addition of his own commentaries. In 510, he translated Porphyry's "Eisagoge", a third-century Greek introduction to Aristlotle's logic. In 511, he translated the "Kategoriai" and added commentaries, as well as other translations many of which became basic texts in medieval scholasticism.

After Boethius, medieval translation was not concerned with anything but intellectual information, and so had little use for any function but symbol. Kelly states that "The readership was a highly professional one with an administrative and technical jargon all of its own, and attitudes to match" (1979:71).

2.1.1.8 SUMMARY OF TRANSLATION TRENDS FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE PRE-MIDDLE-AGES ERA (? - 500 A.D.)

As a general rule, diversity in intents and arguements always leads to questionings, which necessarily require judgements and any anticipation in making judgements, in turn, will lead to theories. Theories are to be experimented and this cyclic trend evolves and regains its cycle. However, when there is no controversy over an issue, theory and judgement processings come to a halt, though temporarily.

The Jewish scholars who translated the Old Testament had no interest in theory because they never anticipated any controversy over the issue of translating the Holy Scriptures. No intent or structure besides those of the Holy Scriptures could be of any value, because they were God's words, and since human beings were in reality in an inferior position, no discussion on the relationship between objects and symbols which represent them was deemed to be possible (Kelly, 1979:221). This attitude towards the Holy Scriptures

dominated the issue even after the Bible. The Bible was also considered sacred and the words were considered those of God's.

What makes the evaluation of translating developments in classics as well as the early Christian era difficult is the fact that, as it was mentioned earlier, either no theory was or even could be available or, if, by any chance, there was a theory, the translators themselves refused to express the techniques and their goals explicitly (Machan, 1985:4). But what is known is that literary translation, that is, word for word rendering of texts, particularly in the translating of the Bible, was dominant from the antiquity to the fourth century A.D. The only goal in translating the Bible was to provide the readers with an accurate but at the same time intelligible version (Amos, 1922:49-50). The emphasis on word for word rendering was a cry heard from all translators exemplified by Horace's statement that:

> "It is the duty of a faithful interpreter to translate what he undertakes word for word."

> (Morton, 1984:59)

Historical documents show that this trend continued from the 3rd century B.C. to Jerome's era (4th century A.D.) (Robin, 1967:46).

Jerome made a distinction between 'attitude' and, purpose' in translating and **that** became a basis for his drawing up of a typology of translation (Kelly, 1979:222). We witness his caution in gradual developing of:

> "non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprime sensu"

> 'sense for sense, rather than word for word'

He cleverly excludes the Holy Scriptures, for which he strongly recommends

the technique of 'word for word' because, as he claimed, in every word order in the Bible or the Old Testament, a mystery is hidden (Amos, 1922:35-36). Thus, from Jerome's era onward, a clear demarcation line was drawn between the holy texts on the one hand, which were to be rendered word for word, and the more general topics on the other hand, which could be translated following the technique of 'sense for sense'. From this era, a focus was made on theoretical issues over the distinction between free versus literal renderings, though not expressed explicitly (Kelly, 1979:220). This controversy led to making a distinction between 'meaning as a constant' common among languages and 'language' as series of symbols which are more language oriented (Kelly, 1979:221).

For some translators (e.g., Boethius), adherence to the source language forms and exclusion of the translator's power of judgement lest he may betray the author's intention became a goal, whereas for others (e.g.St. Augustine 353-403 A.D.), using the power of judgement was not only permissible but also desirable and appreciated (Kelly, 1979:221-222).

Another specification of this era (and the early part of the Middle Ages as well) was the lowly place translation occupied. The Greeks considered their neighbors as barbarians and very seldom showed tendency to translate texts from or into languages. On the other hand, Romans found it not necessary to translate because, in their views, men of power and the educated social class had to learn Greek. Moreover, few books were available to be translated.