dryden's favorite essayists. Montaigne has penetrating commentaries on passages of Horace and frequently embraces the voices of the classical authors into "his own explorations of fundamental human dilemmas" (Hopkins, 2004, p. 36). The writer being translated may affect the translator's philosophy, as translation is a reciprocal activity, so in turn, the translator's philosophy may also affect the statement of a translation. For Dryden, recognizing different thoughts and styles among the authors is the reason why he "becomes more aware of his individuality, instead of losing his self-awareness" (Sloman, 1985, p. 11). His self-consciousness increasingly expands and becomes his source of confidence, pride, even "superiority" (Sloman, 1985, p. 12) in his success as a translator.

Even though Dryden has declared that he puts away his own preconceived ideas and suppresses his identity to translate, Sloman (1985) concludes that he becomes more self-conscious as time goes by and makes no efforts to suppress his identity. Overall, Dryden's individuality could be reflected in his methods when dealing with the original, like deleting, adding, adjusting orders, appending footnotes, borrowing new words, etc. One example which could distinctly present a translator's existence is his editorial comments on translations. In the explanatory notes and arguments of satires of Juvenal and Persius, Dryden makes very subjective comments on the content, and shares his personal statements with readers. Words like "ironically," "of so many indignity," sentences like "I am not of his opinion," "I confess at random" (Juvenal, 1693, pp. 83–86) could directly show his attitude. His judgment and statement reveal his refusal to be invisible.

Dryden's self-awareness also reflects on the materials which he chooses to include and compile in his miscellanies carefully. For example, in fables, Dryden "subordinates" Homer because he has the least space among the other original and puts it next to Chaucer's "The Cock and the Fox" (Sloman, 1985, p. 11); he put Ovid's "luxuriant" verses next to Chaucer's "The Knight's Tale" to "promote the honor" of English (Fleming, 2017). He explains that it is contention among poets, in a discourse concerning the satire by Dryden in 1693. He discusses Horace, Juvenal and Persius, who are translated in this miscellany, in the form of competition; everyone wins in a certain part of poetry. "Aeneas proposes the rewards of the Foot-Race, [and] Juvenal Ride[s] first in triumph" (Dryden, 1693a). Dryden makes the comparison to present his study of each translator. Just like a race, every participant gets a prize. His analysis of the poets in the prefaces is to prove the translator's authenticity. The ability to distinguish different poets' styles (what has been discussed

in the previous section) is the result of his self-awareness. Dryden has the explicit personal preference to lead readers' opinions.

After exploring Dryden's liberty in translation, Hoffman (1994) thinks that Dryden is platonic in his belief of translation. The recurrence of images and subjects proves that one single subject could stimulate different poets and link them in a whole poetic family, like Homer and Virgil (Dryden, 1700a). Dryden declares that he found himself a "soul congenial" (Dryden, 1700a) to the original author, and "Poets can divine each other's thought..." (Dryden, 1700b). Great minds think the same. He believes all true poets are inevitably connected to each other as they are inspired by a similar soul, or "the same God of poetry" (Dryden, 1700a). In the translation of Chaucer, there is also "fatality" that Chaucer was renewed into modern English and French separately and coincidentally. What's more, he also adds his own writing, "Time and Resemblance of Genius in Chaucer and Boccace," into the miscellany in 1700 to compare with other papers (Dryden, 1700a). The platonic imagery emboldens him to translate as if he could read the poets' minds, affirming Dryden's purpose of "establishing the recurrence of Chaucerian subject and... poetic result" (Hoffman, 1994, p. 142).

Dryden's philosophical and ideological thinking could be explored based on his comments, actions, and concerns in choosing and compiling materials, in comparing and leveling different authors, in translating and defending for himself; in turn, his inner world is inevitably influenced by the knowledge he is exposed to when he is compiling, comparing and translating. Therefore, Eliot (1932) depicts the relationship of Dryden and the original as being inextricably intertwined—the original expresses itself through Dryden, and Dryden finds himself in the original.

Translation is like a "crucible" melting the translator's thoughts into the original text, not as easy as pouring liquid from one bottle to another (Tan, 2006, p. 7). For Dryden, translation is not just a passive activity, but a psychological journey of self-discovery. He explores himself when reading the original and even presents some of his personalities through translation. Therefore, the subjectivity of translation thoughts is also a vital aspect needed to be taken into account in the genesis of translation thought.

"Slave" and Status of Translators

Thoughts are of social-historicity. "The proposition

expressed by a given knowledge sentence depends upon the context in which it is uttered" (Wei, 2010, p. 190). Different social and historical contexts of a particular proposition may give it different explanations, which is what epistemic contextualism claims. Genetic studies of translation thoughts think highly of contextualism (Gao et al., 2021), and this part discusses its importance by illustrating counter-examples. Under the perspective of genetic study, this part aims to trace the genesis of Dryden's views on translation. Dryden once compared himself to a slave to complain that the translator is scarcely repaid for his/her labor: "slaves we are, and labour on another man's plantation..." (Virgil, 1909, p. 97); the translator would be scolded if not doing well while taken for granted if fulfilling the task. When collecting the metaphors for translators, some researchers conclude that the negative images like slaves signify the low status and invisible subjectivity of the translator at this period. Starting from the context of "slave," this part also takes Dryden's contemporary evaluations and the socio-cultural background into consideration to see his social status and the relevant issues at his period.

"Metaphors for translator" is a specific category in metaphors of translation (Tan, 2011), which compares translators to other identities. They are taken as a medium or an academic method to describe the ethic relationship system (Bian, 2010), to decode the nature of translators in different periods (Tan, 2011), and to discuss the changes in the status of translators (Peng, 2012). The image of "slave" by Dryden is an often referred example to analyze the status and subjectivity. Based on the information hinted from the metaphor, some studies conclude that during the 18th and 20th century, translators were of low social position and subjectivity in translation (Peng, 2012, p. 182); the relationship between the slave and the master shows the translator's inferiority to the author because they are classics or religion-related materials (Bian, 2010, p. 86). To see whether the metaphor of "slave" shows the low status or invisible subjectivity, this study tries to reproduce the reality with the historical evidence and Dryden's other statements, not just analyzing the metaphors themselves.

The metaphor "slave" appears in the preface of *Aeneid* in 1697. To trace the genesis of his thoughts, this study considers this metaphor within the context. Before referring to "slave," Dryden complains that as a Latin-English translator, he finds that English could not be as "figurative, elegant and sounding" as Latin. He then compares vocabulary to money: "words are not so easily coin'd as money... when little comes in and

much goes out... that I was almost bankrupt” (Virgil, 1909, p. 67). After discussing the difficulty of finding equivalents in English, Dryden then discusses another challenge that the translator has to follow the original meanings. The above is the background of the metaphor. The translator has to work in the author’s plantation but to bear the evaluation of the works. What follows the slave is the image of music: “... make what music he can in the expression...” Therefore, it is not Dryden’s intention to show the social inferiority of the translator, but to emphasize the insuperable difficulty to be bound to the author’s sense and latitudes.

Other metaphors created by Dryden will be of the same characteristics as “slave,” if the arguments made by Bian (2010) and Peng (2012) are untenable. However, the fact shows that they don’t provide more evidence for Dryden’s low status as a translator. One image could be called to describe a “negative” situation: “[d]ancing on ropes with fetter’d legs” (Dryden, 1680, p. 13). He uses the awkward situation of a fettered dancer to criticize “metaphrase” (word-for-word translation). The image of bondage is to show that the translator is limited to rhythm, original forms, ideologies of the author and so on, which has the similar purpose of “slave.” There is also no hint for low status. The over-interpretation without the micro and macro context could lead to a misunderstanding.

He also has other metaphors for the translator to describe the different features of translation. One of the most significant analogies is his turn to “painter.” According to Belle (2011, p. 7), this parallel becomes one of the most familiar images after Dryden in Neoclassical translation discourse. “Translation is a kind of drawing after the life” (Dryden, 1685). Dryden borrows the techniques of drawing, like “out-lin[ing],” “coloring,” and “shadowing” to show how painters employ all their skills to animate the work. So does a translator. Besides, some metaphors also show the distinct characteristics of times, like “if a painter studied Raphael” (Virgil, 1909, p. 42). During the Renaissance, the artists’ self-consciousness and social status increased a lot (Liu, 2010). Therefore, if following the thinking process of Bian (2010) and Peng (2012), Dryden is of a similar position to the painter in the 15th century, which is high. This frequently used image of “painter” leads to a completely different conclusion from “slave.” All in all, a metaphor is to highlight a distinguishing feature, serving a specific goal, so it is wrong to induce that the tenor carries all the weight of the vehicle.

Dryden also compares poets and poetic translators to mechanics to express the difficulty when applying theory

to practice. Even understanding the precept in poetry, poets still feel difficult to write poems; just like mechanics, though they know the specious diagrams, the gap between the “Demonstration in the Mathematicks” and “the Mechanick Operation” (Dryden, 1685) is hard to bridge. Considering the professional knowledge, he believes that a translator must be a poet for poetic translation (Dryden, 1685). Poets have more practical experience, better senses of rhyme and rhythm, and greater ability to perform poetical expressions and artistic conceptions. The dynamic poetic knowledge and distinction between languages and cultures provide both challenges and broad space for the translator to re-work. Dryden himself fulfills his requirements of the translator as he is the first Poet Laureate of England.

The translator’s “status” in translation also deserves to be discussed. Dryden’s attitude toward Latin classics is not like what Bian (2010, p. 86) concludes that “the authority of authors and the superiority of original languages put the translator in the inferior position.” Dryden is relatively equal to or even higher status than the authors. From the information in the previous chapter, Dryden treats different authors as putting them in one competition, and even manipulates the original like his own. According to Sloman (1985, p. 15), “there is no indication that Dryden felt inferior to the authors,” though “he did feel his age” when translating Virgil (1909, p. 429). Dryden’s evaluation of himself is also high. He is bold to say that he has given his “author’s sense” (Dryden, 1693b), and he is “the first Englishman, perhaps” (Virgil, 1909, p. 59) to follow Virgil’s example; there are few (like Dryden) who could “read Chaucer” and “understand him perfectly” (Dryden, 1700a); his English version “has more of Virgil’s spirit in it than” any other languages’ translations (Virgil, 1909, p. 59). He believes what he has done is of “no dishonor to my native country” though it is imperfect due to his age (Virgil, 1909, p. 429).

It is observed that Dryden thinks highly of his achievements, rarely abasing himself; his assessment clearly shows his satisfaction and pride. Besides the metaphors and evaluation in the paratexts, his social values could also be reflected in support of other poets and sponsors. They appreciate Dryden’s works and provide much materialistic and psychological assistance for him. For example, Addison publishes his ideas anonymously in Dryden’s miscellany (Virgil, 1909, p. 423); Congreve participates in translating Homer (Dryden, 1693b) and proofreading Virgil (1909, p. 70); some friends offer important first-hand materials like the author’s prefaces, arguments before every poem, etc. Besides the professional

knowledge, some sponsors generously guarantee his living conditions; some even provide residence for him. When translation the First *Georgics* and the last *Aeneid*, Dryden is in the house of Sir William Bowyer, which Dryden thinks is a “friendly entertainment”; the Seventh *Aeneid* was translated under the roof of the Earl of Exeter, which is a “magnificent abode” (Virgil, 1909, p. 431). He receives many supports from sponsors and contemporary poets, which shows his ability and influence, not like what Peng (2012, p. 182) says that translators are in low status in this period.

It is possible that the translator exaggerates his/her words by figures of speech. What he/she said in prefaces is the message he/she wanted to convey, which might not be the fact but a tool to lead readers to follow his/her minds. With the context of the metaphor of “slave,” Dryden’s own evaluation and contemporary appreciation, this study finds that Dryden as a translator is of high status. What’s more, he feels equal or even superior to the original authors. Contextualism emphasizes people’s intentions and their significance, and context is essential when attempting to understand a certain proposition (Gao et al., 2021). Therefore, it is ex parte to analyze one’s thoughts and styles of translation based on the metaphors and the relevant discussion. The translator’s values, the historical context, and other factors are keys to restoring the genesis of thoughts and their influence.

Conclusion

In understanding the translator’s role, Dryden thinks highly of imitating the different styles of the authors. If “sweetness” is used to compare different authors, the translator needs a keen sense of taste to distinguish and show whether they are the sweetness of “sugar” or that of “honey.” In addition to the imitation of styles, he also thinks that the translator needs to have a deep understanding of the original work. When he translated Chaucer, he found he had a soul congenial to Chaucer, which also explains his free translation. Dryden’s views are also influenced by the original texts and are intertwined with his translations. His self-exploration in the original works and the awareness of his individuality show his liberty and creativity in translation. Dryden claims that the translator works like a “slave.” However, it is concluded that he, as a translator is of relatively high status and has sufficient income, when we look deep into the context of “slave,” relevant translation practice and socio-cultural background.

References

- Belle, M. A. (2011). *Critical introduction to Dryden’s Preface (Ovid’s Epistles)*. <http://tut.univ-paris3.fr/spip.php?article1&lang=fr>
- Bian, L.-H. (2010). On the Ethic Relationship in Translation Metaphors. *Journal of Xi’an International Studies University*, 18(3), 84–88.
- Cordingley, A., & Montini, C. (2015). Genetic translation studies: An emerging discipline. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series—Themes in Translation Studies*, 14, 1–18.
- Dryden, J. (1680). Preface concerning Ovid’s Epistles. In J. Sargeant (Ed.), *The Poems of John Dryden*. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913 & New York: Bartleby.com, 2011. <https://www.bartleby.com/204/207.html>
- Dryden, J. (1685). Preface to Sylvae, or the Second Part of Poetical Miscellanies. In J. Sargeant (Ed.), *The Poems of John Dryden*. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913 & New York: Bartleby.com, 2011. <https://www.bartleby.com/204/180.html>
- Dryden, J. (1693a). A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (edited by J. Lynch). <http://www.jacklynch.net/Texts/drydendiscourse2.html>
- Dryden, J. (1693b). The Dedication to Examen Poeticum. In J. Sargeant (Ed.), *The Poems of John Dryden*. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913 & New York: Bartleby.com, 2011. <https://www.bartleby.com/204/194.html>
- Dryden, J. (1700a). Preface to Fables, Ancient and Modern. In J. Sargeant (Ed.), *The Poems of John Dryden*. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913 & New York: Bartleby.com, 2011. <https://www.bartleby.com/39/25.html>
- Dryden, J. (1700b). To her Grace the Dutchess of Ormond. In J. Sargeant (Ed.), *The Poems of John Dryden*. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913 & New York: Bartleby.com, 2011. <https://www.bartleby.com/204/124.html>
- Dryden, J. (1942). *The letters of John Dryden, with letters addressed to him*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Eliot, T. S. (1932). *John Dryden, the poet, the dramatist, the critic, three essays*. New York: T & Elsa Holliday.
- Fleming, C. (2017). Improvised Patronage: Jacob Tonson and Dryden’s Linguistic Project. *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36, 59.
- Gao, S.-B. (2019). *A Historical Textual Approach to Translation Thoughts*. The Third Foreign Language Translation Research High-level Forum: Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the May 4th Movement.
- Gao, S.-B., Lu, S.-N., & Xi, Y. (2021). An Epistemological Study on Translation Thoughts. *Shanghai Journal of Translators*, 156(01), 13–17.
- Gelineau, D. (2012). The Substance of Fables: Dryden’s “Of the Pythagorean Philosophy”. *Papers on Language & Literature*, 48(4), 382.
- Harth, P. (1968). *Contexts of Dryden’s thought*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffman, A. (1994). *John Dryden’s Imagery*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

- Hopkins, D. (2004). *John Dryden*. Tavistock: Northcote House Publishers.
- Juvenal. (1693). The Sixth Satyr of Juvenal. In *The satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis translated into English verse by Mr. Dryden and several other eminent hands; together with the satires of Aulus Persius Flaccus, made English by Mr. Dryden; with explanatory notes at the end of each satire; to which is prefix'd a discourse concerning the original and progress of satire... By Mr. Dryden*. J. Dryden (Trans.). London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1693 & Ann Arbor: Text Creation Partnership, 2011. <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A46439.0001.001>
- Liu, J. (2010). The Social Status of Painters in the Renaissance. *Charming China*, 116(17), 263.
- Mastin, L. (2009). *Existence and Consciousness*. https://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_epicureanism.html
- O'sullivan, M. J. (1980). Running division on the groundwork: Dryden's theory of translation. *Neophilologus*, 64(1), 144–159.
- Peng, Y. (2012). The change of the translator's social status from the metaphor of the translator. *Journal of Ningxia University (Humanities & Social Sciences Edition)*, 34(02), 180–182+188.
- Sloman, J. (1985). *Dryden: The poetics of translation*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Tan, Z.-X. (2006). Metaphors of Translation: A Window for Looking into the Nature of Translation. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 27(02), 3–8.
- Tan, Z.-X. (2011). Metaphors for the Translator and Translatorial identities. *Jinan Journal (Philosophy & Social Sciences)*, 33(03), 116–123+209.
- Virgil. (1909). *Virgil's Aeneid*. J. Dryden (Trans.). New York: P. F. Collier and Son.
- Wei, Y.-D. (2010). The Sources of Epistem in Cotextualism. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 10, 107–114+190.