THE IMAGIST POET AS TRANSLATOR:
H.D. AND THE TRANSLATION OF THE CLASSICS

Jennifer Varney

Universitat Rovira i Virgili

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Diploma of Advanced Studies

PhD program in Translation and Intercultural Studies

Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain

Supervisors:

Professor Anthony Pym, Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Professor Raffaella Baccolini, Bologna University

2008

Introduction: the creation of H.D.

H.D.'s literary career was officially launched in the British Museum tea-room in 1913 when the man she had once been engaged to marry, Ezra Pound, scouting for fresh poetic talent for Harriet Monroe's newly-established *Poetry* magazine, was handed one of her poems:

> 'But Dryad,' (in the Museum tea room), 'this is poetry.' He slashed with a pencil. 'Cut this out, shorten this line. *Hermes of the Ways* is a good title. I'll send this to Harriet Monroe of *Poetry*. Have you a copy? Yes? Then we can send this, or I'll type it when I get back. Will this do?' And he scrawled 'H.D. Imagiste' at the bottom of the page.' (H.D. 1979: 18)

Hilda Doolittle was born September 10, 1886 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, into an academic and musical family. In 1895 her father, Charles Doolittle, was appointed Flower Professor of Astronomy at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1902, a year before graduating from high school, Hilda Doolittle befriended Ezra Pound who, in 1905, would present her with a collection of love poems which he had written for her, a collection which would later be entitled 'Hilda's Book'. That same year, Hilda Doolittle began studying Greek literature at Bryn Mawr College, though much to her horror and shame, failed to achieve sufficiently high grades after only three terms, and as a consequence abruptly dropped out of college. Of this event, she later wrote that she was 'shocked… to be flunked quite frankly in English,' and indicated that this was 'one of the spurs toward a determination to self-expression' (Hughes, 1931: 110). In 1907, Hilda Doolittle became engaged to Pound, though her father's strong disapproval of the union contributed to the engagement being called off. In 1908, Pound left for Europe and Hilda Doolittle entered into a relationship with a young female art student named Frances Gregg. In 1911, she sailed for London with Gregg and Gregg's mother.

Pound, by this time, was well-established in London cultural circles and was regularly meeting with other poets in the Eiffel Tower Restaurant in London's Soho district to discuss contemporary poetry and its need for reform. Hilda Doolittle had begun publishing her writings in 1909 (children's stories for a local church paper) and by 1913 was writing the sort of poems that corresponded to Pound's idea of what

contemporary poetry should be. Rachel Blau DePlessis says of this well-known moment in the British library, when Pound first encountered Doolittle's verse:

> It may have been a triumphal moment to have her status as a poet valued by the man who had before been most decidedly fascinated by her as woman and muse. But while Pound marked her transition from muse ('But Dryad…') to maker ('this is poetry!'), his gesture also appropriates her work. For once he helped her to create her identity in vocation, this paradigmatic encounter in the British Museum tea-room re-created a literary tradition that depends on and reinforces the masculine orientation of language and of the poet. (DuPlessis 1986:7)

Names and the theme of naming are leitmotifs that run through the whole of H.D.'s oeuvre. In *HERmione*, H.D.'s early autobiographical novel, the protagonist states, 'Names are in people, people are in Names' (1981: 5), a notion that signals the dual problematic of identity and belonging. By accepting to be identified by those two enigmatic initials, H.D. was accepting a neutralising mask which concealed both her gender (Hilda) and her social, cultural and national roots (Doolittle). Paradoxically then, the name bestowed on the female poet by Pound did more to erase her identity and to objectify her, than to reinforce a notion of strong subjective self. In *End to Torment* (1979), H.D.'s memoir of Ezra Pound, she states that early in their relationship, while still living in Pennsylvania 'I was clothed in confusion. I had been forced into the wrong groove… 'You are a poem, but your poem's naught' quoted Ezra. From what? I did not ask him' (1979: 12). Pound's use of H.D. as a muse drained her of a, self-centralising identity at a time when the young poet was seeking her own poetic voice, a voice which Pound initially negated and then appropriated. Gender identity and poetic identity are thus themes which from the outset fuel H.D.'s struggle to achieve poetic authority. By this we mean the right of the poet to be allowed entry into a predominantly male creative tradition, to write poetry that will be accepted on its own artistic merits, and to make her voice heard in a phallocentric linguistic, social and cultural system that traditionally silences women by casting them in the role of object.

Following publication of her first poems, H.D. quickly became recognised as Imagism's leading exponent. Her marriage to Richard Aldington added an emotional dimension to what had already become a strong creative bond, the two working together to produce English translations of lesser-known Greek and Latin classics for the Poet's

Translation Series which Aldington launched in 1915. H.D. also produced three volumes of translations-proper from the Greek: The Chorus from *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, *Hippolytus* and *Ion*, all from Euripides.

H.D. and Translation Studies

H.D.'s early poetry was formed and influenced by her translations and re-workings of classical Greek literature. Like the Romantics, early Modernist writers such as Pound, Eliot, Aldington and Joyce were all turning to myth 'as a means of defying their culture's rationalism and materialism' (Ostriker, 1985: 317). In 1916, Pound began considering the important role that the practice of translation plays in the development of literary cultures. In an essay in the *Egoist* he suggests that 'a great age of literature is perhaps always a great age of translations; or follows it' (Pound 1968: 232). By 1929, he was more fully sure of the prime importance that translation plays in the rise of great literary traditions. In 'How to read', an essay delineating Modernist aims and ambitions, he states that 'English literature lives on translation, it is fed by translation; every new exuberance, every new heave is stimulated by translation, every allegedly great age is an age of translation' (1968: 34-35). Pound was not alone in his recognition of the importance of translation not only to the burgeoning Modernist movement, but to English literature in general; other major Modernist writers engaged in translation include W. B. Yeats, who in 1926 began studying Greek tragedy as a model for the development of a national, specifically Irish dramatic culture by translating and producing for the stage both *King Oedipus* (1928) and *Oedipus at Columbus* (1934). Marianne Moore, who studied at Bryn Mawr while H.D. was herself enrolled as a student there, published her translations of La Fontaine's *Fables* in 1954. William Carlos Williams translated poems by Nicanor Parra, Silvana Ocampo, Pablo Neruda, Octavia Paz and Miguel Hermandez among others, whilst Eliot translated St. John Perse's poem *Anabase* which he termed 'a piece of writing of the same importance as the later work of Mr. James Joyce'. (1938:19). Virginia Woolf, extending the practice of translation beyond the confines of poetry and drama, worked together with S.S. Kosteliansky on the English translation of Dostoyevsky's *Stavrogin's Confession* and *The Plan of Life of a Great Sinner* in 1922. For his part, D.H. Lawrence translated three novels by Giovanni Verga, whilst Ford Maddox Ford, an important influence on

Modernist writers, translated Pierre Lotì's novel *The Trial of the Barbarians* from the French.

Stephen Yao's study, *Translation and the Languages of Modernism* (2002) dedicates a chapter to H.D.'s translations, and although Yao's conclusions might be said to be somewhat univocal, this is the only example to date of book-length research focusing specifically on Modernist translation output beyond that of Ezra Pound. This book marks an important step towards situating the translation activity at the heart of Modernism. Examining writers such as Pound, H.D. Yeats and Joyce, and the way in which translation was for them a source of inspiration and innovation, he makes the claim that these writers transformed the way we think about translation, not least the preconception that translators must have a scholarly knowledge of the source language. Pound translated Chinese and Medieval Italian verse, H.D. translated from classical Greek, though neither were experts in these fields. 'Modernist writers', says Yao, 'repeatedly engaged in translation, and sometimes achieved remarkable results, with partial, imprecise, faulty, and sometimes even no formal understanding of the languages in which the texts they translated were originally written' (2002: 11). To think about translation in this way, to liberate it from the clutches of scholarship and the binary logic of faithfulness/betrayal, meant that translation was 'no longer the bastard child in the family of literary genres, translation came over the course of the Modernist period to function and be recognised as a distinctly vital and generative writing practice' (2002: 9). Yao's contribution to the studies of Pound's translations, a relatively well-researched area in itself, allows him to make some important claims about the way in which translation enabled Pound to explore literary perspectives and form in a way that would not have been possible outside translation – especially his concentration on the female voice and experience in his translations from the Chinese. Yet almost half of this book is dedicated to Pound as a translator, while his work on Joyce repeats much of what has already been discussed in Joyce studies, leaving not much room for original study into the translations of H.D. and Yeats. His chapter on H.D. entitled 'From Greece to Egypt: translation and the engendering of H.D.'s poetry' and looks at the translations carried out between 1915 and 1937. His conclusions however are limited to viewing translation for H.D. as a means of critiquing patriarchal narratives; these he says were prevalent in classical literature and underpinned many aspects of Modernist literary projects; as such, translation presented H.D. with the opportunity to develop a female-centred vision

and poetics which countered the repressive narrative inhabiting myth and tradition (2002: 82, 86, 91-92).

In recent years, researchers have begun to address more fully the question of H.D.'s engagement with classicism. Books such as Eileen Gregory's *H.D. and Hellenism. Classic Lines* (1997) and Diana Collecott's *H.D. and Sapphic Modernism* (1999) give central importance to H.D.'s revisionary myth-making, as does Raffaella Baccolini's *Tradition. Identity. Desire. Revisionist strategies in H.D.'s late poetry* (1995) which provides important insights into the way H.D. used myth-revising strategies to develop a poetic voice and forge an identity for herself. Yet whilst the main emphasis of these important studies falls on the way H.D. was influenced by, revised or incorporated classical myth into her own poetic works, little attention has been given to H.D.'s translations, despite their being instances of the poet's direct engagement with classical writers and with myth.

The one scholar to have shown a prolonged interest in H.D.'s translations is Eileen Gregory and the book cited above is an example of greater engagement with the relationship between H.D. and the classics. Whilst the main thrust of this work is to trace the classical influences that shaped H.D.'s literary production (which Gregory does in fascinating detail), the scholar dedicates a chapter to analysing short segments of H.D.'s translations of Euripides, Sappho, Theocritus and the Greek Anthology, and Homer. Her analysis reveals important insights into the way in which classical intertextuality was a fundamental characteristic of H.D. work and contributed greatly to her achievement as a lyric poet in the first half of her career (1997: 129). The section dedicated to her translation of the Euripidean choruses runs over nine pages and is predominantly concerned with assessing reception of her translation, with presenting a short textual analysis and with reflecting on the importance of the choral 'I':

> The polyvalence of the choral 'I', taking on a dimension within the context of a supreme fiction, is perhaps the most important lesson H.D. learned from Euripides. I would suggest indeed that the choruses of the *Iphigeneia* initiate H.D. into a more deliberate heroic sense of her role as lyric poet within a Hellenic fiction. (1997: 147)

She concludes that the results of this translation experience can be directly observed in the hymnal poems she subsequently began to write, such as 'Sea Gods',

'The Helmsman' and 'Adonis', and in the later more autobiographical poems such as 'Circe' and 'Eurydice', in which the 'I' of these poems can be seen as quasi-choral: 'an 'I' within a lost or fragmentary fiction'. Euripides, says Gregory, is the most likely predecessor of H.D.'s adoption of this 'mercurial and expansive voice' (1997: 148) and the translation activity must therefore be seen as central in her development as a poet. However, Gregory's milestone of a study is less concerned with analysing H.D.'s translation process as such, and the scope of her research discounts the possibility of carrying out a microscopic analysis of her translation strategies in order to determine the casual factors influencing her translated textual production. This, therefore, would be a useful point of departure for further study – indeed the micro-structural analysis of H.D.'s translation will form the backbone for this present research.

Our present work therefore aims to respond to the need for further research into this area by undertaking a more in-depth study of an author who, despite having translated much and reflected much on translation, has received remarkably little attention from the translation community. It is hoped that the results of this research will go some way to providing insights into the relationship between Modernist literary aesthetics and translation, an important though neglected area for researchers interested in the history of translation as well as scholars of Modernism.

In terms of its relevance to the field of H.D. studies, this work aims not only to broaden the scope of research currently available but to address the recent tendency to view H.D. in terms of her engagement with gender politics. Issues of gender certainly provide fertile ground for the researcher, and feminist criticism particularly has done much to rescue H.D. and her poetry from the literary slagheap to which she was consigned by the dominant critical tradition. Thanks to works by Susan Stanford Friedman (1981, 1990), Rachel Blau DuPlessis (1886), Donna Krolik Hollenberg (1991), Cassandra Laity (1996), Alicia Suskin Ostriker (1983) and the studies already mentioned above, H.D. is now a visible representative of Modernist literature. Her place within the canon should no longer require constant justification and re-justification. Yao's chapter on H.D.'s translations limits their relevance to a discourse of gender, but it is our belief that alternative perspectives from which to view her engagement with translation exist. If explored thoroughly these will produce new insights into H.D.'s role within the Modernist translation project and her relevance to Anglo-American poetry. One of the reasons why H.D.'s translations are a particularly interesting site of exploration can be found in the fact that, undertaken as they were during periods of

personal crisis, they can be seen as occupying an in-between space between silence and 'original' poetic output, in which the poet rehearses her innovative aesthetic expression. H.D.'s early translations of Euripidean tragedy were undertaken during the First World War while she was preparing her first volume of poetry and provided H.D. with the opportunity to experiment with form. These translations, says Gregory, shaped H.D.'s conception of the Greek lyric. 'In particular, [Euripides] taught her a mode of dramatic visualisation and a complex lyric voice which she exploited boldly in her early poetry' (Gregory 1997: 139). H.D. published her translation of excerpts from Euripides' *Hippolytus* in 1919 after the trauma of the war; she again turned to translation after analysis with Freud in the thirties, for writers' block among other things, publishing her version of Euripides' *Ion* in 1936. Translation thus represents a sort of bridging activity which enables H.D. to find or find again her poetic voice. Just as H.D. learned much about the kind of poetic aesthetics she was seeking to espouse by translating, so the researcher can learn much about H.D.'s artistic preoccupations by studying these translations. The hypothesis that we wish to test therefore is one that seeks to explore the relationship between H.D.'s translating activity and her aesthetic position, and is as follows: H.D.'s translations broke with the prevailing norms of classical transmission. The two research questions that should operationalise this hypothesis are: i) did H.D.'s translations break with prevailing norms; and ii) in what way did her translations break with prevailing norms. But before turning to the case study in which we will analyse H.D.'s translation of the first chorus from Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, we will seek in the next few pages to flesh out the context surrounding H.D.'s early translation project.

Imagist aesthetics

In 1912, Ezra Pound published his translations of Guido Cavalcanti's sonnets and ballads. In the introduction he makes reference to his translation strategies and aims: 'I have in my translations tried to bring over the qualities of Guido's rhythm, not line for line, but to embody in the whole of my English some trace of that power which implies the man' (Pound 1912:12). If we look beyond Pound's somewhat confusing rhetoric, what he seems to be advocating is the translation of *effect* as opposed to any literal rendition. Indeed, earlier in his argument he makes the claim that:

[I]t is conceivable that poetry of a far-off time or place requires translation not only of word and of spirit, but of 'accompaniment', that is, that the modern audience must in some measure be made aware of what these others drew from certain fashions of thought and speech. (Pound 1912: 2)

In the same year, Pound sent Harriet Monroe a selection of poems written by himself, Richard Aldington and H.D. which he described as being 'Imagist' and which Monroe subsequently accepted for publication in her magazine *Poetry*. In the January 1913 issue, H.D.'s first imagist poems were printed; in the March issue came the Imagists' manifesto, an article which was presented in the form of an interview with Pound, though which Pound mainly wrote himself. Attached to this was Pound's 'A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste' in which he outlined some basic principles for the would-be imagist poet. The language used should not be descriptive, he says, should contain no superfluous word or adjective which does not directly reveal something, and should eschew all forms of abstraction. 'An image' he writes, 'is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time' (1913: 200) and it is this mixture of spontaneous intensity and critical rigour which should be presented to the reader of the poem. Eliot, in his introduction to St John Perse's *Anabase*, elucidates the point: the reader should of an imagist poem should allow 'the images to fall into his memory successively without questioning the reasonableness of each at the moment; so that, at the end, a total effect is produced' (cit. Zach 1976: 236).

Towards the end of his proclamations, Pound suggests that the activity of translation might act as a sort of training ground for the hopeful poet: 'Translation is likewise good training, if you find that your original matter 'wobbles' when you try to rewrite it. The meaning of the poem to be translated can not 'wobble'' (1913: 206). Pound's implied dislike for unstable, unfixed, ambiguous and ultimately uncertain meanings contrasts with much contemporary Modernist thinking (works such as *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad (1902), *To the Lighthouse* by Virginia Woolf (1927) and *As I Lay Dying* by William Faulkner (1930), for example, all question the stability of meaning) but responds nevertheless to the scenario of chaos characterising the early twentieth century. Indeed, Modernist literature developed within and reacted against the climate of chaos and uncertainty produced by a series of destabilising factors pervading all areas of life. Einstein's theory of relativity, Saussure's work on the arbitrary relationship between signifier and signified, Cubism's insistence on the lack of unitary

perspective, Freud's investigation of the subconscious and the advent of the First World War with its consequent destruction of civilisation and ridiculing of enlightened reason, are but a few of the elements serving as background to the production of a literary oeuvre which questioned and discredited traditional notions and norms – the fixity and univocal nature of meaning falling among these. But what Pound's advice to the novice poet seems to suggest is that translation functions in some way as a stabiliser, as a way of fixing meanings that may otherwise wobble, move or refuse to stand still. This then is how we might want to view H.D.'s translation of the choruses of the *Iphigeneia in Aulis*: as a site of aesthetic experimentation in which she was able to rehearse fully and in some way 'fix' her imagist poetics. H.D. worked on this translation at the same time as she was writing the poems that would eventually be published in her first book of poetry (*Sea Garden*, 1916) and this would seem to suggest that H.D. was indeed following Pound's advice in using translation as a means to reinforce her own poetic stance in this early period in her career.

But just what was that poetic stance? In answer to this we must examine the poetic movement to which H.D., Pound and Aldington all initially belonged. The first imagist anthology, entitled *Des Imagistes* (acknowledging a French symbolist influence) and published in 1914 in both London and New York, contained poems by Richard Aldington, H.D., F.S. Flint, Skipworth Canell, Amy Lowell, William Carlos Williams, James Joyce, Ezra Pound, For Maddox Hueffer (later Ford), Allen Upward, and John Cournos. However, the affiliation of some of these poets was tenuous if not contradictory (for example, Lawrence's poetry appeared in the anthologies of different poetic movements) and Pound rejected the Imagists in favour of the Vorticists after its first year, so it would be misleading to suggest that the movement was in any way compact in terms of its affiliates, aspirations or even understanding of what constituted an 'image' (Jones 1972: 13). Yet, Eliot defended the importance of the movement in shaping modern poetry when, in an address on 'American Literature and the American Language' he stated that 'The *point de repère* usually and conveniently taken as the starting point of modern poetry is the group denominated 'imagists' in London about 1910' (cit. Jones 1972: 14). By 1916, with the movement's third anthology, the *Times Literary Supplement* endorsed imagist poetry, saying that it 'fills us with hope; even when it is not very good in itself, it seems to promise a form in which very good poetry could be written' (cit. Jones 1972: 14). Imagist aesthetics were of course dedicated to the notion of the image where the image is seen as a sort of equation for an emotion, it

is an effect produced by a relationship between things rather than a simple snapshot of the thing itself. Natan Zach suggests that Pound may have been influenced by Mallarmé in this: 'Instituer une relation entre les images exacte, et que s'en détache un tiers aspect fusible et clair' (cit. Zach 1976: 235). The image, for Pound and H.D. at least, was conveyed through a concrete engagement with the thing; poetic style, rhythm and the emotion conveyed were characterised by hardness, and the poetic form itself became content. Imagist verse has the resilience and stone-like quality of sculpture, avoiding the frills of rhetoric, and favours concision over verbosity. The rawness of everyday reality is captured and conveyed through the use of simple, everyday language and the perspective sought is one of concrete objectivity which effectively banishes all possibility of the poem being what Pound called 'an asylum for the affections' (in a letter to Kate Buss, March 1916, cit. Scott 1976: 363). The theme of fragmented time and experience which runs through much Modernist literature also had a place in imagist aesthetics; like Eliot, the Imagists seem to be 'intent in preserving a sense of eternity which inhabits the few fragments left to them by the past' (Sheppard 1976: 324). This sense of fragmentation is conveyed through the use of short lines, plain direct language and a detached staccato rhythm which results from the avoidance of the symmetrical, fluid metres characterising nineteenth century Romantic verse. H.D.'s first imagist poem to be published was 'Hermes of the Ways' which presents an example of this condensed, fragmented universe:

> Hermes, Hermes,
> the great sea foamed,
> gnashed its teeth about me;
> but you have waited,
> where sea-grass tangles with
> shore-grass. (H.D. 1983: 37)

The description of the sea and grassy estuary in this first poem are strikingly similar to those H.D. was to use several years later in her translation of the first chorus from the *Iphigeneia in Aulis*. As we can see from this example, it is the detail that the poetry focuses on, the crystalline quality of the image constructed, rather than the great epic narratives characteristic of Greek myth. Indeed in her novel *Paint it Today* H.D. writes that:

[l]arge epic pictures bored her, though she struggled through them. She wanted the songs that cut like a swallow-wing the high, untainted ether, not the tragic legions of set lines that fell like black armies with terrific force and mechanical set action… (H.D. 1992: 13)

James Longenbach argues that in the context of the First World War, during which these first poems and translations were written, when 'militarism and masculinity seemed to go hand in hand, H.D.'s world was a strategic rejection of an epic imperative' (Longenbach 1999: 106). Yet while these condensed, crystalline and fragmented poems were initially met with critical acclaim, by 1927 Robert Graves and Laura Riding were writing that H.D.'s work was 'so thin, so poor, that its emptiness seemed perfection, its insipidity to be concealing a secret, its superficiality so glacial that it created a false classical atmosphere' (cit. Gregory 1997: 14).

Neo-classicism

Even before Pound, H.D. and Aldington joined the Imagist movement, T.E. Hulme's group of 'obscure, non-combative poets' (Zach 1976: 229) were meeting between 1909 and 1911 in the Eiffel Tower restaurant in London's Soho to discuss the new, hard and dry geometrical poetics they envisioned as replacing the organic, soft and fluid poetry of the Romantic period. In his essay on modern art, Hulme suggests that geometrical art seeks to bring immobility and a certain essentialism to the characteristics of the natural world and is a response to 'a world whose lack of order and seeming arbitrariness' must inspire a certain fear. 'In art', he says, 'this state of mind results in a desire to create a certain abstract geometrical shape, which, being durable and permanent shall be a refuge from the flux and impermanence of outside nature' (Hulme 1936: 86). At the same time, Hulme was calling for a classical revival which would invigorate literature and would counter the ideals of Romantic poetry, thought and belief (Hulme 1936: 113). Romantisicm was criticised to varying degrees by Hulme, Bush, Eliot and Pound who objected to the Romantics' effeminacy of tone, their lush, self-indulgent language and presumed acceptance of moral deviance (Gregory 1997: 19). Modern Classicism was in many ways therefore a re-instigation of a gendered and specifically masculine set

of values. Irving Babbitt, one of Eliot's teachers at Harvard, was, as Eileen Gregory points out, one of the first scholars to speak in terms of a gendered classical revival. In his discussion of modern literature, he calls for a new critical disposition emphasizing the 'masculine' virtues of analysis, scientific objectivity and judgement which would replace Romanticism's 'feminine' ideals of knowledge, sympathy and impressionistic suggestiveness (Gregory 1997: 15). By 1916, Eliot was ready to declare that 'the beginning of the twentieth century has witnessed a return to the ideals of classicism' (cit. Gregory 1997: 13) though implicit to this return is the notion that these ideals should reject all forms of complicity with effeminacy and the feminine.

Pound's 1913 claim that translation should be undertaken as an exercise might not have been the only motive driving H.D. to embark upon the translation of Greek poetry and drama. Another possible explanation lies in the fact that through the translation of the classics, H.D. was able to legitimise herself as a poet in a male poetic tradition hostile to female intruders. Indeed, as Rachel Blau DuPlessis states, 'to enter the classics is to confront the issue of cultural authority, for knowledge of Greek or Latin, formerly barred to women and certain males, was the sigil of knowledge and authority, the main portal of the liberal humanist hegemony' (DuPlessis 1986: 17). Or to use Margaret Homans' terms, H.D. used the classics in her battle against a valued and loved literary tradition to forge a self out of the materials of otherness, especially traditions of representation (Homans 1980: 12). Another possible reason for H.D.'s engagement with Hellenism is offered by Susan Stanford Friedman who claims that the therapeutic powers of the translation project and its implied retreat into the Hellenistic past were evident insofar as the work was 'magically regenerative, removing her from the suffering of war-stricken London, healing her on the stark shores in the crystalline sea air of Druidic Cornwall' (Friedman 1981: 515). It was Friedman once more who suggested that H.D.'s sense of vocation and her Modernism were tied to the marginal or eccentric rather than the centric, to the position of outsider rather than insider (1981) and any appraisal of H.D.'s engagement with classical transmission must take this marginality into account. H.D. as a poet worked on the very outer borders of the literary and more specifically Hellenistic tradition, and as DuPlessis points out 'to all agendas given by others, H.D. is characteristically both complicit and resistant' (DuPlessis 1986: 5). Thus her stance cannot be defined in terms of the either/or dichotomy that we see prevalent in much classical scholarship of the early twentieth century (e.g., in that of Hulme [1936] and Pound [1913]) but is the result of an approach admissive of

ambiguity and ambivalence. 'I can't write unless I am an outcast,' she wrote to Marianne Moore (cit. Collecott 1990), highlighting the extent to which the paradox of rejection both helped and hindered H.D.'s literary production.

Classical Models

Eileen Gregory suggests that H.D. saw her translations of classic Greek drama as part of a struggle for survival. The Classical revival of the early twentieth century, says Gregory, can be interpreted as a return home to an authentic cultural space, as a means of recovering the lost idyllic past (Gregory 1997: 12). With the advent of World War I, the symbols of Troy, the devastated city, and the Trojan Wars gained significance and, faced with what looked like the destruction of civilisation, literature turned to the Greeks in order to learn the lessons of survival. The fragmented remains of Grecian architecture and the rugged landscapes that contextualised myth became synonymous with the notions of preservation, resilience and permanency. The turn to classicism was a desire to piece together a lost civilisation; to recover, through the painful archaeology of writing and translating, the obliterated containers of the classical ideal.

Yet the Modernist interest in the classics can be traced further back, to when Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* was issued in 1877, a book which calls for a return to the great tragic age of the Greeks and defines classicism in terms of its pessimism and disillusionment. Hulme took up the banner of this new classicism and transformed it into 'one of the idioms of Modernism' (Gregory 1997: 12). Eliot and Pound acknowledged that each age gave classicism its own particular reading, though both believed that a true, exclusive and authentic line of transmission existed (though could not agree on what that line was). Commenting on the classical style of twentieth-century poetry, Pound launched a veiled attack on the classicism of the decadent poets such as Swinburne, Wilde and Pater who were banished from his notion of the authentic line due to the sentimentality and nostalgic Romanticism they brought to their Hellenism:

> As to twentieth-century poetry… it will… be harder and saner, it will be what Mr Hewlett calls 'nearer to the bone'. It will be as much like granite as it can be, its force will lie in its truth, its interpretative power… At least for myself I want it so, austere, direct, free from emotional slither. (Pound 1954: 11-12)

Implicit therefore in the Modernist classical revival was a critique of its Romantic inheritance. Classicism was seen as a site of critical discourse and whilst Hulme, Pound and Eliot all proposed different reformulations of what they saw as the authentic line of transmission, they all agreed in defining themselves against the Romantic Hellenism of the preceding century (Gregory 1997: 39). Thomas Swan notes that Gilbert Murray's lush, rhymed and discursive translations of Euripides and the other Greek dramatists held the stage until Eliot attacked him in his 1918 essay 'Euripides and Professor Murray' (Swann 1962: 8) and in many ways the 'hyper-masculine rhetoric of the Modernist poetic enterprise' (Laity 1996: 1) aimed to masculinise the modern image of the poet and his work after the supposed effeminacy of the Romantic poets. Charges levelled against the past included sentimentalism, effeminacy, escapism, lack of discipline, emotionalism, self-indulgence and confessionalism. Diana Collecott suggests that Romanticism's preoccupation with Hellenism was a sort of underground code for homosexual discourse and notes that H.D. was well aware that for generations 'Hellas' meant a male-male coupling' (Collecott 1999: 131). H.D. was at least exposed to these views if not influenced by them and convictions such as these can be observed in her rejection of frilly description in favour of the stark linguistic precision that characterises her verse. These may also account for her suppression of the overtly emotional, and possibly sentimental sections of the choruses, notably the moment in the text (the second chorus, a section she does not translate) where the women begin ruminating on the relationship between love and war, marriage and sacrifice and proclaim on the attitude of married women towards love. In an article in the *Egoist* in 1914, Richard Aldington stated that 'Women writers are incapable of the indirect method of writing and [can] only imitate the confessional mode' (1914: 17); as we shall see in our case study, H.D.'s translation certainly rises to her husband's challenge.

Yet H.D.'s stylistic choices in the early poems and translations cannot be explained exclusively in terms of their being a reaction against Victorian Hellenism. In fact, as early as 1914, H.D. was already being criticised by Pound for her effeminate 'paterine sentimentalesque Hellenism' (cit. Collecott 1999: 137) which would suggest that her aesthetic position is characterised by a greater degree of complexity. She certainly brought to her translations an imagist engagement with language, but was also heavily influenced by the Greek poetry and drama that she had studied at Bryn Mawr (before being expelled for failing a mathematics exam). Her first poems to be published

in *Poetry* in 1913 bear the title *Verses, Translations, and Reflections from 'The Anthology'* and Robert Babcock's 1995 essay on the importance of the Greek Anthology to H.D.'s poetics makes a huge contribution to our understanding of H.D.'s aesthetic development. Pound says that Sappho, Catullus and Villon are the main literary models for the imagists (cit. Babcock 1995: 201), yet Babcock makes a strong argument for the Greek Anthology as primary source for the most imagist of H.D.'s first poems (i.e., 'Epigram', which Pound signed, 'H.D., Imagiste'). Babcock claims that H.D. studied J.W. Mackail's 1911 edition of *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* which was among her personal library, now housed in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library and Yale University (1995: 202). H.D.'s first three poems are not strictly translations though seem to be re-workings of the epigrams included in Mackail's book. Of the three, only one comes close to being a transliteration ('Epigram'), whilst the others appear to be inspired by different qualities appearing in several different epigrams. Babcock notes that it is not known whether H.D., Pound, or Harriet Monroe assigned this sub-title to her work, and claims that Monroe was uncomfortable about publishing poems with obvious Greek antecedents so she sent them to the classics department of the University of Chicago for approval, a move which resulted in poems by Pound and Aldington being rejected or shortened – 'as though the poems were supposed to be literal translations' (Babcock 1995: 203). Monroe added a provisory note to H.D.'s poems insisting that they should not be considered as translations: 'Her sketches from the Greek are not offered as exact translations, or as in any sense finalities, but as experiments in delicate and elusive cadences, which attain sometimes a haunting beauty' (cit. Babcock 1995: 203, n.11). In the introduction to his book, Mackail provides an insight into the character of the epigram, meaning 'inscription'. The epigram was written on stone monuments before the invention of prose in verse; it was, at that time, the single vehicle of organised expression and was used to convey simple fact (Mackail 1911: 1).

> The epigram in its first intention may be described as a very short poem summing up as though in a memorial inscription what it is desired to make permanently memorable in a single action or situation. It must have the compression and conciseness of a real inscription, and in proportion to the smallness of its bulk must be highly finished, evenly balanced, simple and lucid. (Mackail 1911:4)

Noting similarities between Mackail's translations of the *Epigrams* and H.D.'s verse, Babcock suggests Mackail inspired H.D.'s use of hyphenated words which abound in the translation of the choruses from the *Iphigeneia* as well as in much of her early lyricism, which was 'perhaps a reflection of her effort to preserve some of the richness of the polysyllabic compounds in the Greek language' (Babcock 1995: 208).

H.D. and Euripides

In 1915 The Poets' Translation Series was launched with Richard Aldington in the role of editor, a position which was filled by H.D. when Aldington went to fight in World War I. Each of the first twelve monthly pamphlets contained the following outline of aims:

> The object of the editors of this series is to present a number of translations of Greek and Latin poetry and prose, especially of those authors who are less frequently given in English. This literature has too long been the property of pedagogues, philologists, and professors. Its human qualities have been obscured by the wranglings of grammarians, who love it principally because to them it is so safe and so dead. But to many of us it is not dead. It is more alive, more essential, more human than anything we can find in contemporary English literature. The publication of such classics, in the way we propose, may help to create a higher standard for poetry than that which prevails, and a higher standard of appreciation of the writers of antiquity who have suffered too long at the hands of clumsy metrists…. The translations will be done by poets whose interest in their authors will be neither conventional nor frigid. The translators will take no concern with glosses, notes, or any of the apparatus with which learning smothers beauty. They will endeavour to give the words of these Greek and Latin authors as simply and as clearly as may be. Where the text is confused, they will use the most characteristic version; where obscure, they will interpret. (Poets' Translation Series, No.1, 1915: 11-12)

The mention of essentiality, simplicity and clarity firmly situates the translation strategies of this group of poets within the broader perspective of imagist poetics, though the sexual undertones implied by the rejection of a 'frigid' approach to translating is less easy to locate. The imagist take on the world is characteristically detached and impersonal so it would be interesting to examine the extent to which H.D. in her translation of Euripides' choruses (the third edition in the series) managed to marry the detached objectivity demanded by the imagist aesthetic with a non-frigid representation of the Greek lyric.

It was not uncommon for the choruses of the *Iphigeneia* to be translated and performed independently of the play itself (Gregory 1997: 140), so for H.D. to choose to fragment the play in this way, giving expression to the lyricism of Euripides' poetry, was not an uncommon strategy. What was particularly resonant, however, to the Modernists, was the form of the Greek chorus which, because of its varying line-lengths and metres, became a model for the new *vers libre*. 'Within the longer iambic line of the Greek play, it employs the short line, the traditional metres, the spare and nuanced language of lyric poetry' (Gregory 1997: 140). The picture that we are beginning to form, therefore, is of a modern poetics entering into a dialectic relationship with classical literature from which it will on the one hand learn, and on the other enrich, via these new, vigorously vital translation strategies.

H.D.'s decision to translate Euripides' last and somewhat uncomfortable play is significant. Kenneth McLeish claims that Euripides was unpopular between 1900-1930 because much of the English speaking public could only gain access to Euripides through Gilbert Murray's lifeless translations which did not convey the dramatist's critical genius (McLeish 1997: xxix). The *Iphigeneia* was not translated by Murray however, probably because of the text's problematic identity. Since the mid-eighteenth century, scholars had agreed that the play was corrupt and very much interpolated (England 1891; Barbour 1924; Page 1934; Verrall 1905; Dimock 1978) and the doubtful authenticity of some of the parts became the source of paranoia in the scholarly community, which in turn led to the play receiving less critical and poetic attention than it might otherwise have received. A possibly inauthentic text, then, marginalised for its supposed imperfection, is chosen by a marginal (and soon to become marginalised) poet as the training ground for her aesthetic development. Like the transgressive, possibly inauthentic text which he either did or didn't (entirely) author, Euripides represents an interesting choice of playwright for the young poet. Most critics underline two main

characteristics: that Euripides was particularly relevant to the Modernist age (Verrall 1905; Norwood 1909; Murray 1913; McLeish 1997), and that in his own time Euripides was considered a transgressive writer (Cartwright 1868; Verrall 1905; Loeb 1912; Murray 1913; Warrington 1956; McLeish 1997). McLeish says he was essentially experimental (1997: xxviii) and notes his 'fragmented, edgy style' (1997: xxix). Gilbert Murray suggests that as a thinker he is 'treated almost as a personal enemy by scholars of orthodox and conformist minds; defended, idealised and sometimes transformed beyond recognition by various champions of rebellion and the free intellect' (Murray 1913: 8). With his characteristic desire to give voice to 'the exiled and the vanquished' (Johnson 1982: 147), Euripides should be seen not only as the product of an immensely strong tradition, but also as the fiercest of all rebels against it (Murray 1913:14).

The first edition of the Poets' Translation Series states that H.D. was to translate Euripides' *Rhesos,* but by the second edition this note had been revised and stated that H.D.'s translation of the *Iphigeneia* would be ready by November 1915. Like the *Iphigeneia*, the *Rhesos* is a war drama, though whose emphasis falls on the futile quest for knowledge and maternal mourning. In May 1915, H.D. had given birth to a stillborn child (Aldington was the father) and the grief enacted by the mother figure in *Rhesos* may have compelled H.D. to embark upon a project that would immerse her in the painful and yet therapeutic dialectic of translating a tragedy which resonated on a personal level. Though with its focus on Agamemnon's sacrifice of his own daughter, the *Iphigeneia* might be said to engage more directly with the pervading sense of disillusionment with the futile human sacrifice and carnage that the First World War was turning out to be. This suggests that H.D.'s emotional life figured largely in her choice of texts to translate and implies that she used translation not only as a sort of mirror to reflect and refract her own personal experience, but also as a means of bringing the force of eternal mythical truths, inscribed as they were in the fragments surviving past destruction, to bear on contemporary culture and society.

McLeish says that Euripides was writing for 'fellow-citizens whose sense of personal and social identity had been affected both by the catastrophic events of nearly two decades of the Peloponnesian war and by the huge increase of religious, ethical and social questioning which it fostered' (1997: xxv), a state of mind which certainly would have found great resonance during the First World War. Voluntary sacrifice of a young person to save family, city or nation in a situation of social crisis, usually war, is common in Euripides, yet Foley notes that in this play 'the strategy for salvation comes

from a woman, a person whose imagination is shaped by poetic tradition, by ritual and marriage, not by politics' (1985: 91). In fact, H.D. was not the only female artist interested in this particular play; research for our corpus shows that in the period between 1909 and 1924 three 'translations' were published by women: the first was a reprint of Lady Lumley's translation executed probably around 1550 and reissued by the Malone Society Reprints in 1909; the second was H.D.'s; and the third was a translation into music of the lyric portions of *Iphigeneia in Aulis* and *Iphigeneia at Taurus* by Jane Peers Newhall and published in 1924 by the Smith College Classical Studies. This heightened, specifically gendered interest in the play during these years probably had less to do with the fact that the choral odes present what Helene Foley calls 'beautiful meditations on love and war' (1985: 67) and more to do with the abominable sense of injustice and failed humanity that the spectator experiences in the face of Iphigeneia's self-sacrifice for the political and military ambitions of the masculine world.

The note prefacing H.D.'s translation is unsigned and so we cannot be sure whether it was written by H.D. herself, by Aldington, or whether the two collaborated in its compilation; nevertheless, it provides an insight into why H.D. may have been interested in the text:

> The choruses of this play are popularly considered to be among the least interesting of those written by Euripides, on account of supposed interpolations. Yet they have something of that rocky quality, of that imaged clarity, which are so admirable in the earlier lyric poets. (Poets' Translation Series, No.3, 1915: 1)

What is interesting in this declaration is that it makes no mention of the content of the play or its resonance for contemporary readers, suggesting that the choice to translate this play was motivated by aesthetic considerations rather than by what the choral odes might express on the level of content. Whilst translator's introductions (if this is what this note is) do not generally discuss matters of content, the slant given to this series by the editor's note cited earlier which pauses on the 'human qualities' of classical texts and speaks of the need to forge a 'higher standard of appreciation of the writers of antiquity' (PTS, No. 1, 1915: 11), would certainly allow for an implicit if not explicit signalling towards the translation's transmission of important messages for the contemporary reading public, if that were the case. Yet the note limits itself to a discussion of style and goes on to outline the translation strategies applied: 'the

rhymeless hard rhythms used in the present version would be most likely to keep the sharp edges and irregular cadence of the original' (*ibid*.) This therefore provides us with an important clue to reading H.D.'s early translations. Her choice of texts and her translation strategies may have less to do with content-based considerations such as those highlighted by Donna Hollenberg who writes that '[i]n her earliest translation, H.D. attempts to rationalise the apparent inevitability of female pain and loss by showing how women internalise a value system that is inimical to them and then collude in their own victimization' (1991:79). Such a claim is difficult to corroborate once we map H.D.'s translation against the Euripidean source text and find that the only significantly long chorus section to be left out of H.D.'s version is precisely that in which the women of Chalkis express acceptance for an internalised value system that controls female behaviour within the marriage relationship:

> Chorus: Happy are they who share the delights of the Goddess in moderation and with temperance, enjoying peace from the raging gadfly; for there, Love with the golden locks draws a double bow of fascination, one for a happy fate, and one for the derangement of life. Give me moderate charms, and innocent love. Let me participate in love, while I reject it in excess. But the constitution and ways of men are different; though what is good is always plain to see; ad the training of education contributes mush to virtue; for respect for appearances is wisdom, and brings a compensating pleasure in understanding the right, wherein reputation brings unfading glory to life. 'Tis a great advantage to pursue virtue; for women in their secret affections; but I men it is a beauty of the mind, which makes the State manifold greater and more populous. (trans. T.J. Arnold 1884: 13)

There are at least two possible reasons for H.D.'s suppression of this material: one argument would be that H.D. uses silence (non-translation here) as a means of blocking the transmission of a repressive set of domineering male / misogynistic values; the other and possibly more convincing argument, given the aesthetic principles referenced in the prefacing note, would suggest however that H.D. was more interested in the poetics than the politics.

If this is so, then the theme of H.D.'s poetics must be examined far more rigorously. Baccolini reminds us that H.D. was initially known almost exclusively for

her association with imagism (1995: 12) and her aesthetical position was generally explored within the context of imagism. Yet it would seem that in this early appreciation of H.D.'s work, she was always examined in terms of the label 'exponent of', imagism or Modernist verse being the main focus of research. Now that feminist criticism has liberated H.D. from that label, and we can examine H.D.'s work without needing the optical aid of imagism to focus our attention on her, it would be interesting to take a fresh look at H.D.'s aesthetic development and poetic conviction. In this way we would be starting with H.D.'s oeuvre and working backwards or through imagism, rather than the other way around. We would expect a rather different set of results to emerge from this inverted analysis.

H.D.'s poetics also need to be revisited, now that the poet has been more or less validated by the tradition, because, above and beyond any specific discourse of gender, they narrate the story of a marginal poetic voice learning the language of aesthetic dissent in order to challenge and ultimately alter a dominant literary tradition. On the one hand, when contextualised in a post-colonial scenario, H.D.'s aesthetic commitment gains resonance for a society in which the themes of power and impotence underpin all major political and social discourse; on the other, her desire to cut out for herself, even from an early age, a courageously alternative aesthetic position should provide some important lessons for a generation of young writers in the English language whose lack of critical rigour, fear of formal experimentation and general acquiescence to market logic risks stunting the development of English literature in the twenty-first century.

Reception

In order to understand more fully the character and significance of H.D.'s translation of the chorus from *Iphigeneia in Aulis* before actually examining it on a micro-structural level in the case study, we will briefly contextualise her work in terms of its critical reception. Eileen Gregory states that her early translations should be seen 'not simply as literary exchanges, but as important psychological sites, defining or clarifying constructs so clearly that… they become architectonic in H.D.'s discourse.' (Gregory 1997: 184) and says that H.D. spoke from a marginal position and saw her role in terms of a 'subversive, erotic and visionary endeavour' that challenged the assumptions of classical transmission (Gregory 1997: 57). Whilst initial reception was tentatively

favourable, with praise coming from Eliot in his essay 'Euripides and the Professor' (1922) and from an anonymous reviewer in the *New Age* journal (March 30, 1916), Douglas Bush famously took great offence to H.D.'s translations claiming that her Greece had no connection to the Greece of what he calls historic actuality: 'The fact is that the hard bright shell of H.D.'s poetry partly conceals a soft Romantic nostalgia which, however altered and feminised, is that of the Victorian Hellenists' (Bush 1937: 505-506). In her novel *Bid Me to Live*, H.D. gave a fictional account of the translation activity:

> She brooded over each word, as if to hatch it. Then she tried to forget each word, for translations enough existed and she was no scholar. She did not want tot 'know' Greek in that sense. She was like one blind, reading the texture of incised letters, rejoicing like one blind who knows an inner light, a reality that the outer eye cannot grasp... Anyone can translate the meaning of the word. She wanted the shape, the feel of it, the character of it, as if it had been freshly minted.' (H.D. 1983: 163)

The most insightful of examples, however, comes from Douglas Carne-Rosse who, in his 1961 essay entitled 'Translation and Transposition', claimed that in the field of Greek translation, the most interesting work was done by H.D. in these choruses:

> Here, to my mind, she suggested certain elements in the Greek lyric better than they have ever been suggested before or since. She leaves out an enormous amount. She is not interested in the syntax, in the elaborate weave of the Greek lyric; and she shows little dramatic feeling. She is hardly concerned with the 'sense', it is the picture – the 'image' – that she is after, and this is what she presents, a sequence of images as fresh and unexpected as though they had just been disinterred from the sands of Egypt. (cit. Gregory 1997: 142)

This then should set the scene for our case study in which we will seek to investigate the extent to which H.D. broke with the prevailing norms governing classical transmission in the English language in order to give priority to imagist aesthetics.

Case study: models and methodology

Norms, models and descriptive translation studies

In order to explore the validity of our hypothesis, we need to adopt an analytical model. If we are seeking to establish the extent to which H.D. broke with prevailing norms, we would obviously need to gain an idea as to what those norms were. Toury (1995) offers a useful description of norms which he says are considered by sociologists to represent the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community into performance instructions appropriate for particular situations. They express what are seen to be acceptable and unacceptable forms of behaviour and are acquired by the individual during his/her socialization. As far as Translation Studies is concerned, translational norms can be said to be formulated by the target culture. The analyst can identify specific norms by the effects that these norms have; that is, the products of norm-governed instances of behaviour can be individuated and studied. Where a norm is active and effective, we might be able to distinguish regularity of behaviour; where what has been established as a norm is not active, we can talk in terms of a break with norms. (Toury 1995: 55)

Yet Toury also claims that norms are not directly observable and can only be identified by studying the products of norm-governed instances of behaviour. He lists two sources on the basis of which these norm-products can be observed: i) textual (primary norm products): the translated texts themselves; ii) extra-textual (norm by-products): prescriptive theories of translation, other translation criticism, reception, influence of a particular 'school', etc. (Toury 1995: 65). What we plan to do then is to try to observe certain textual norms that may have governed classical transmission in the late Victorian and early Modernist periods. To this end we will build a corpus of translations of the *Iphigeneia in Aulis* as published between 1865 and 1925 (dates which correspond to the late Victorian and early Modernist periods) and then select two translations from this corpus (i.e., in addition to H.D.'s text) for further analysis. It is hoped that a close analysis of these two translations will reveal data which we can use in order to try to gain an idea as to what the norms governing transmission might have been. Given the necessary brevity of the present study, we cannot subject a larger number of texts from the corpus to adequate comparative analysis, though in order to make any concrete claims about what norms may have influenced textual production

(translations) at that time, and what norms H.D. was breaking and why, we would need to examine a far greater spread of texts. At this point, it would thus be more appropriate to talk in terms of 'similarities' existing between texts belonging to the traditional line of transmission. We can then examine whether H.D.'s translation presents these same similarities or whether her text is fundamentally different.

Our comparative analysis requires a model, which Toury again provides in his work on descriptive translation studies. In very basic terms, Toury advocates the mapping of the target text onto the source text in order to identify the shifts present which once analysed would enable the researcher to make claims about the underlying concept of translation. This in turn allows us to suggest an explanatory hypothesis which can account for why one particular translated text has taken a particular form:

> the identification of shifts is part of the discovery procedures only, i.e., a step towards the formulation of explanatory hypotheses. The latter, in turn, necessitate the establishment of the overall concept of translation underlying whatever corpus one sets out to investigate, one text within a broader context, one problem area across texts, or a body of texts selected according to one principle or another. (Toury 1995: 85)

Our aim is of course to be able to reconstruct the translation decisions made and the constraints determining these specific decision being taken (1995: 88). In order to do this we must approach the issue from three angles: we must look not only at the relationship between the source and target text, but must also examine the relationship between one target text (H.D.'s), the line of transmission (the two target texts selected from our corpus) and the source text (Euripides' choruses).

The problem is further complicated by the fact that H.D. probably used a range of source texts. Toury accounts for situations such as this when he claims that:

> there are indeed several cases where a multitude of candidates for a source text may exist. In cases of this kind, any attempt to justify a researcher's selection of source text would depend, at least in part, on what the target text itself exhibits, which would render the establishment of the source text's identity part of the comparative analysis itself. (Toury 1995: 74)

In seeking to identify which source texts H.D. used we need to recall that in an interview with Thomas Swann, H.D. herself claimed that she read 'a little Greek' and used dictionaries and other sources to help her translate, and read Murray's prose rather than his translations (Swann 1962: 10). Gregory says that she almost certainly looked at his translations too, if only for his excellent notes (1995:273n10). Though research undertaken when compiling our corpus of translations suggests that the *Iphigeneia* was one of the few plays that Murray did not translate. Friedman warns against playing down H.D.'s knowledge of Greek – enough evidence exists in her notebooks to suggest that she knew enough Greek to work from the original. In connection with this, Eileen Gregory has studied H.D.'s working notebooks for *Helen in Egypt* housed in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale which contain notes H.D. took between 1953 and 1955. These notes, says Gregory, record 'H.D.'s re-reading of five plays by Euripides' (Gregory 1995: 83) – including the *Iphigeneia*. In a footnote she states that: 'H.D. read Verrall and Murray at the time of writing her early essays on Eurpides; she re-read Murray's *Euripides and His Age* and perhaps also Verrall in preparation of the *Ion*' (1995: 85n5). The essays referred to are unpublished as a whole and were written as H.D. was translating Euripides; they were gathered under the heading 'Notes on Euripides, Pausanius, and the Greek Lyric poets' and are now contained in the Beinecke Rare Books Library. Gregory also claims that:

> The largest single portion of the notebook records H.D.'s re-reading … in the French translation of Leconte de Lisle. H.D. also at the same time apparently consulted the Loeb edition of Arthur Way: factual information as presented in this edition can be identified in the notes. (Gregory 1995: 83)

Arthur Way's text would certainly need to be examined as a potential source, especially since Verrall too mentions his translation as being that which he used for his own critical analysis: 'I appreciate highly the advantage of being able to adduce a version so faithful' (1905: v). Though in order to ascertain more securely which existing translations H.D. used in her own translation we would need to study the notes she kept and the books she owned at the time of translating. Unfortunately, given that this topic represents a gap in both Translation Studies and H.D. studies, information on this is as yet non-existent. The inevitable next step in our research, then, would be to examine

these in the Beinecke Library. The Leconte de Lisle text would also need to be studied to ascertain whether or not H.D. used this in her translation of the choruses, though the fact of its being in the French language means that as a translation it may be responding to a different set of norms.

Once the other translations to be used in the comparative analysis have been identified, we would then need to map the texts in order to match text segments which would in turn allow us to identify shifts. Toury guides us through this: 'What would normally be mapped onto each other, then, is segments of an assumed translation onto segments of its assumed source, rather than the two texts as wholes' (Toury 1995: 88). He notes however that a crucial requirement would be that whatever units one chooses to analyse must be relevant to the operation to be performed, which in our case is to attempt to establish whether or not H.D. broke with norms and how she broke with them.

Corpus-selection

We will use Toury's model of mapping text segments in order to prepare material for the comparative analysis. Prior to this however, we must build a corpus of translated texts published between 1865 and 1925. These dates have been chosen because they correspond to the late Victorian period and the early Modernist period. The reasons why these periods are of interest have already been discussed in our study of neo-classicism and Modernism. The British Library lists eleven translations published during this period; if we add to this the Leconte de Lisle translation, our corpus is as follows:

1. Euripides/Lumley, Lady (trans). 1550?/1909. *Iphigenia at Aulis*. London: The Malone Society Reprint.
2. Euripides / Cartwright, J. (trans.). 1868. *Translations from Euripides*. London: D. Nutt & Co.
3. Euripides / Arnold, T. J. (trans.). 1884. *Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulis*. Kelly's keys to the classics series. London: James Cornish & Sons.
4. Euripides / Leconte de Lisle (trans.). *Euripide*. 1884. Paris, Alphonse Lemerre Editeur.
5. Euripides / Potter, Robert (trans.). 1887. *Alcestis and Other Plays by Euripides*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

6. Euripides / Cudworth (trans.) 1889. *The Iphigeneia in Aulis of Euripides*. Darlington: William Dresser.

7. Euripides / England, E.B. (trans.) 1891. *The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides*. London: Macmillan and Co.

8. Euripides / Norwood (trans.). 1909. *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Ed. G. Norwood. London: Sherratt and Hughes.

9. Euripides / Way, Arthur S (trans.). 1912. *Euripides in four volumes*. London: William Heinemann.

10. Euripides / Way, Arthur S. (trans.) 1912. *Euripides: Plays.* London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

11. Euripides. 1913. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Gilbert Murray ed, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

12. Euripides / Newhall, J. P. (composer). 1924. Iphigenia *at Aulis / Iphigenia among the Taurians. The Lyric Portions set to music.* Boston: C.W. Thompson & Co.

Comparative text selection

From this corpus we need to select two translations for study, with the aim of establishing similarities (as opposed to norms, at this stage). The Leconte de Lisle translation was examined but rejected on the basis of its bearing very little relation to H.D.'s text. Arthur S. Way's 1912 text was selected on the basis of Gregory claiming that H.D. used this translation and the fact that it was published only three years previously to H.D.'s translation. The second translation to be chosen was that of T.J. Arnold. The reason for this choice was that his translation is listed as being 'literal' and is presented in prose, thus contrasting with Way's translation which is in rhyme; it is our hope that belonging to different sub-genres of translation (the poetic and the literal), the two texts will act as two reasonably different examples of the sort of approaches that were characteristic of classical transmission in the given period. Arnold's text was published in 1884 and is thus useful for the additional reason that it represents a translation carried out towards the earlier years in our period of study whilst Way's text was published towards the end.

Research questions

We will now be in a position to investigate our two research questions: i) Did H.D. break with prevailing norms? ii) In what way did H.D. break with these norms? A comparative analysis of the two texts representing traditional classical transmission on the one hand and H.D.'s text on the other will respond to this.

Text analysis

With regard to text analysis, we will once more turn to Toury. 'It will normally be target-text segments to be mapped onto segments of the source text' (Toury 1995: 37). The target text segment chosen is the first section of the first chorus, which is clearly marked and delineated in H.D.'s translation and thus proves to be a logical segment for study. Arnold's text and Way's text will then be mapped onto this segment of H.D.'s text in order to obtain from each the appropriate section for analysis. Each of the three texts will then be subjected to a close textual analysis in order to gain a clearer understanding of the character of each text. In order to guard against non-uniformity in our analysis, we will analyse only the linguistic features (as opposed to metre, rhyme scheme, etc) of these texts.

Comparative analysis of target texts

Once a profile of each of the three texts has been created, we will then compare the profile of Way's text with that of Arnold's text to see if any similarities exist. Once these similarities have been noted, we will have a basic idea of the sort of norms that might have governed classical transmission in this particular period. We then need to compare H.D.'s text to Way's and Arnold's texts to see if H.D.'s text contains these same similarities. To this end we will use the document containing the Way text and the Arnold text mapped onto H.D.'s text. H.D.'s shifts will be noted and classified according to three types: a) zero reproduction, where H.D. does not reproduce a meaning that the other two texts do reproduce; b) expansion, where H.D.'s text is more expansive then the other two texts; c) interpretative differences, where H.D.'s text appears to be interpreting in a different way meanings that can also be found in Way and Arnold.

Comparative analysis of source and target text

The shifts present in H.D.'s text will then be mapped back onto the Eurpidean source text in order to establish an answer to the question: in what way did H.D. break with

norms. For the purposes of this study, which must necessarily be brief, we will examine the variables of zero production and expansion.

Explanatory narrative

As we analyse the shifts present in H.D.'s translation in relation to the Greek source text we will seek to provide explanations as to what the causes, influences and reasons motivating these shifts might be. This would in turn build an explanatory narrative that would enable us to understand why H.D.'s text is a 'different' text. In other words, we will be able to prove or disprove our opening hypothesis that H.D.'s break with the prevailing norms of classical transmission gave priority to the forging of poetic authority.

4.6 Analysis of H.D.'s translation

What follows is a micro-structural analysis of H.D.'s translation of the first chorus, 'The Women of Chalkis', from Euripides' play *Iphigeneia in Aulis*. Linguistic features will be analysed according to the order in which they appear in the table. The lines have been numbered to facilitate analysis.

Chorus of the Women of Chalkis (trans. H.D., 1915)

1. I crossed sand-hills.
2. I stand among the sea-drift before Aulis.
3. I crossed Euripos' strait –
4. Foam hissed after my boat.

5. I left Chalkis,
6. My city and the rock-ledges.
7. Arethusa twists among the boulders,
8. Increases – cuts into the surf.

9. I come to see the battle-line
10. And the ships rowed here
11. By these spirits –
12. The Greeks are but half-man.

13. Golden Menelaus
14. And Agamemnon of proud birth

15. Direct the thousand ships.
16. They have cut pine-trees
17. For their oars.
18. They have gathered the ships for one purpose:
19. Helen shall return.

20. There are clumps of marsh-reed
21. And spear-grass about the strait.
22. Paris the herdsman passed through them
23. When he took Helen – Aphrodite's gift.

24. For he had judged the goddess
25. More beautiful than Hera.
26. Pallas was no longer radiant
27. As the three stood
28. Among the fresh-shallows of the strait.

Subject

Nineteen of the twenty-five lines carry subjects. In stanza 1, the first three lines feature the pronoun 'I' in the subject position. This serves to accentuate the notion of self, in this case the travelling self. The lines bat out this repetition of the 'I' until it begins to form an incantatory pattern, establishing a code within the stanza itself. Thus the sudden subversion of this pattern with the introduction of the subject 'Foam' strikes the reader with its unexpectedness. Working against the grain, it sets up a form of counter- pattern and challenges the thematic model established by the repetition of the pronoun 'I' and its occupation of the theme position (Thompson 1996) in the sentence. What we are faced with then is a translation which establishes right from the very outset a code which it then proceeds to undermine almost immediately, challenging all notions of fluid, or even logical, progression. The effect on the reader is such that having been drawn into a sort of rhythmic alliance with the text, where rules are set up and expectations satisfied (certainly by line three), the reader is then in a sense betrayed by the text which suddenly offers 'Foam' in the place of a fourth 'I'. Already the dominant mood, at least on a micro-linguistic level, is one of disharmony.

The text then returns to its previous formula of placing the pronoun 'I' in the first position in the line. In line 6, however, the text once more replaces the expected 'I' with 'My city'. The reader of course will presume, on the basis of the preceding pattern, that 'My city' will function as a subject and will be followed by a verb, yet this is not

the case: 'My city and the rock-ledges'. Line 7 re-establishes the pattern of subject in the theme position, and in this case the subject is a noun ('Arethusa twists'), though the pattern is once again subverted in the following line with the introduction of a verb in the theme position ('Increases – '). What is most striking of course in this line is the complete absence of a subject, a fact which once more serves to undermine the expectations of the attentive reader.

Stanza 3, line 9 sees a return to the pronoun-as-subject pattern, whilst line 10 begins not with a subject but with an additive ('And'). Here we are faced with the text's first complex sentence (lines 9 – 12): 'I come to see the battle line / And the ships rowed here / By these spirits - / The Greeks are but half-man.' The reader is struck by the text's break with its use of short sentences and the lack of subject in two consecutive lines (10, 11) upsets once again the dominant linguistic pattern formed by the text. Yet whilst this stanza might be said to represent the first steps towards the lack of subject, the next stanza more than fills this brief lack with its subject-heavy constructions.

Analysed from a functional perspective, all that precedes the verb can be considered a subject. Stanza 4 is thus a subject-heavy stanza in which the whole of lines 13 and 14 are filled with the presentation of the subject: 'Golden Manelaus / And Agamemnon of proud birth / Direct…' (lines 13 – 15). Lines 16 and 19 refer back to these same subjects ('they') and line 19 presents an interesting strategy in which Helen is in a sense rescued from the object position to become a subject in her own right: 'Helen shall return'. Raising her status in this way, H.D. uses the syntactical construction of her phrase to offset the narrative meaning of the statement (i.e., that Agamemnon and Menelaus will bring Helen back) and Helen acquires a degree of power that she would not have had she remained relegated to the object position.

'There are' (line 20) occupies the first subject position in this stanza and is used to introduce the description of the setting in which a particular event took place. At first glance, the absence of pronoun or object as subject appears as an interruption, and it would certainly seem incongruous for the majestic scene described in stanza 4 and its epic characters to be suddenly dropped in favour of the description of a pastoral landscape. And yet this should tell us something important about H.D.'s interest in settings and places, which as we will see are very often raised to the same level of importance as the characters and events she translates.

Lines 23 to 28 present a series of conjunctions occupying the first position in the sentence, which has mainly been reserved so far for the subject ('when' [l. 23]; 'for' [l.

24]; 'as'[l. 27]). To shift the subject out of the first position in these lines means to distance that subject and the actions it undertakes from the reader, mediating the narrative through these discourse markers whose main function is to relate parts of a discourse to each other, and not directly to the world being described. So we have lost the immediacy of the first stanzas where the directness of description served to situate the witnessing voice (and by proxy, the reader) right at the heart of the action. But what does it mean here to distance the narrative at this point? It might, of course, have something to do with its very fact of being a narrative, a well-known mythical narrative that cannot be directly witnessed by H.D.'s choral voice. This would tend to suggest therefore that the story contained in these narrative passages (the traditional story of Aphrodite allowing Paris to seduce Helen by way of payment for his having judged her more beautiful than Pallas and Hera) is in fact secondary to the story of the witnessing self.

Verbs

The verbs used in stanza one emphasize the notion of the immobile or mobile body in space ('crossed' [l.1]; 'stand' [l.2]). The shift between past and present tenses creates a sense of movement, a movement between a past and a present time, a movement however that is not contained within the verb tense itself (like, for example, the present perfect tense) but is contained in the space between the two tenses. The tension is created by the quick succession of past and present time being juxtaposed, by the layering of present time over past, and past over present.

Lines 4 to 8 present a number of verbs which are hostile in nature and which are used to describe the backdrop to the choral 'I': 'hissed' [l.4]; 'twists'[l.7]; 'increases' [l.8]; 'cuts' [l.8]. The choral 'I' leaves behind a hostile home and travels through a hostile space to reach Aulis. What is interesting to note is that H.D. uses verbs such as these rather than adjectives to create a sense of atmosphere. This technique adds force and intensity to the space surrounding the chorus, and because the setting is the subject of the verbs, we are left with a powerful sense of active space.

Stanza three continues with the strategy of assigning essentially simple and direct verbs to the choral 'I', whilst the surrounding space and the inanimate objects which occupy this space are given dynamic verbs. 'The ships rowed here' [l.10] is another example of

the avoidance of the present perfect tense (i.e., we do not read: 'the ships that have been rowed here').

What we believe to be a deliberate ambiguity is present in lines 16 – 17 where the word 'cut' can either be read as an adjective or as the auxiliary in a present perfect verbal structure. Obviously, a strategy such as this produces ambivalent meaning, the sense depending on how the reader chooses to interpret the line. A reading of 'cut' as adjective would, however, adhere more closely to the imagist's desire for the concrete transmission of images.

With the use of the 'There are' in line 20 we find once again a structure that emphasises the visual observations made by the witnessing choral 'I': 'There are clumps of marsh-reed' belongs to the world of that which is seen and recounted by the chorus. The verb 'passed' in line 22 once again reinforces the idea of the body (this time Paris') moving through space. What we find here then is the observation of space which in effect sets the scene for the subsequent action of Paris passing through the long grasses. Line 23 relegates Helen to the object position when it recounts that Paris 'took Helen' which undermines the possibility alluded to several lines earlier with Helen's strong agency ('Helen shall return' [l.19]).

The use of the past perfect tense in stanza 6 stands out for its incongruity when compared to the other tense choices made by the translator. 'For he had judged' [l. 24] situates the action and thus the ensuing narrative some distance in the past. This section recounts the story of Paris judging Aphrodite more beautiful than Pallas and Hera. Because of the use of the past perfect tense, the story does not have the immediacy of the previous scenes. The difference may be explained by the idea that what the choral 'I' can directly observe is awarded an immediacy that these traditional and mythical stories lack. H.D. would therefore appear to be giving priority to the images of setting over the components of epic narrative.

Once again we find the active verb (in this case the reference to Paris judging, in line 24) being given precedence over nouns to describe a given situation. Rather than use the noun group 'beauty contest' to refer to what took place between the three goddesses and Paris, H.D. prefers to transmit the idea using a verb which gives the scene an added force and dynamism. The emphasis thus falls on human action (judging) and the idea of competitiveness is transferred from the static noun ('contest') to the active verb ('judge'), lending the scene an immediacy that a static noun maybe not be able to convey.

Direct / indirect objects

In this section we are able to observe once more the precision which motivates H.D.'s choice of lexis. Of the 29 direct / indirect objects classified in the table, 14 are used to evoke space. Indeed, all the objects appearing in stanza 1 are space-defining nouns and reinforce what would appear to be the text's commitment to the construction of a highly rarefied space. The setting described here is an in-between space with the choral voice being located at the moment of speaking in the breaking waves at the sea shore, a space that is neither strictly land nor sea. This aqueous setting is brought clearly into focus by the references to the sea, the waves, the boats and the strait. The sea is not only the hostile space surrounding the chorus ('Foam hissed after my boat'), it is also the setting for conflict and the military activity of the battle ships.

An important feature of H.D.'s text is the presence of compound nouns which account for almost a third of all nouns used. In the first stanza we find references to 'sand-hills' [l.1] and 'sea-drift' [l. 2] which are neologisms and infuse into the text a sense of unfamiliarity and newness. The inclusion of the word 'hills' in the fist example above lends a sense of shape and undulating movement to what would otherwise be a flat static space. 'Sea-drift' works in a similar way, echoing the first compound and accentuating the notion of movement in space ('drift'). This space therefore is infused with life, with movement and dynamism.

H.D. uses the same noun-hyphen-noun structure to indicate the rocky quality of the landscape ('rock-ledges' [l. 6]) which copies the structure her newly created terms take. Yet the word rock ledge is by no means a coined term, yet H.D.'s use of the hyphen here seems to suggest that it is, insofar as it echoes the neologistic structures already used. This is a form of linguistic appropriation and its effect on the reader is such that it asks us to look at that word as if for the first time, as if it were a new word on a par with the other new words already presented. New words have an immediacy and impact that commonly-used words have lost. To speak with new words is to speak with a new language, it is to say unfamiliar things to an unsuspecting interlocutor.

The reference to 'battle-lines' in line 9 is another instance of a false neologism and once again the translator manages to charge the description of the fleet of ships with a strong sense of the spatial. 'Line' calls to mind the geometrical formation of the ships whilst 'battle' belongs to the semantic field of conflict. Space and conflict are united

once again, suggesting that not only is H.D.'s text predominantly motivated by a desire to question the notion of space in this context, but that the space interrogated is necessarily a space of conflict.

The reference to 'spirits' and 'half-man' in lines 11 and 12 once again emphasise the notion of in-between spaces or states. Like the position occupied by the choral 'I' (that in-between space where land meets sea), these Greek sailors are said to be spirits, beings that occupy that ambiguous space between life and death.

The 'pine-trees' referenced in line 16 can be read as an attempt to emphasise the material quality of the image of boats. H.D. presents the reader of her translation with this sensuous detail, pausing on the wooden quality of the oars and evoking the material qualities over the rhetoric of their grandeur. Indeed, the only mention of abstract, non-material qualities in this auspiciously grand and highly dramatic stanza is the reference to 'purpose' in line 18. This of course respects Pound's notion that imagist poetry should steer clear of rhetoric in order to imbue the image itself with communicative force.

After the description of the ships in stanza 4, we are now taken to the grassy periphery of the strait where the reeds stand tall and sharp as spears. Once again we are located in the semantic field of conflict ('spear-grass' [l. 21]) which, we are the told, Paris crossed on his way to steal Helen. It is this grassy space, as witnessed and described by the choral 'I', that forms a bridge between the mythical narrative of Paris and Helen and allows the chorus to segue into an explanation of the story that motivated the presence of the war ships at Aulis. What is interesting to note here is the absence of a rhetorical linker; again H.D. applies her imagist poetics in the shunning of rhetorical strategies and makes the grassy borders of the strait act as a link between the host of ships and the story of Paris' seduction of Helen.

The end of stanza 5 together with stanza 6 contain four references to female mythical characters – Helen, Pallas, Aphrodite and Hera – and as such balances with its concentration on the feminine the weight and potency of the references to the masculine world contained earlier in the text. Again, it is the image that takes precedence in this scene; the setting is conveyed in terms of the sensuous and erotically charged compound 'fresh-shallows' [l. 28]. The two nouns making up this new compound belong to two different semantic fields and the tension inherent in this new word-construct works according to a movement of attraction and repulsion: the two terms are consolidated

into a single entity by the presence of the hyphen and yet their belonging to contrasting semantic fields serves to pull them apart.

Prepositions

Eight of the fourteen prepositions used in this text are either prepositions of place or prepositions highlighting the quality of space. Two prepositions which are usually used to talk about time are here used to talk about space: 'before' in line 2 means 'facing', and is thus spatial rather than temporal, whilst 'after' in line 4 means 'behind'. When two nouns need to be linked, e.g., 'the strait of Euripos', the preposition 'of' is never used (cf. l. 3 'Euripos' strait'). The sort of relationship pursued by this text is that of body/self/object to space and thus we find a high incidence of prepositions like 'through' (l. 22) 'into' (l. 8) and 'among' (l. 2) which emphasise the notion of a space being penetrated by an object.

Articles

H.D. only uses the definite article, that which we use to refer to something which has already been introduced or which is familiar to us. Here we find it being used to reaffirm a sense of familiarity with the mythical situations being transmitted.

Pronouns

There is a low incidence of pronouns in H.D.'s translation. Worthy of mention is the repetition of ownership as implied by the possessives attached to objects: 'my boat' (l. 4); 'my city' (l. 6). The witnessing self is a self whose own home and origin are cited ('my city' [l.6]) and who owns, more importantly, a means of transport ('my boat' [l.4]). Ownership of elements makin up the textual narrative contributes to the authority with which the witnessing self can describe the events and space of myth.

Adjectives

The markedly low incidence of adjectives in this text is quite remarkable given the highly evocative nature of H.D.'s poetic discourse. The lack of adjectives seems to

suggest that H.D. is trying to shift description, or the effect of description, out of the grammatical element traditionally associated with description (i.e., the adjective) and into alternative elements. We usually associate evocative description with adjectives, and so when this quality is displaced onto another grammatical element, onto verbs or nouns for example, the strangeness of such a technique increases the impact of description. Again, H.D. can be seen to be subverting or playing with traditional grammatical codes and in making syntactical elements work in new ways she makes her words say new things in a new way. Also, of course, she is adhering to Pound's demand: 'Don't be descriptive' (Pound 1913).

Adverbs

Adverbs also have a low incidence, possibly due to their grammatical role of describing where, when and how an action took place. H.D. seems more interested in the action itself, or in the quality of the space inhabited. There is little room for this less direct communication of parenthetical information.

Conjunctions

If conjunctions belong to rhetorical discourse then, given what we know of the Imagists' aversion to 'useless rhetoric', we would expect to find a low incidence of conjunctions. Indeed, 'and' is used in line 6 possibly to avoid stressing the part/whole relationship suggested by the notion that by characterising the city of Chalkis, the rock-ledges are in fact an attribute. The use of the additive allows this part/whole relationship to be played down. Line 10 contains another simple additive, 'and the ships', as do lines 14 ('And Agamemnon') and 21 ('and spear-grass'). Additives here allow for the enumeration of elements which are observed or witnessed by the choral I. Only when we eneter the non-witnessed narrative (that of Paris, Helen and the three goddesses) do we find the cluster of on-additive conjunctions. 'When' (l. 23), and 'as' (l. 27) are temporal and serve to link two actions (e.g. 'this was happening when this happened'). What is interesting though is that we usually find, in past narratives such as this, the pairing of the temporal conjunction with a past tense action; one finite action is situated within the realm of another action that was taking place in the past. In H.D.'s translation, however, continuity over time as represented by a verb tense is again avoided, giving rise ot a

concentration of finite moments in time which interact with each other. The relationships formed exist therefore between these finite actions or images, and not within the grammar selected by the translator (i.e., in this case the past continuous tense is not used).

Punctuation

Full-stops in this text serve to block continuity and block any sense of syntactical fluidity. Each short sentence contains an essential image and each image is finite and enclosed within its own sentence structure. The punctuation, especially the repeated use of the full-sop, creates the quick staccato rhythm that emphasizes the completeness of each of these separate images – the add force, intensity and almost a sense of emergency (at least in the first two stanzas) to the information conveyed.

Hyphens and colons are used where normally we would expect to find rhetorical linkers ('for one purpose: / Helen shall return.' [l.18-19]) or relative pronouns ('When he took Helen – Aphrodite's gift.' [l. 23]) which would create a smooth flow of ideas communicated and organised rhetorically. Again, rhetoric is eschewed in favour of transmitting as economically as possible the force and immediacy of the image.

Interpretative analysis of textual strategies

A good way into H.D.'s text might be her suppression of the explicative 'for our husbands tell us' which both the other translations analysed for this study transmit. This presumably deliberate omission serves to foreground the female subject, the plurivocal choral 'I' of the text, promoting her from the position of second-degree inheritor of information to the position of direct witness of the events recounted. The female speaking persona no longer needs the husband/male to mediate between experience and linguistic response; by removing both the husbands and the act of telling, HD effectively awards the female subject interpretative freedom and reserves for her all right to poetic expression. This claiming of the right to witness and express obviously finds a parallels in H.D.'s own position as a marginal poet-translator seeking to enter the traditionally masculine line of classical transmission.

The repression of the act of telling is also part of a broader strategy which serves to repress the narrative elements of the song. H.D.'s text removes all elements of the

traditional narrative and as such distances the poetic expression from the traditional genres of epic and war-adventure. What we now find therefore is a general favouring of non-decorative image-creation over narrative; H.D.'s text drains language of its temporal and thus narrative component, arrests notions of continuity through time, and undermines the logic of chronological progression. The opening *I crossed – I stand – I crossed* juxtaposes different moments in time and interrupts any sense of a forward-moving development from one event to the next. Imagist poetry has often been described as the verbal equivalent of painting and sculpture where the image, as we have seen, is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time. A close examination of H.D.'s translation suggests that what she is seeking to do is to fragment and then reorganise the account into a collection of crystalline image-clusters whose apparent hard, impenetrable, marble-like surface is animated internally by a vibrating tension which is only retrospectively revealed to the reader in the form of impression or effect. An example of this would be one of the many evocative compounds that the poet creates. At the end of the song, she increases the immediacy and intensity of the image of the Goddesses standing by the fountain by creating the sensuous and erotically charged compound 'fresh-shallows' (l. 28). Belonging to two different semantic fields, the two words move along two opposite planes – 'fresh', belonging to the field delineated by the terms 'new' and 'old', whilst 'shallow' belongs more obviously to a discourse of depth. The tension inherent to this new word-construct thus works according to a movement of attraction and repulsion. The two terms are consolidated into a single entity by the presence of the hyphen and yet their belonging to contrasting semantic fields serves to pull them apart. Again the push-pull movement evident here and characteristic of much of H.D.'s poetry is the textual counterpart to what DuPlessis terms H.D.'s characteristic 'complicity and resistance' (1986: 5).

Another obvious characteristic of H.D.'s revisionist textual strategies present in this section is the emphasis she puts on the spatial dimension. Again, a discourse of space or place logically brings to the fore the notion of positioning and serves indirectly, through the transformative potential of the text, to situate the innovative poetic voice within the orthodox literary tradition, the translation within the canon, and H.D.'s revisionary poetics within the broader context of twentieth century poetry. Arnold's 'sandy shore of sea-washed Aulis' (lines 1-2) in HD's hands becomes an emblem of the in-between space she sees herself as inhabiting: the sea-drift in which the choral 'I' stands is neither strictly land nor sea, but is an ambivalent bi-focal image encompassing

both elements. Of course, for H.D.'s text to occupy a marginal space vis-à-vis the tradition is hardly surprising if we consider the fact that H.D. herself was marginal to the male-dominated tradition of classical transmission. One look at the title pages of the texts in our corpus proves just how important the credentials of the translator were to the acceptability of the translated text itself. After each name appears the translator's academic position and qualifications, which suggests that the identity of the translator did much to validate the translation itself. These title pages seem to imply that translators who do not belong to the male-dominated elites of Oxbridge have no right enter the space of classical transmission. So H.D. as a translator is a marginal figure working in a space in which she is not 'qualified' to enter. Space of course, as we have seen over and over again, is of prime importance to her translations and is the feature that she emphasises perhaps more than any other in her translation of this first chorus. It is no surprise then that the textual space she creates should be so overtly hostile when on an extra-textual level H.D. as translator is in effect infiltrating a space which, because of her gender, her lack of qualifications and even her nationality, she ought not enter.

Perhaps H.D.'s most daring move and that which would be most open to discussion is her subversion of grammatical logic and precision. Free Verse of the sort used by the Imagists had all the freedoms usually allowed to prose, and thus all its attendent ambiguities. In free verse, the reader easily becomes the poet's plaything because he/she has the burden of defining the line. 'What could be more amusing then and more damaging to prosody's good name than presenting a mongrel line and compelling the reader, if he would read it, to give it a pedigree?' (Scott 1976: 365). The point in question appears over lines 16-17: 'They have cut pine-trees / For their oars.' A narrative-directed reading of the line produces a present perfect verb structure (they have cut) whilst an image-directed account would read the word 'cut' as an adjective, thus intensifying the material quality of the oars and facilitating the creation of the image. The fact that this syntactical arrangement is ambiguous is, we would argue, fully intentional on the part of the poet and whilst on the one hand it contextualises the poet's commitment to the Imagist cause, it also openly defies and attacks the tradition in which it is purportedly seeking to participate. Clive Scott, commenting on ambiguities of this sort, raises the question of whether the reader can 'derive much pleasure from reading when each line is a test for his poetic conscience, when each line, if it is to become a line, involves something more than reading, something more like connivance?' (1976:

365). HD eliciting connivance on the part of the reader for her subversive poetics: what could be more empowering for a transgressive poet than to use the power of her text in such a way as to produce complicity in the potentially hostile reader?

Analysis of T. J. Arnold's translation

As with the analysis carried out on H.D.'s translation of 'Chorus of the Women of Chalkis', our analysis of Arnold's translation of the same segment will cover the following variables: subject; verb; direct/indirect object; preposition; article; pronoun; adjective; adverb; conjunction; punctuation.

Chorus of the Women of Chalkis (trans. T.J. Arnold, 1884)

(The prose has been re-ordered into lines in order to facilitate classification. In the target text, this segment appears as straight prose and has no line divisions.)

1. I have come to the sandy shore
2. of sea-washed Aulis,
3. sailing through the waters of Euripus,
4. leaving Calchis,
5. my own city on the narrow sea,
6. nurse of the seaside waters of famed Arethusa,
7. to see the Grecian host
8. and sea-crossing galleys
9. of the young warriors,
10. whom, as our husbands tell us,
11. Menelaus
12. and high-born Agamemnon
13. are bringing
14. in search of Helen,
15. whom the herdsman Paris
16. took away
17. from reed-bordered
18. Eurotas
19. the gift of Venus,
20. when the Cyprian Goddess had a rivalry of beauty – a strife with Juno and Pallas
21. at the fountain.

Subject

Only five subjects are present in this segment of Arnold's translation. The subject pronoun 'I' supports the whole first half of the segment whilst the main characters in the narrative appear from lines 11 to 21; 'Meneluas', 'Agamemnon', 'Paris' and the 'Goddess'.

Verbs

The use of the present perfect tense in line 1 indicates a link between past and the present, as we have already said, insofar as the tense is used to talk about a past action or event that has an effect on the present. It acts as a sort of temporal bridge and underlines a sense of fluidity and continuity between past and present.

The use of the present participle in lines 3 and 4 ('sailing'; 'bringing') indicates the durational form, once more suggesting continuity over time. Fluid time is implied by these verbs which allow the temporal aspect to travel through them.

The verbs used in the translation imply motion: 'come' [l.1]; 'sailing' [l.3]; 'leaving' [l.4] 'bringing' [l.13]; 'took' [l. 16] (you *come* to a place from somewhere else; you *sail* from one place to another; you *leave* one place in order to reach another; you *bring* something from one place to another; you *take* a thing from one place to another). They imply a mediating between one thing and another, or from one place/state to another place/state. Coming, sailing and leaving are all verbs of physical movement, generally where a point of departure and a point of arrival exist, which in terms of the geometry of space creates a binary of balance. The verbs bringing and taking offset one another, once again establishing a sense of balance, where something is added when something else has been taken away: the verb 'bringing' (add) precedes the verb 'took' (remove) and precludes any sense of loss or imbalance that the notion of removal might have.

Line 10 is an important moment in the text: 'as our husbands tell us'. Worthy of note here is the fact that the statement made by the husband is relayed in the present tense (as they 'tell' us not as they 'told' us), reinforcing the exact similarity and balance between the two statements made – between all that the choral 'I' is recounting, and that which is recounted to the choral 'I' by the husbands. Both sides of the equation are thus taking place in a present time. The use of present simple here can be interpreted in three ways grammatically: either the husbands are telling the chorus members this

information in the present moment (i.e. the present simple used to refer to actions that are taking place in the present, though the sense of the piece discounts this possibility); or the 'tell' is an instance of universal truth (i.e., the use of the present simple to refer to universal truths, as in 'the earth is round'); or the act of telling is a form of habit (i.e., the present simple used to refer to habitual actions, as in 'I wake up every morning at seven o'clock'). If we read the present simple tense here as denoting a form of habit, the action denoted by the verb happens more than once. If the tense denotes universality, the action or state denoted is always true. Again, what we find with this instance of 'tell' as opposed to the choice of 'told' (which would have been equally possible here) is an avoidance of action or event as constituting a unique moment in time (i.e., unique, finite moments are more fragile in terms of what we can learn from them; if an event recurs over time, however, or if something is universally true, the point in question is more stable). Expressions denoting continuity over time and the continuity of action are given precedence over the presentation of finite, unique moments in time which are only true for a specific period of time.

Direct/Indirect objects

The Objects used in the translation present a low incidence of creative effect-producing terms, though this is to be expected given that the translation presents itself as a literal rendition of sense rather than an attempt to capture through poetic expression the equivalent effect of the Euripidean source text. The native city of the choral 'I' is reproduced with the spelling 'Calchis' (unlike Way's and H.D.'s translations which settle for 'Chalkis') and is feminised ('Nurse' [l. 6]).

Prepositions

The dominant preposition is 'of' (which accounts for 8/15 prepositions used in the section). It is mainly used to indicate a relationship of part to whole where something is indicated as being an attribute of something else or in some way belongs to it: 'shore of sea-washed Aulis' (l. 1-2); 'waters of Euripos' (l. 3); 'nurse of the seaside waters' (l.6); 'waters of famed Arethusa' (l. 6); 'Galleys of the young warriors' (l. 8-9); 'gift of Venus' (l. 19).

Articles

Twelve articles are used, ten of which are definite articles, which as a form is generally used to refer to unique objects or to something which is already a familiar part of a discourse. Two instances of the indefinite article can be detected: 'a rivalry of beauty' (l. 20); ' – a strife' (l. 20). Whilst the use of the indefinite article defamiliarises the concept of the beauty contest and distances it from the reader, the choice of article here was probably determined by the need to avoid repeating the word 'the' after it had so recently been used ('the Cyprian Goddess' [l. 20]) in order to retain an elegant-sounding phrase.

Pronouns

The relative pronoun 'whom' is used in lines 10 and 15 and since it functions as a conjunction, it will be analysed below. The other two pronouns used ('my city' [l. 5]; 'our husbands' [l. 10]) would seem to imply possession though in the case of this section, they imply a relationship of belonging of the choral 'I' – first her belonging to a particular city, and later her belonging to her husbands.

Adjectives

Compound adjectives are present in this text ('sea-washed' [l. 2]; 'sea-crossing' [l. 8]; 'reed-bordered' [l. 17]) and are formed by uniting a noun ('sea' or 'reed' in this case, both of which are common words) with an adjective derived form a verb. The lexical items selected are not disharmonious and both parts of the compound are in other instances collocations (the sea is said to wash, you cross the sea, the reeds border a river). There is no discord here; again we find the notion of harmony evident even in these moments of compound-creation. Where we find the creation of new words, the sense of familiarity could potentially be upset, innovation often creating a sense of disturbance. But the new here is delivered as familiar: we are used to seeing these words together and so the compound is easily accepted by the receiver, the familiarity fostering acceptance of the new. The new here extends that which is already familiar. It does not introduce the notion of unfamiliarity and hence rupture or non-acceptance. Again the new is seen to continue on from what is already familiar.

Adverbs

There are no adverbs in this section.

Conjunctions

The relative pronoun 'whom' acts as a conjunction and allows the narrative to proceed in a continuous flow. Without the 'whom' the name of the latter-mentioned character or characters would have to be repeated. It thus represses repetition of characters' names, and allows for the sentence to remain unbroken (by a full stop). Also it prevents 'Helen' or the 'young warriors' from becoming subjects in a new sentence. The relative pronoun acting as conjunction is a bridge between the different situations covered by the lyric. Again, this strategy favours fluidity and a sweeping liquid movement from start to finish.

The conjunction 'as' in 10 ('as our husbands tell us') introduces justification for the statements made by the choral 'I'. In effect, what is being suggested is that all that the choral 'I' recounts is equal to what their husbands have recounted to the choral 'I'. The function of this conjunction is to bring to the fore the notion of similarity which in turn implies faithfulness.

Punctuation

Arnold's translation makes frequent use of commas which allows the text to flow smoothly from beginning to end with no breaks or full-stops.

Interpretative analysis of textual strategies

Arnold's text is a subtle rendition of the Euripidean source text and avoids grand epic tones. The non-repetition of the first person pronoun after the first line dims the presence of the choral 'I' which allows for a fluid progression from one item to the next, the imagination passing from Aulis to Calchis to Arethusa to the host of ships without any sense of an intruding mediating eye or voice. The result is to make the high number

of direct and indirect objects come into clearer focus, the reader confronting these nouns immediately because the choral 'I' does not eclipse this contact. The lack of majestic, epic or frilly words and the simple, almost plain vocabulary used (especially in the compound-adjectives) means that the language of this text is by no means the protagonist (as it may be in Way's and H.D.'s translation). The linguistic choices made in the construction of this text seem to be motivated by the need to forge an aura of acceptance – the text calls itself a literal rendition, where 'literal' would suggest that the translator is concentrating on content as opposed to form. Yet form cannot be entirely overlooked, of course, and even where lexical and grammatical choices are less overtly 'poetical' in character, we can nevertheless draw some important conclusions from their analysis, conclusions which go some way to suggesting what this text is trying to do.

Arnold's text points throughout to a sense of continuity. The use of the present perfect tense which forms a continuity between past and present signals a text which is concerned with the idea of its own relationship to the past, here specifically a textual past, as contextualised in the line of transmission to which, through its subtle emphasis on acceptance, it seeks to belong. The use of the relative pronoun 'whom' as a conjunction also favours this sense of continuity, and allows the text to flow unbroken between the different situations listed in the song.

The part / whole relationships identified in the word class analysis and the emphasis on belonging (to a city, to one's husband) may also be read, once again, as textual strategies which help build a sense of continuity. The predominance of the pronoun 'of' not only links a pair of nouns, thus locating them in a relationship, it also underlines the idea of an attribute belonging to a whole. A text which seeks to bring emphasis to the part / whole relationship is also concerned with its own position in a part / whole relationship. If this text is attribute, then once again, the whole to which it belongs would be the traditional line of transmission. By emphasising its belonging to the tradition, the text engenders acceptance for itself and thus validation.

The concentration on similarity and thus faithfulness that we identified in the use of the conjunction 'as' ('as our husbands tell us') functions in a similar way. If this text is concerned with notions of faithfulness within itself, on a textual level, then these concerns are relevant on an extra-textual level. The text is a form of interface and the meanings that it produces are projected inwards, into the textual world inhabited by text, author and reader, but also outwards, into the broader discourse to which the text belongs. The linguistic elements characterising the text resonate therefore on both a

textual and an extra-textual level, where extra-textual in this case means the broader literary, social or political discourses engendering the activity of textual production which resulted in texts such as Arnold's being created. To seek to emphasise the idea of faithful rendition internally, here in terms of the choral 'I''s statements being valid because the information actually originated with their husbands, in turn projects the preoccupation with faithfulness onto an extra-textual level. The reader is thus faced with a text which in every way seeks to justify its position in the traditional line of transmission in order to create for itself a stable position within that tradition.

Analysis of A.S. Way's translation

As with the analysis carried out on H.D.'s translation of 'Chorus of the Women of Chalkis', our analysis of A.S. Way's translation of the same segment will cover the following variables: subject; verb; direct/indirect object; preposition; article; pronoun; adjective; adverb; conjunction; punctuation.

Chorus of the Women of Chalkis (trans. A.S. Way, 1912)

1. I have come to the Aulian sea-gulf's verge,
2. To her gleaming sands,
3. I have voyaged Euripos' rushing surge
4. From the city that stands
5. Queen of the Sea-gate, Chalkis mine,
6. On whose bosom-fold
7. Arethusa gleameth, the fountain divine,-
8. Have come to behold
9. The Achaian array, and the heroes' oars
10. That the pine-keels speed
11. Of a thousand galleys to Troyland's shores,
12. Whom the two kings lead, -
13. Who with prince Menelaus the golden-haired,
14. As our own lords say,
15. And with King Agamemnon the high-born, fared
16. On the vengeance-way,
17. On the quest of her whom the herdman drew
18. From beside the river
19. Of whispering reeds, his sin-wage due, -
20. Aphrodite the giver, -
21. Promised, when into the fountain down
22. Spray-veiled she descended,

23. When with Hera and Pallas for beauty's crown
24. The Cyprian contended.

Subject

The most interesting feature with regard to Way's use of subjects in his translation is the absence of the first person pronoun in line 8. In lines 1 and 3 we find the first person pronoun occupying the theme position to recount the voyage to and arrival at Aulis, in line 5 'Chalkis' is described, and 'Arethusa' takes the subject position in line 7. Yet when we arrive at line 8 and find the purpose of the visit being referred to, we would expect to find once again the use of the first person pronoun, as in lines 1 and 3 (to which this line is thematically linked). And yet the subject is absent, the line simply reading: 'Have come to behold'. If we read on, this lack of subject becomes increasingly startling, especially given the fact that what follows is a series of relative and subordinate clauses which depend on line eight's main clause. This absence of the first person pronoun in such a dominant position is on the one hand motivated by the metrical requirement of Way's lyric, yet on the other can be read in terms of its lessening of the impact of the choral 'I'. Way's text finds the first person subject fading to the extent that she (i.e. the female choral voice) blends in with her background; her presence in the text is given no more emphasis than the characters and events recounted.

Verb

The choral 'I' is attributed actions which take place in the present perfect tense. The idea here is that the verbs used (have come [l.1]; have voyaged [l.3]; have come [l.8]) contain the notion of an unfinished action which began in the past and which has repercussions in the present – it is a tense which links past and present in a single action. Clearly this is a relationship-forming tense, and one which can be used to create a sense of fluid chronology and development between a past time and the present.

Archaic words, such as 'gleameth' (l.7) and 'behold' (l.8) function in a similar bridge-building fashion, evoking a sense of past and inserting that past into the present text with a view to making it feel older, more authentic and thus more faithful. These archaic forms also raise the register of the text, giving it an elitist high-art feel, which could be said to lend the text a sense of purity that a lower register may not have,

removing the text from the dangers of contamination or corruption. Contamination and corruption are referenced over and again in the introductions to the translations we collected for our corpus, and the need for a non-corrupted source text and the corresponding desire for purity and faithfulness in the line of transmission is high on the agenda of editors introducing the various translations to their readers (Cartwright 1868; Potter 1887; England 1891; Norwood 1909; Dimock 1978).

Line 10 presents another ambiguity in terms of our word classification, though it is our belief that this ambiguity is far from willed by the translator. The lines 'That the pine-keels speed / Of a thousand galleys to Troyland's shores' indicate that 'speed' should act as a verb associated with the subject 'pine-keels', though this renders the reading of the subsequent phrase rather clumsy. The phrase would indeed read more convincingly if the preposition 'of' were replaced by 'with'. But what if there was a typing error in the 1912 translation obtained for the corpus? If 'pine-keels' is missing an apostrophe, and should in fact read 'pine-keel's' then what currently appears as a verb should in fact be classed as a noun, as in: the pine-keel's speed. At the risk of sounding pedantic, problems like this cannot be overlooked. This is because on the one hand translations of classical Greek texts during the late 19th and early 20th centuries were subject to a highly critical form of reception with critics venomously eager to point out any errors they might have found; indeed, the 1919 edition of H.D.'s 'Choruses' was prefaced by an *Errata* note pasted into the front of each edition (*The Poets' Translation Series*, Second set: no. 3, 1919) correcting the two supposed 'spelling mistakes' which had caused offence to one particular critic (New Age, vol.8, March 1916). On the other hand, this 1912 text is indeed part of the accepted line of transmission (and comes highly commended by important scholars; see, for example, Verrall 1905: v) and this ambiguity – for we daren't say 'error' – represents precisely the kind of contamination that scholars and critics alike were afraid would result from translations being entrusted to non-initiates – that is, those not having the right prerequisites for the job, one of which demanded that the translator be male, another that he be a recognised Greek scholar (see for example the title-pages of Cartwright 1868; Potter 1887; England 1891; Norwood 1909; Dimock 1978 where the translator's name and title are given, followed by a full list of academic merits and qualifications.)

Line 14 presents another interesting point for our analysis. The phrase 'As our own lords say,' assigns, through the verb 'say', the role of witness to the women's husbands, not to the women themselves. The choral 'I' is given the task of coming and

beholding, though it is the husbands who have the authority to narrate and to explain. The women have access to experience, but they do not have the power to directly translate that experience into language, a task reserved for their husbands, or 'lords'. This strategy removes narrative authority and witnessing responsibility from the female choral 'I', who is relegated to the position of secondary witness.

Direct/indirect object

The predominant feature characterising Way's use of direct and indirect objects is the recurrence of the genitive (Sea-gulf-s verge [l.1]; Euripos' (rushing) surge [l.3]; heroes' oars [l.9]; Troyland's shores [l.11]; beauty's crown [l.23]). The genitive is used to indicate possession and together with the reference to 'Chalkis mine' in line 5, the above function according to a logic of relationship-building between elements belonging to the external world. In terms of their assigning of the role of owner and owned, these relationships are hierarchical in nature and serve to bind different aspects of the external world in a network of interconnecting phenomena which is presented to the reader as a harmonious, organic whole. As far as one element belongs to another, it participates in the logic of part/whole which situate parts and attributes in the context of the whole.

A second feature of interest is the feminisation of the speakers' home city of Chalkis, by means of the terms 'Queen' [l.5] and 'bosom-fold' [l.6]. Apart from having a possibly unwanted comical effect, to liken a geographical position to a woman's body, specifically a woman's cleavage, unwittingly conjures up images of softness when the Grecian landscape would more 'faithfully' be described by terms which conjure up its rocky appearance. Once again, however, this reference to a woman's body part taps into the part/whole argument insofar as the term 'bosom-fold' is only meaningful if we know that the term stands for cleavage and as such signals the female body.

Prepositions

The theme of relationship-building can also be detected in Way's use of prepositions. There are five instances of the prepositions 'to' and 'from' being used: 'come to the Aulian sea-gulf's verge' [l.1]; 'to her gleaming sands' [l.2]; 'from the city' [l.4]; 'to Troyland's shores' [l. 11]; 'from beside the river' [l. 18]. In terms of their textual

function these prepositions of movement and direction serve to link two different places (which aren't necessarily both cited) in the logic of a single action or experience. For example, in the first two lines the home city of Chalkis is linked through the use of prepositions to the point of arrival – Aulis – via the verbs of voyage and arrival. Or again, Paris' seduction of Helen is expressed by the notion of him drawing her away *from* the riverside, in order to take her *to* another place. With this joining of departure and arrival points, the world described by the text is presented to the reader as being founded on an inclusive network of interconnecting relationships.

Articles

Our analysis of the use of articles in A.S. Way's translation shows that there is a very high incidence of the definite article – almost every line contains at least one and sometimes two incidences of the word 'the'. If the definite article is used to introduce references to nouns which are already accepted parts of a discourse (i.e., they are not being referenced for the first time), then the effect of such a high number of definite articles in this first chorus is to firmly and confidently situate the text in familiar territory. The text is participating in a discourse that is familiar, already known, and whose components (the characters and places named, in this case) are those of the tradition. To underline the familiarity of the discourse, here, is to emphasise the idea of continuity, a continuity with tradition and with the various familiar components participating in this tradition.

Pronouns

All of the seven pronouns used in Way's translation indicate possession (e.g., 'her' [l. 2]; 'mine' [l.5]; 'our own' [l.14]). Once again, ownership is underlined by these pronouns, the participants in the logic of ownership (owner and owned) being bound one to the other by the stability of this relationship of possession.

Adjectives

The adjectives used in Way's translation can be divided into two categories. In the first we find evocative adjectives (e.g., 'gleaming' [l. 2]; 'rushing' [l.3]) which function in

such a way as to bring texture to the descriptions given. The second category of adjectives is used to signal origins: 'Aulian' [l. 1], 'Achaian' [l. 9] 'divine' [l. 7]'high-born' [l. 15] all speak of derivation and emphasise the notion of identity . The fountain derives from the nymph Arethusa ('divine'), the army is from Greece ('Archaian'), the sea-gulf is part of Aulis ('Aulian'), Agamemnon is of royal blood ('high-born'). Each of the nouns described by these adjectives are identified by their association with a higher identity-category, e.g., Agamemnon / royal family, Achaian array / Greeks, fountain / myth and divinity. In Way's translation, adjectives function in much the same way as the other items discussed above: they stress the theme of belonging and derivation and articulate a situation whereby the singular gains identity through its association with or belonging to a higher identity category.

Adverbs

There are no adverbs in Way's translation.

Conjunctions

We can identify three different sub-categories of conjunctions. The first are relative pronouns which are used to link different parts of the discourse and therefore function as conjunctions. The words 'that' [l. 4]; 'that' [l. 10], 'whom' [l. 12], 'who' [l. 13]; 'whom' [l. 17] all appear at moments in the text where a shift in subject matter or focus takes place. For example line 12 ('whom the two kings lead') can be referenced back across various preceding details (the oars, the ships, their direction) and therefore linked to line 9 ('the Achaian array') thanks to the presence of the relative pronoun. Clearly what we are dealing with here is a connecting device used in order to avoid breaking up the discourse and separating it into finite sections. This means that the text is able to flow freely from beginning to end, with all elements woven seamlessly together into a continuous whole.

The three instances of the conjunction 'and' also emphasise the notion of unity with disparate parts or elements in a discourse being linked together into a continuous unified whole.

The conjunction 'as' in line 14 ('as our own lords say') links the statements preceding the conjunction to the situation described after its appearance. The idea is that

all that has been recounted by the choral voice is equal and identical to that which their husbands have said. The theme of similarity connoted by the word 'as' also underlines the rather more concealed idea of faithfulness. The choral voice faithfully divulges information provided by their husbands and therefore can be trusted not to betray the 'truth'.

Punctuation

Way avoids using full-stops in his opening chorus and this once again helps to create a sense of continuity. Almost every line contains a comma and in some cases a hyphen appears after the comma in order to emphasise the linkedness between two different lines. This double-linking feature is used when ideas or scenes recounted are potentially unrelated, or where the grammatical words needed to link one idea to the next must be left out in order for the metrical pattern to be honoured. An example of this appears in lines 19 to 21 where the hyphen serves to bridge the grammatical and lexical gaps left between lines: '…his sin-wage due,- / Aphrodite the giver, - / Promised,…' . This on the one hand reflects the Euripidean source text in which no line breaks appear, and on the other helps to create the impression of a continuous unified discourse.

Interpretative analysis of textual strategies

On the basis of the observations made above with regard to the micro-structural components of A.S. Way's translation, certain underlying concepts can tentatively be suggested. The first is that Way's text seems to be fuelled by the need to convey a sense of continuity. The use of the present perfect tense favours continuity and contains within itself the commingling of a sense of past and present. If time can be presented as continuous and if past and present can be joined in a single tense, all question of degradation or loss can be eradicated. If past is linked to present then past source text / tradition can be linked to present target text in a relationship founded on continuity and therefore similarity.

Similarity and familiarity are also stressed by Way's translational choices. The dominance of the definite article stresses the familiar, known aspects of the chorus's song. If the chorus's song is familiar, it is so because it has already been sung many times before (tradition) and is like / similar to the song originally sung by Euripides'

chorus (source text). Difference is banished from the scene, and with it all notion of betrayal (of the source text, of the tradition). Similarity is also reinforced by the validating statement in line 14, 'As our own lords say', which once again projects a sense of faithful rendition. Familiarity is signposts throughout the text by the high incidence of definite articles which situate the reader is a conspicuously familiar territory and reference a known world of characters, situations and places with which we are already acquainted. If we are already acquainted with these elements, it is because we are acquainted with the tradition to which they belong. By using such a high number of definite articles, the text teases us into making the link between these recognised elements ('the Achaian array' [l. 9]; 'the city that stands' [l. 4]) and the tradition that contains them. Once this is achieved, the translated text itself is, by extension, itself firmly rooted in the tradition and thus gains validation.

The theme of belonging which, as we have seen, runs through Way's translation. Belonging is signalled by the various relationships which are formed across the disparate elements of the text, from characters to places to objects. The relationships suggested by the adjectives underlining origin, for example, or the part/whole logic suggested by certain of the adjectives used, or the translator's use of possessive pronouns and the way certain prepositions work – all these linguistic choices speak of the theme of belonging which on a textual level create an interconnected harmonious hole and on an extra-textual level suggest that the translated text should not be viewed as separate, finite, or marginal. The target text emphasises belonging within itself in order to emphasise its own sense of belonging – a belonging to the tradition and a belonging to the source text from which it gains its own existence.

Seen together, what these different ideas seem to suggest is that Way's translation is preoccupied with situating itself firmly within the classical line of transmission (tradition) in order to gain validation for what it implicitly claims is a faithful translation of the Euripidean source text.

Similarities found between A.S. Way's text and T.J. Arnold's text

On the basis of our micro-structural analysis of the first chorus we can begin to plot the similarities between the Way text and the Arnold text. We of course do not yet have enough textual evidence to make any firm claims about the nature of the norms

governing the line of Euripidean transmission in the English language at the beginning of the twentieth century as our corpus is too small to be anywhere near exhaustive. What we can do however, is closely analyse Way's text and Arnold's text in such a way as to reveal the similarities that unite them; to talk in cautious terms of similarities rather than norms at this early point in the research would certainly seem more appropriate. So the fact that these two texts, subtracted from the accepted line of transmission, present a range of similarities should be evidence enough at this point in our research to allow us to make some tentative claims about how H.D.'s text is a 'different' text and why she might have made it different.

In brief, whilst the two texts would appear to belong to two different sub-genres within the line of transmission, Way's text falling into the category of poetic translation and Arnold's into that of literal translation, both texts highlight certain common themes. Continuity is possibly the most obvious of these themes. Continuity exists in the use of the present perfect tense as we have seen; it is also promoted by the relative pronoun conjunctions which both translators use, and by the measured use of the first person subject pronoun 'I' which if repeated with each verb would introduce a fragmented discourse. Both texts use punctuation to accentuate the movement and flow of the language and neither favours the breaking up of the chorus into segments or sections. Arnold stresses continuity also through his use of durational forms.

The second broad category of similarity between the two texts is their stress on faithfulness as connoted by the validating statement referring to the women's husbands. Both texts underline the fact that the women's knowledge is not first hand, that all description and details originated with their husbands. On the one hand, the conjunction 'as' (found in both texts) can be interpreted as a means to underline the faithfulness of the women's account (where 'as' functions as a sort of verbal equals sign balancing two sides of an equation), and on the other it removes direct witnessing potential and responsibility from the women of the chorus. They are second hand witnesses; they can comment on reality but cannot participate directly in it – direct participation, even in the form of observation (where observing is participating), is reserved not for women but for men. One consequence of the inclusion of this phrase is the weakening of the presence of the choral 'I': the choral voice is not continuously referred to in the first person, not is it awarded prime witnessing or recounting responsibility, so it slips from our attention as we focus on the objects and characters and events being narrated. The

choral 'I' in these texts is therefore not an intrusive 'I'; it is a disembodied voice more at home in rhetoric than in a concrete physical space.

Relationships are also overtly expressed in both texts. Where Arnold uses the preposition 'of' to link nouns in a relationship of part/whole and belonging, Way often uses the genitive to signal a similar form of ownership relation: 'I have come to the Aulian sea-gulf's verge' (Way); 'I have come to the sandy shore of sea-washed Aulis' (Arnold). Part-whole relationships and the emphasis on origins and belonging take on an important position in the inter-textual dialogue existing between target text and the line of transmission on the one hand, and target texts and the Euripidean source text on the other. One effect of this might be the forging of links and thus the positioning of the target text within (as opposed to beyond) the accepted line of tradition which of course originates, or ends, with the Euripidean source text.

Finally, the interrelated themes of similarity and familiarity are common to both translations. That nothing should appear as difference engenders acceptance to the extent that it is easier to accept that which is familiar than that which is strange; this once more strengthens the notion of tradition and helps to characterise these texts as being 'similar' to the original, i.e., faithful, and thus valid.

Comparative Analysis

Having firstly carried out a micro-structural linguistic analysis of the three translations in order to determine what sort of textual strategies might characterise each of the texts, and having then sketched the similarities that exist between Way's text and Arnold's text, we now have enough information to begin the comparative analysis. To facilitate the comparative analysis, we will map A. S. Way's text and T. J. Arnold's text onto H.D.'s text in order to compare like segments:

Way's text and Arnold's text mapped onto H.D.'s text

First line = HD   second line = Arnold   third line = A.S. Way

1. I crossed sand-hills.
    I have come to the sandy shore
    I have come to the Aulian sea-gulf's verge,

2. I stand among the sea-drift before Aulis.
of sea-washed Aulis,
To her gleaming sands,

3. I crossed Euripos' strait –

4. Foam hissed after my boat.
sailing through the waters of Euripus, (3-4)
I have voyaged Euripos' rushing surge (HD3-4)

5. I left Chalkis,
leaving Calchis
Queen of the Sea-gate, Chalkis mine,

6. My city and the rock-ledges.
my own city on the narrow sea,
From the city that stands

7. Arethusa twists among the boulders,
nurse of the seaside waters of famed Arethusa, (7-8)
Arethusa gleameth, the fountain divine,-

8. Increases – cuts into the surf.
On whose bosom-fold

9. I come to see the battle-line
to see the Grecian host
Have come to behold

10. And the ships rowed here
and sea-crossing galleys

11. By these spirits –

12. The Greeks are but half-man.
of the young warriors, (11-12)

13. Golden Menelaus
whom, as our husbands tell us, (HD0) Menelaus
Who with prince Menelaus the golden-haired, / As our own lords say, (HD0)

14. And Agamemnon of proud birth
and high-born Agamemnon
And with King Agamemnon the high-born, fared

15. Direct the thousand ships.
Of a thousand galleys to Troyland's shores, / Whom the two kings lead, -

16. They have cut pine-trees

That the pine-keels speed

17. For their oars.
The Achaian array, and the heroes' oars

18. They have gathered the ships for one purpose:
are bringing (15,16,17,18)
On the vengeance-way,

19. Helen shall return.
in search of Helen,
On the quest of her whom the herdman drew

20. There are clumps of marsh-reed

21. And spear-grass about the strait.
from reed-bordered (20-21)   Eurotas – (HD0)
Of whispering reeds, his sin-wage due, - (HD20-21)

22. Paris the herdsman passed through them
whom the herdsman Paris
From beside the river (HD20, 21, 22)

23. When he took Helen – Aphrodite's gift.
took away / the gift of Venus,
Aphrodite the giver, -

24. For he had judged the goddess
When with Hera and Pallas for beauty's crown (HD24,25,26)

25. More beautiful than Hera.

26. Pallas was no longer radiant
when the Cyprian Goddess had a rivalry of beauty – a strife with Juno and Pallas
(24-25-26)
The Cyprian contended. (HD24,25,26)

27. As the three stood

28. Among the fresh-shallows of the strait.
at the fountain. (27-28)
Promised, when into the fountain down / Spray-veiled she descended,

        We already know from the micro-structural analysis carried out on the individual texts that Way's translation and Arnold's translation share various characteristics. H.D.'s translation, however, seems to be governed by a wholly different set of exigencies. Yet in order to prove this we need now to carry out the comparative analysis and to identify the shifts in H.D.'s translation. Once these have been identified, we can

then map these shifts against the Euripidean source text in order to measure the extent to which H.D.'s 'norm-breaking' strategies (or 'similarity-breaking' strategies) were motivated by a greater attention or sensitivity to the Greek text. Finally we need to interrogate these shifts in order to suggest what might have motivated the differences we have found; in other words we will be looking for what Pym calls an 'explanatory narrative' (Pym 1992: 221). At this point, returning to our hypothesis, we would expect to find that where H.D.'s text diverges from Way's and Arnold's texts the differences identified can be explained by the poet's desire to give priority to the expression of a particular aesthetical position. We would also expect to find that gender issues are less of a concern at this early stage in her career, when, as we have argued, H.D. was using translation as a training ground and was principally concerned with developing an authoritative poetic voice.

Shifts

The principle shifts can be categorised into three classes: a) zero reproduction (where H.D. does not reproduce a meaning that the other two texts do reproduce); b) expansion (where H.D.'s text is more expansive then the other two texts); c) interpretative differences (where H.D.'s text appears to be interpreting in a different way meanings that can also be found in Way and Arnold). The shifts present in H.D.'s text will then be mapped back onto the Eurpidean source text. For the purposes of this study, which must necessarily be brief, we will examine the variables of zero production and expansion. The Euripidean source text follows:

Chorus of the Women of Chalkis (Euripides, Ed. Gilbert Murray, 1913)

Choros

1. emolon amphi paraktian
2. psamathon Aulidos enalias,
3. Euripou dia cheumatôn
4. kelsasa stenoporthmôn,
5. Chalkida polin eman prolipous',
6. anchialôn hudatôn trophon
7. tas kleinas Arethousas,
8. Achaiôn stratian hôs esidoiman
9. Achaiôn te platas nausiporous hê-
10. mitheôn, hous epi Troian

11. elatais chilionausin
12. ton xanthon Menelaon th'
13. hameteroi poseis
14. enepous' Agamemnona t' eupatridan
15. stellein epi tan Helenan, ap'
16. Eurôta donakotrophou
17. Paris ho boukolos han elabe
18. dôron tas Aphroditas,
19. hot' epi krênaiaisi drosois
20. Hêrai Palladi t' erin erin
21. morphas ha Kupris eschen.

Zero reproduction

Both the Way text ('As our own lords say') and the Arnold text ('as our husbands tell us') make reference to the husbands recounting descriptions to their wives. If we analyse the Euripidean source text we find the words: 'hameteroi posies enepous' (l. 176-177). The roots of these words are *posis* meaning 'husband'; *hemeteros* meaning 'our'; and *enepo*, meaning 'to tell, tell of, relate, describe'. H.D.'s text therefore deviates from the Way and Arnold texts, as well as from the Euripidean source text, when she omits this expression. This is therefore a valid and meaningful shift which we can read, as already suggested, as an attempt to claim for the choral 'I' primary witnessing potential and the permission to act as sole narrator bridging the space between the spectator/reader and the maritime scene observed. This would clearly have great significance on an extra-textual level for a young writer concerned with questions of poetic authority. To claim the right to witness directly and to express directly is to claim a space for one's own personal poetic vision. This tactic of suppression then can be read as a way of validating the voice of the female witnessing 'I'. It gives authority to that voice and allows it both to participate directly in the construction of the narrative recounted and to express personal, individual and unmediated meanings to her spectator/reader.

Expansion

The first shift we notice is H.D.'s repetition of the first person subject 'I'; indeed where the other two translators both make one or two references to the pronoun 'I', H.D. uses this pronoun five times. If we examine the source text we find that this repetition of the first person pronoun is not directly implied in the Greek; in fact, Arnold's version seems to be the closest rendition in its non-repetition. However, a close analysis of the verb

'emolon' reveals it as being aorist, indicative, active and as implying both the third person plural and first person singular subjects. H.D.'s repetition of the subject 'I' could therefore be an attempt to recognise the plurivocal subject position suggested indirectly by the mingling of singular and plural voices implied by 'emolon'; it also responds to the indicative aspect which emphasises the active voice where the subject is the agent of the action. So H.D.'s choice, despite being different from those of Way and Arnold, can in fact be corroborated by the source text. H.D.'s text underlines the non-unitary nature of the choral voice and with each repetition of the 'I' she not only fragments that plurivocality into its constituent parts in order to examine each separately (by allotting each repetition of the subject its own finite verb), she also re-emphasizes agency and the active (not passive) subject. What all this suggests therefore is that the dominant readings in the dominant tradition of transmission have deliberately chosen not to emphasise the plurivocal nature of the voice, they have not emphasised its active nature and they have generally reduced the force of the choral 'I''s textual presence – tactics which H.D. has revised in her own translation, restoring to this female chorus a powerful, expressive, narrating voice.

H.D.'s tense expansion must also be mapped back to the Greek. Where Way and Arnold both favour the present perfect tense, H.D. chooses to step between the simple past and present tenses. If we analyse the tense used in the source text, we find that 'emolon' (l.1) can be read as an instance of the specific aorist which denotes a simple action in the past or of the gnomic aorist which is used to express a general truth and should thus be translated by the present tense. It would seem therefore that Way and Arnold were both favouring a personal agenda when they stressed harmony and continuity over accuracy to the source text – the present perfect tense obviously reads more harmoniously and would seem more appropriate from the point of view of English grammar, but it is not stated in the Greek. H.D.'s juxtaposition of simple past and present tenses in the first stanza draws attention to itself, to itself as form, because it sounds awkward, rigid, and subverts the grammatical logic of the English construction. And yet in reading the double tense possibility inherent in the Greek, H.D. captures more faithfully the implications of the Greek text and allows the spectator/reader to experience time differently – in a sense, she is leading us towards a Greek concept and experience of time, one which is alien to our English grammar and which, ultimately, undermines the temporal suppositions (e.g. that time is chronological, that we are moving forward through time, etc) underpinning perception. This revisionist approach

to the theories of time and how we experience time clearly taps into the Bergson discourse which H.D. was exposed to, predominantly via T.E. Hulme who began studying Bergson in 1907 (Jones 1972: 15) and who was writing his 'Bergson's theory of art' in 1913-1914.

Finally, why would H.D. chose to represent the action of the choral 'I' with two different verbs – 'I crossed' and 'I stand' – when Way and Arnold reproduce the meaning with the verb 'to come'? The answer to this probably lies in the fact that the Greek emphasises a spatial quality 'emolon amphi paraktian' (line 1) where 'amphi' can be interpreted as 'on both sides'. Thus 'emolon amphi' gives us an idea of time, of the nature of the action, but also of the spatial nature of that action, i.e., its being undertaken in, over or across a space which is delineated by two sides. H.D.'s decision to express this circumstance with the verb 'cross' captures both the spatial quality of 'amphi' and the action of leaving one place and arriving at another expressed by 'emolon'. Way and Arnold fail to capture this. 'I have come' introduces more of an abstract, almost rhetorical journey whose emphasis lies not in the space traversed but in the sense of arrival implied by 'come'. Both Way and Arnold further reduce the spatial aspect of the journey (and hence its physicality, its concreteness) by linking 'I have come' with a reference to purpose: in Way we find 'Have come to behold' (line 8) and in Arnold we find 'come [l.1]… to see [l. 7]'. This almost completely eliminates the physicality of the action, debasing the verb 'come' to its grammatical function as implied by the construction 'come + to + verb'. 'Come' in both Way and Arnold thus has a rhetorical, conceptual role as opposed to signalling a concrete physical action characterised by a spatial dimension. What H.D.'s translation does, therefore, is to reinstate the spatial and thus the physical; she pauses on the materiality of the language, transmits a sense of the concrete, sensuous experience that the Greek text evokes. The language of the chorus is transformed into (or reinstated as) experience, something that can be felt – it speaks not just to the rational mind but also to that part of us that responds to materiality, that experiences the physicality not only of the external world but also of the language we use to express that external world.

The next expansion that we find in our mapped document appears in H.D.'s second stanza where she pauses on the physical description of Chalkis and the landscape surrounding the Arethusa sping: 'My city and the rock-ledges. / Arethusa twists among the boulders' (lines 6-7). Neither Way nor Arnold present us with this topographical detail, so why does H.D. seek to emphasise the rocky landscape? Part of

the answer can be found in the introductory note to the translation published in the Poets Translation Series No. 3, where the writer (H.D. presumably) refers to the rocky quality of Eurpides' lyricism. If form and content merge in the imagist poem, it should be no surprise to find direct correspondences between the rocky quality of the form (which H.D. recaptures with her stark plain language and short, fragmented lines) and the rocky surroundings of the city described. The Greek source text reads: 'Chalkida polin eman prolipous' anchialon hudaton trophon tas kleinas Arethousas'; the only mention of physical topographical detail here is contained in 'anchialon' (*anchialos* - near the sea) and 'hudaton' (*hudor* – water) and 'trophon' (*trophos* – a feeder, rearer, nurse) which suggests a spatial configuration that positions Chalkis in relation to Arethusa via the rearing metaphor which Way and Arnold both decide to relay with the feminine: 'nurse' (Arnold l.6); 'Queen' (Way l. 5), 'bosom-fold' (Way l. 6). Way is clearly intent on viewing the Greek through the exaggeratedly grandiose and yet distorting telescope of Empire. Where the source text implies fame, Way raises the status of the spring to the level of divinity and his rendition of these lines swathes the images in the pompous regalia of regency and deity ('Queen', 'fountain divine' [l. 7]) which is firmly bound to and acts as an attribute of the choral 'I' via the presence of the ownership alluded to in 'Chalkis mine' (l. 5). This of course is Empire talking to Empire where ownership means power, and there is no little sense of gloating arrogance in the gratuitous inclusion of the overtly showy 'gleameth'. Arnold emphasises the aqueous quality of the space, as does the source text – both allude to water twice, while H.D. makes only one allusion to water ('cuts into the surf' [l. 8]). Her Chalkis, the hometown which the choral 'I' has forsaken, abandoned ('prolipous') is a different kind of city then, not a city linked to water, but a city characterised by a granite quality. That her choice finds no correspondence in the source text leads us to presume that this translation solution was strongly motivated by her imagist aesthetics. Indeed, for the sculpted poetic form to be such, the artist needs a material to sculpt from. The rock-ledges and boulders provide this material, which the poet then uses to sculpt an experience that resonates in the reader's intuition. This experience is sensory in nature and is founded on the juxtapositional dissonant relationship that H.D. configures between water ('surf') and rock. It is through this fusion of fluid with solid that we are able to experience, intuitively, these elements. It is the setting of one beside the other in the reader's mind that releases the sensory experience of the image. Imagist poetics requires concentration on the material, concrete, non-infinite qualities of the external world and must aspire to

the form of 'dry hard classical verse' in order to counter what the imagists saw as the sentimental 'moaning or whining' of Romanticism (Hulme 1936: 126). In countering the fluidity of water-images with rock and boulders, H.D. also defends her poetry from accusations that she might not be as modern as she ought to be; she was, after all, seen by many as the original 'Imagiste', and necessarily bore all the responsibility that this identity conferred on her.

H.D.'s reference to spirits is absent from both Way's translation and that of Arnold. Way calls the Grecians 'heroes' (his epic tones tending towards the superlative, as is becoming of Empire) whilst Arnold refers to 'warriors' (l. 9). H.D.'s reference reads: '…ships rowed here / By these spirits / The Greeks are but half-man. (lines 10 – 12). If we trace this back to Euripides' source text, we find the reference to 'hemitheon' (*hemitheos* – half-god, demigod). Of the three then, H.D. is the only translator who allows the esoteric occult or transcendental connotations referenced by this word to enter her text. The rationalism encountered in Way and Arnold gives way in H.D. to a mysticism that openly interrogates the visionary alongside the concrete. Freidman states that H.D.'s fascination with visionary experience began when she met Frances Gregg in the late 1910s (Friedman 1987: 156) and she explores the links that existed for H.D. between the visionary and psychoanalysis. H.D. had several occult experiences during her life and one of the reasons for her turning to psychoanalytic therapy with Freud in the 1930s was to find a way of translating what she called her psychic or occult experiences into art (Friedman 1987: 159). In pausing on the mystical aspect of Agamemnon's warriors, H.D. finds in Euripides an external, authoritative source for her own interest in the occult, psychoanalysis and the non-rational and in so-doing authorises a vision that clearly has no place in traditional transmission.

The final instance of obvious expansion we find in the mapped texts is H.D.'s line 'As the three stood' at the end of this first chorus section. H.D. explores this image to greater depth than do either Way or Arnold; she pauses on the moment, on the visual picture of the three goddesses' physical position, or spatial configuration, as they stand 'among the fresh-shallows of the strait'. Arnold favours the plainer 'when the Cyprian Goddess had a rivalry of beauty – a strife with Juno and Pallas at the fountain' (l. 21) and Way gives the grandiose rendition: '…when into the fountain down / Spray-veiled she descended / when with Hera and Pallas for beauty's crown / The Cyprian contended' (lines 21-23). The Greek reads: 'Aphroditas, hot'epi krenaiaisi drosois Herai Palladi t'erin erin morphas ha Kupris eschen'. Both Way and Arnold give the

nationality identifier implied by 'kupris', Arnold maintains the emphasis contained in the repetition of 'erin erin' with 'strife' and 'rivalry', and Way reads the idea of Aphrodite being covered with dew into the phrase 'hot'epi krenaiaisi drosois'. *Drosois* however is an instance of the plural feminine dative and would suggest that all three Goddesses are covered with spray or dew, and this might partly justify H.D. situating all three in the 'fresh-shallows of the strait'. The most important feature here however is H.D.'s removal of the three figures from the fountain in order to reposition them in the strait of Euripos referenced at the beginning of the song. A review of this translation appearing in the March 30 issue of *New Age* in 1916 ridiculed H.D.'s 'over-working' of the strait of Euripos:

> Not only do the women of Chalkis cross it, 'leaving behind their city and the rock-ledges' (whatever these may be), but Paris passes through it to Helen and Sparta and apparently judges the Goddesses there as they stand 'in the fresh shallows of the strait' – no wonder 'Pallas was no longer radiant'! But… the water of the fountain where the judgement takes place, is, of course, in 'many-fountained Ida' as H.D. himself (*sic*.) recognises in the second chorus. (*New Age*, Vol.8. March 30, 1916)

This displacement is clearly a deliberate move on H.D.'s part. But what does it mean for a translator to reposition in such an accentuated fashion, to resituate an event which the source text (and myth) clearly says takes place at the fountain? In one sense this could be read as H.D. claiming for herself as translator the right to revise, the right to enter into a dialogue with the source author, and the right to alter myth, to rewrite myth from her own perspective. Such a revisionist approach to myth was to become a recurring theme throughout H.D.'s work and one which is eloquently investigated by Raffaella Baccolini (1995). Focussing on H.D.'s revisionist mythmaking and the autobiographical use of mythic masks prevalent in her late poetry, Baccolini argues that H.D. exposed classical myths as being quintessentially patriarchal in nature and responsible for the problematic construction of gender identities that early twentieth century writers inherited via the canon. 'Her transformations of myths entail a critique of patriarchy from a woman's perspective' (Baccolini 1995: 15). Rather than revise gender identity here, though, H.D. is revising topographical detail and the spatial configuration in which action takes place. Place and space, as we have seen, are features which H.D.

continually emphasises in her translation. To create a tangible, material space corresponds with the imagist programme of avoiding all non-concrete, sentimental and infinity-directed images which Hulme identifies with Romantic decadence (1936: 116). Space is also the context in which objects exist. For the imagists, authentic feeling was the result of a direct perception of, or relationship with, the real; William Carlos Williams states: 'no ideas but in things' (cit. Jones 1972: 37). If the impersonality of things and objects of the concrete external world are the focus of poetry, then to develop the notion of space means to construct and identify a context in which these objects can exist. The creation of this tangible context, or space, enables the reader to draw close to the 'thing'; we travel through that space, our minds attaching themselves to the various things / objects inhabiting it, and the numerous prepositions that we find help us to position ourselves, to find a footing as it were, to trace the spatial configuration that coordinates our relationship to the thing. If each thing evoked is like a word, then the space moulded around that thing is equivalent to form. 'The image itself is speech' says Pound in the Fortnightly Review in September 1914; 'The point of Imagisme is that it does not use images as ornaments' (*ibid.*). It is when these elements converge on a sensory, intellectual and emotional level that we are able to perceive the image, when the external objective thing darts into an internal and subjective thing. 'Poetry has to be something more than a conception of the mind', says Wallace Stephens in his notebook *Adagia* (written between 1930 and 1955); 'It has to be a revelation of nature. Conceptions are artificial. Perceptions are essential'(cit. Jones 1972: 37). H.D.'s ability to conceive of 'things' and to conceive of a form for these things was praised by her fellow imagists. Aldington said her poetry had 'a kind of accurate mystery' (cit. Jones 1972: 36) whilst Flint claimed that 'the form of her poems seems to me to be so inevitable that those who cannot accept it had better move on' (cit. Jones 1972: 33). Norman N. Holland writing in 1969 on H.D.'s relationship with Freud talks of her 'remarkable ability (and defensive need) to recreate the touch and feel of various objects; she is much less able to recreate people… H.D. was above all a poet of the thingness of things' (cit. Jones 1972 37).

So H.D. constructs a new space, the 'fresh-shallows' of the strait, in which to position her three goddesses. This new space though of course is not a new space but rather a space of return; we find ourselves returning to what has become an emblematic space which facilitates the configuring of relationships between the choral 'I' (who

travelled through it), Paris (who passed by it on his way to Helen) and the three goddesses (whose beauty was judged there).

Another explanation for H.D.'s non reproduction of the fountain may have something to do with the representational significance of the fountain to Victorian Hellenists (e.g. as figured in Pre-Raphaelite paintings). This may have been a problematic visual image for H.D. who was seeking to apply the tough, straight-talking, anti-sentimental non-rhetoric of the imagists. In the February 1914 issue of *Egoist,* Pound attacked a critical 'anonymous reader' for expressing 'Paterine sentimenalesque Hellenism'. This anonymous reader was probably Aldington who, in the January 1914 issues, had identified Hellenic ideals of art with late-Romanticism (as professed by Rossetti and Pater) and attacked imagism on the grounds of its being 'unHellenic and …unhealthy' (cit. Gregory 1997: 44). If the image of the fountain is seen to be associated with paterine Hellenism, which of course was synonymous with the effeminate 'wailing' poetry that Pound and Hulme so virulently abhorred, then H.D.'s removal of the fountain may be read as a means of distancing herself from the Romantic, and now discredited, position.

Conclusions

The Goddesses, then, are displaced by this revisionist translator who claims for herself not only the right to revise the spatial detail and place of myth, but also the right to make her own presence as reader / translator / authoritative poet emerge through these overt interventions. In doing so, she anticipates by many decades what would come to be an acceptable view of the translator as subjective interpreter and active meaning-maker, and her translations transcend the binary prescriptive logic of fidelity vs. betrayal that paralyses translated texts and cripples the translation process. As we can see from the brief examination of this translation, in claiming for herself the right to re-write myth and tradition, to intervene creatively in the process of textual production and transmission, she operates a sort of palimpsestic approach which entails a placing of one text over another and the inevitable re-writing of the new over the original. Indeed, it is our suspicion that this claiming of the right to creatively intervene is a theme that will become increasingly prevalent in H.D.'s translations. Creative intervention can be detected on a textual level where H.D. signals her own presence via re-writings, re-

working and other significant shifts, but it can also be read in terms of her claiming the right to intervene in and position herself within the line of transmission and the poetic cannon itself. What we would expect to find therefore, in our research of later translations undertaken by H.D., is that her translations and her 'original' work (prose and poetry) begin to undermine the very categories of 'original' and 'reproduction' to the extent that these strict classifications collapse in front of a textual output which both is and isn't original, is and isn't reproduction. The liminal, marginal position which she inhabited at the start of her career (due to her lack of acceptable credentials – gender, age, nationality, education) was destabilising enough for the poet to seek to obliterate or at least conceal her true identity; in changing her name (or allowing Pound to change it) from Hilda Doolittle to the gender-less, character-less, age-less, nationality-less 'H.D.', she invented for herself the mask of neutrality and anonymity that allowed her passage into spaces traditionally hostile to young, inexperienced, American women writers. Yet through the transformative power of her writing, she was able to turn this marginality into an asset. By deliberately positioning herself on the boundaries of a tradition that was to alternately accept and reject her, in an in-between space that confounded binary logic, she successfully subverted the definitions by which that tradition organised itself.

A measure of her 'successful' subversion is the critical response to her work; the initial critical acclaim that she received in her early career was quickly replaced by what in some cases verged on intimate hatred from the likes of critics such as Douglas Bush who interpreted her challenging, difficult, misbehaving poetics as a personal insult and a threat to the very precepts of the tradition which validated their existence - as critics or writers, as men, as authoritative figures inhabiting particular positions of power in a hierarchically organised structure. H.D.'s translations, as we have seen from this case study, are not obedient translations seeking to obey the laws of faithfulness; they are the site of dialogue (with Eurpides, with the tradition), of experimentation (for her imagist aesthetics) but most importantly at this early stage of her career, they are sites of validation where the marginal poetic voice seeks and would seem to gain authority for her personal aesthetic commitment.

We now need to return to our opening hypothesis, that H.D. broke with the prevailing norms of classical transmission, and decide whether or not we have been able to prove its validity. The comparative analysis of the Way text and the Arnold text did reveal some interesting similarities, themes underpinning the linguistic features present, which would suggest that the two translators were responding to varying degrees to a

certain unwritten agenda or norm scheme that contextualised the desire to belong to a tradition. H.D.'s text is a 'different' text because it seems at no point to be conversing with tradition; both Way's text and Arnold's text conceal within themselves an implicit dialogue with classical transmission which guarantees the texts' validation in terms of their being allotted a position within that tradition. H.D.'s text would appear on no level to be concerned with conversing with tradition and addresses Euripides directly, or his source text directly, when making her linguistic choices. Her shifts (from Way and Arnold) in many cases were less instances of 'betrayal' than instances of super-honesty and she has no qualms about going against the grain of tradition in order to capture and relay, for example, the fragmented epithet-like quality of the source text's language, or the different conceptual frames that underpin its grammar (e.g. the fact that 'emolon' can refer at the same time to the singular and plural voice). Though H.D. is no servant of the original; the brave subversion of linguistic, grammatical or norm systems in order to capture what would appear to English readers as incongruous thematic or linguistic features in the source text is balanced by a brazen disregard for faithfulness when H.D.'s own aesthetic or thematic exigencies outweigh those of the source text. And it would seem from our study that it is H.D.'s aesthetic concerns which motivate both the shifts away from transmissional norms and her divergences away from the source text. Therefore we can say at this point, keeping in mind all the limitations implied by such a limited study, that our hypothesis seems to hold true, at least for the material here analysed.

Research problems

The research problems encountered fall into two categories: those resulting from the present case study, and those which we envisage as presenting problems for the thesis in general.

The first problem arouse from the fact that we do not know which previous translations H.D. consulted while she was carrying out her own translation. In order to determine whether H.D. was really responsible for the shifts we encountered we would need to make sure that these shifts are not present in the existing translations that she worked from. In order to assess her readings of the source text, we would also need to know what language aids and dictionaries she used in order to clarify the Greek.

Establishing transmissional norms was also problematic, given that we could only analyse two texts which was an insufficient spread.

Another problem regards text analysis. We would certainly need to cut down on variables for analysis in the initial stages of study – analysing ten linguistic variables was too broad a scope. We might want to examine only the linguistic variables of verbs and prepositions, given that the most important observations we made were generally linked to these.

In terms of the broader research problems, the first is connected to the fact that almost no research has yet been done into this area. This means that much of our research will have to be carried out at the Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library at Yale University. This will entail the raising of funds to cover expenses.

References

Babcock, Robert G. 1995. 'Verses, Translations and Reflections from The Anthology: H.D., Ezra Pound, and the Greek Anthology.' in *Sagetrieb* Vol. 14, Nos. 1 & 2. (Spring and Fall 1995). 201 – 216.

Baccolini, Raffaella. 1995. *Tradition. Identity. Desire. Revisionist Strategies in H.D.'s Late Poetry.* Bologna: Patron Editore.

Bachmann, Ingeborg. 1993/1980. *Letteratura come utopia. Lezioni di Francoforte.* Milano: Adelphi Edizioni SpA.

Barbour, Amy L. 1924. 'Introduction' in Euripides / Newhall, J. P. Iphigenia *at Aulis / Iphigenia among the Taurians. The Lyric Portions set to music.* Boston: C.W. Thompson & Co.

Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane (Eds.) 1976. *Modernism. A guide to European literature 1890-1930.* London: Penguin.

Bush, Douglas. 1937 / 1969. *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Camboni, Maria. (Ed.) 2003. *H.D.'s Poetry. The meaning that words hide*. New York: AMS Press.

Cartwright, J. 1868. 'Preface' in *Translations from Euripides*. London: D. Nutt & Co.

Collecott, Diana. 1999. *H.D. and Sapphic Modernism.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Conrad, Joseph. 1902. *Heart of Darkness.* London: Penguin.

Dimock, George E. 1978. 'Introduction' to *Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis*. New York: Oxford U.P.

DuPlessis, Rachel Balu. 1986. *H.D. The career of that struggle*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP.

Eliot, T.S. *The Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*. Edited by Frank Kermode. London: Faber and Faber.

Eliot, TS. 1922. 'Euripides and Professor Murray'. In *The Sacred Wood. Essays on Poetry and criticism*. 71-77.

Eliot, TS. 1917. 'Reflections on *Vers Libre.' New Statesman*. March 3rd 1917. 518-519

Eliot, T.S. 1917. *Ezra Pound. His metric and poetry*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Eliot, T.S. 1938. *Anabasis*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

England, E.B. 1891. 'Introduction' in *The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Euripides/Lumley, Lady (trans). 1550?/1909. *Iphigenia at Aulis*. London: The Malone Society Reprint.

Euripides / Cartwright, J. (trans.). 1868. *Translations from Euripides*. London: D. Nutt & Co.

Euripides / Arnold, T. J. (trans.). 1884. *Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulis*. Kelly's keys to the classics series. London: James Cornish & Sons.

Euripides / Leconte de Lisle (trans.). *Euripide*. 1884. Paris, Alphonse Lemerre Editeur.

Euripides / Potter, Robert (trans.). 1887. *Alcestis and Other Plays by Euripides*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

Euripides / Cudworth (trans.) 1889. *The Iphigeneia in Aulis of Euripides*. Darlington: William Dresser.

Euripides / England, E.B. (trans.) 1891. *The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Euripides / Norwood (trans.). 1909. *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Ed. G. Norwood. London: Sherratt and Hughes.

Euripides / Way, Arthur S (trans.). 1912. *Euripides in four volumes*. London: William Heinemann.

Euripides / Way, Arthur S. (trans.) 1912. *Euripides: Plays.* London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Euripides. 1913. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Gilbert Murray ed, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Euripides / Newhall, J. P. (composer). 1924. Iphigenia *at Aulis / Iphigenia among the Taurians. The Lyric Portions set to music.* Boston: C.W. Thompson & Co.

Euripides / Way, Arthur S. (trans.). 1956. Everyman Library Euripides' plays in two volumes. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Euripides / Merwin W.S. and Dimock, G.E. (trans.) 1978. *Iphigeneia at Aulis.* New York: Oxford U.P.

Euripides / Davie, John (trans.). 2005. *The Bacchae and other plays.* London: Penguin.

Faulkner, Peter. 1986. *A Modernist Reader. Modernism in England, 1910-1930.* London: Batsford.

Faulkner, William. 1996. *As I lay Dying.* London: Vintage.

Foley, Helene P. 1985. *Ritual Irony: Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. 1981. *Psyche Reborn: The emergence of HD.* Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. 1990. *Penelope's Web. Gender, Modernity, H.D.'s fiction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grene, David and Richmond Lattimore. (Eds.) 1991. *Greek Tragedies. Volume One.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gregory, Eileen. 1995. 'Euripides and H.D.'s working notebook for *Helen in Egypt*' in *Sagetrieb* Vol. 14, Numbers 1 & 2 (Spring and Fall 1995). 83 – 100.

Gregory, Eileen. 1997. *H.D. and Hellenism: Classic lines.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

H.D. 1915. 'Choruses from the Iphigeneia in Aulis' in *The Poets Translation Series.* No. 3, pp. 1 – 10.

H.D. 1919. *Choruses from the Iphigeneia in Aulis and the Hippolytus of Euripides.* London: The Egoist Ltd.

H.D. 1979. *An End to Torment: A memoir of Ezra Pound.* New York: New Directions.

H.D. 1981. *HERmione.* (1926-7) New York: New Directions.

H.D. 1983. *Collected Poems.* 1912 – 1944. Edited by Louis L. Martz. New York: New Directions.

H.D. 1988. *Selected Poems.* Edited by Louis L. Martz. New York: New Directions.

H.D. 1988. 'Notes on the translation of Euripides' *Ion*' in *Selected Poems.* New York: New Directions.

H.D. 1937. *Euripides' Ion.* London: Chatto & Windus.

H.D. 1983. *Bid me to Live: A Madrigal.* Connecticut: Black Swan.

Hollenberg, Donna K. 1991 *H.D.: The Poetics of Childbirth and Creativity*. Boston: Northeastern U.P.

Hollenberg, Donna K. (ed.). 2000. *H.D. and poets after.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Homans, Margaret. 1980. *Women writers and poetic identity: Dorothy Wordsworth, Emily Bronte and Emily Dickinson.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hough, Graham. 1976. 'The Modernist Lyric' in Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (Eds.) 1976. *Modernism. A guide to European literature 1890-1930.* London: Penguin. 312-322.

Hughes, Glenn. 1931. *Imagism and the Imagistes*. Standford University Press.

Hulme T.E. 1936. 'Romanticism and Classicism.' In *Speculations Essays on humanism and the philosophy of art.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 113 – 140.

Hulme, T.E. 1936. 'Modern Art and its philosophy'. In *Speculations. Essays on humanism and the philosophy of art.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 75-103.

Hulme, T.E. 1936. 'Bergson's theory of art'. In *Speculations. Essays on humanism and the philosophy of art*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 143-169.

Johnson, W.R. 1982. *The Idea of the Lyric. Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jones, Peter. 1972. 'Introduction.' In *Imagist Poetry*, P. Jones (ed.) London: Penguin. 13 – 42.

Kenner, Hugh. 1971. *The Pound era*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Laity, Cassandra. 1996. *H.D. and the Victorian fin de siècle. Gender, Modernism and Decadence.* Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.

Loeb, James. 1912. 'Introduction' in *Euripides in four volumes*. London: William Heinemann.

Longenbach, James. 1991. 'Modern Poetry.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*, M. Levenson (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 100 – 129.

Mackail, J.W. 1911. *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. 3rd edition. New York: Longmans.

McLeish, Kenneth. 1997. 'Introduction' in Kenneth McLeish and Michael J. Walton (Eds.) *Euripides: Plays IV*. London: Methuen.

Morley, Henry. 1887. 'Introduction' in *Alcestis and Other Plays by Euripides*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

Murray, Gilbert. 1913. *Euripides and his Age.* London: Williams and Norgate.

G. Norwood. 1909. 'Introduction' in *Euripides. Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Ed. London: Sherratt and Hughes. 5-20.

Neitzsche, Friedrich. 1877. *The Birth of Tragedy*. New York: Vintage.

Ostriker, Alicia. 1983. *Writing like a Woman*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ostriker, Alicia. 1985. 'Thieves of Language' in Showalter, *The New Feminist Criticism*. 314-38.

Pound, Ezra. 1913. 'A few don'ts by an Imagiste'. *Poetry*. March 1913. 200-06.

Pound, Ezra. 1912. 'Introduction. In *Sonnets and Ballate of Guido Cavalcanti*. London: Stephen Swift and Co. 1-13.

Pound, Ezra (ed.) 1914. *Des Imagistes. An anthology*. London: Poetry bookshop; New York: Albert and Charles Boni.

Pound, Ezra. 1954. *Literary Essays*. London: Faber and Faber.

Pound, Ezra. 1968. *The literary Essays of Ezra Pound*. New York: New Directions.

Pym, Anthony. 1992. 'Shortcomings in the historiography of translation', *Babel* 38/4, 221-235.

Rexroth, Kenneth. 1959/1961. 'The poet as translator.' In *The craft and context of translation*. Texas: University of Texas Press.

Sheppard, Richard. 1976. 'The crisis of language'. In Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (eds.) 1976. *Modernism. A guide to European literature 1890-1930.* London: Penguin. 322 – 336.

Scott, Clive. 1976. 'The prose poem and free verse'. In Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (eds.) 1976. *Modernism. A guide to European literature 1890-1930.* London: Penguin. 349– 368.

Swann, Michael. 1980. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swann, Thomas. 1962. *The Classical World of H.D*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Sword, Helen. 1995. *Engendering Inspiration: Visionary Strategies in Rilke, Lawrence and H.D.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins Translation Library.

Verrall, A. W. 1895. *Euripides the Rationalist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verrall, A.W. 1905. *Essays on four plays of Euripides*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolf, Virginia.1964. *To the lighthouse.* London: Penguin.

Yao, Stephen G. 2002. *Translation and the Languages of Modernism: Gender, Politics, Language.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zach, Natan. 1976. 'Imagism and Voticism'. In   Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (eds.) *Modernism. A guide to European literature 1890-1930.* London: Penguin. 228 – 242.