Poetry Translation

1. Introduction
The first problem one encounters in attempting to translate poetry is the importance of both its meaning and form in the response created by it in the audience. Hence, the translator should make decision whether scarify the form for the meaning or vice versa. According to Nida & Taber (1964) "the conflict between the dictates of form and content becomes especially important where the form of the message is highly specialized" as it is in poetry.

Poetry is a means of expressing one nation's feelings and attitudes. Translation acts as a bridging tool through which different cultures can get closer to each other. Despite the difficulties which accompany poetry translation, excellent and acceptable translations of masterpieces of world poetry have been presented by a number of translators for example translation of Sa'di's *The Gulistan* by Rehatsek (1964), or Hafz by Arberry. These translators have attempted to preserve both form and content as far as possible in order to transfer all aesthetic aspects of the source text to the target text. First of all, some theoretical aspects related to poetry and translation will be presented. At the next step, the linguistic and extra linguistic analysis of the poetry will be offered.

2. Definition of Poetry
Poem is defined by Cudden (1976) in the following manner: it is a work of art, a composition, a work of verse, which may be in rhyme or may be blank verse or a combination of the two. Or it may depend on having a fixed number of syllables.

Random House Unabridged Dictionary (2006) defines it as "the art of rhythmical composition, written or spoken, for exciting pleasure by beautiful imaginative or elevated thoughts". Frost (1969) calls poetry memorable speech which is lost in translation. Poetry is the expression of feelings experienced by a poet. Nair (1991) believes that "poetry is an imaginative rendering of a poet's feelings and experiences."
3. Features of Poetry
Many great efforts have been done to determine what makes poetry distinctive from prose which resulted in the development of poetics—the study of the aesthetics of poetry. Stating the difference between poem and prose, Cudden (1976) asserts that:

“what makes a poem different from any other kind of composition is a species of magic, the secret to which lies in the way the words lean upon each other, are linked and interlocked in sense and rhythm, and thus elicit from each other's syllables a kind of tune whose beat and melody varies subtly and which is different from that of prose”

Poetry is also defined by him mentioned below: poetry is a general term encompassing all kinds of metrical composition. It is often used with reservation and the opposite of verse.

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that some forms of poetry are specific to particular cultures and genres, responding to the characteristics of the language in which the poet writes. In this case, translation of poetry preserving both form and content becomes harder than before.

Discussion about the concepts of **translatability** and **untranslatability** has an old history. One of the prominent scholars who have elaborated on the concept of untranslatability is Catford. He distinguishes two types of untranslatability, which he terms **linguistic** and **cultural**. On the linguistic level, untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactical substitute in the TL for an SL item. Catford’s category of linguistic untranslatability, which is also proposed by Popović, is straightforward, but his second category is more problematic. Linguistic untranslatability, he argues, is due to differences in the SL and the TL, whereas cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the TL culture of a relevant situational feature for the SL text.

But once again, it is Popović who has attempted to define untranslatability without making a separation between the linguistic and the cultural. Popović also distinguishes two types. The first is defined as a situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation. The second type goes beyond the purely linguistic: A situation where the relation of expressing the meaning, i.e. the relation between the creative subject and its
linguistic expression in the original does not find an adequate linguistic expression in the translation (in Bassnett, 1988).

The first type may be seen as parallel to Catford’s category of linguistic untranslatability as has already been suggested; it is clearly the task of the translator to find a solution to even the most daunting of problems. Such solutions may vary enormously; the translator’s decision as to what constitutes invariant information with respect to a given system of reference is in itself a creative act. Levý, as cited in Bassnet (1988), stresses the intuitive element in translating:

As in all semiotic processes, translation has its pragmatic dimension as well. Translation theory tends to be normative, to instruct translators on the optimal solution; actual translation work, however, is pragmatic; the translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called mini-max strategy.

Steiner (1984) there was some people who believed in untranslatability of some texts merely because of their belief about the sacredness of some texts:

Many people in ancient religious world were incredulous of the validity of translating as they believed that language was sacred and mystic, in which was hidden the will and order of God. Based on understanding the nature of the language, they used to regard translation or any kind of contrived conversation of a divine message from one language into another as no less than profanity and vice.

On the whole, untranslatability becomes more evident in poetry translation where we deal with formal features of language such as rhyme, rhythm, pun etc. In poetry these features play an important role. So it can be said that in poetry in addition to cultural cases of untranslatability, a lot of cases of linguistic untranslatability can also be found. According to Nida (1984) “anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the message”.

Similarly, there are different views regarding the possibility of poetry translation. There are some scholars who believe translating poetry is impossible. For example, Landers (2000) argues: Translating poetry well is so difficult as to be called impossible by most experts, the late John Ciardi referred to translation as "the art of failure" and yet we go on trying, sometimes with remarkably reduced degree of non-success. If literary translation is itself a leap of faith, poetic translation puts that faith to the severest of all tests.

"Translation of a literary work is as tasteless as a stewed strawberry". (Harry de Forest Smith, 1959). "Poetry cannot be translated." (Samuel Johnson, 18th century)

On the other hand, there are some who don't accept the impossibility of poetry translation. For example, Bashevis (1995) talks about the necessity of literary (including poetry) translation as he states "translation undresses a literary work, shows it in its true nakedness. An author can fool himself in his own language, but many of his shortcomings become clear to him in another language. Translation tells the bitter truth. It unveils all masks". Generally speaking, it is not justifiable to refrain from poetry translation, since poetry is the means of expression of one nation's feelings and attitudes toward world affairs. In this case translation can act as a bridging tool bringing closer different nations of the world.

Dryden emphasized that poetry is translatable. He believed that to render a poem, the translator should be a thorough poet (in Miremadi, 1995). In fact he used to pay much attention to the style, or formal features of the original poetry.

4. Strategies for Translating Poetry

According to Rose (1981) “The translator of poetry must be fluent in and sensitive to the source language; he must know the source language's cultural matrices, its etymologies, syntax, and grammar, as well as its poetic tradition. He must culturally and politically identify himself wholeheartedly with the original poet. He must penetrate the exteriority of the original text and lose himself in its intertextuality. To make the translation become a poem, the translator must also meet successfully the expectations and sensibilities of the poetic tradition of the target language. Thus, the most successful translators of poetry are frequently those who happen to be bilingual and bicultural and, above all, poets in the target Language”.
As it is evident translating poetry is a matter of relativity i.e. all **aesthetic aspects** of the original poem cannot be transferred into the TL version. We can find excellent translations of masterpieces of the world poetry. This shows that although translating poetry is more demanding than other types of texts, it doesn't mean impossibility of translation of poetry. In the researchers' opinion, translators of literary texts, especially poetry, should at least possess some degree of artistic genius. There are different types of strategies which translators adopt for translating poetry. These strategies will be elaborated on below:

5. **Free vs. Literal Translation**

These two main strategies are too familiar to the translators. In literal translation poetry is rendered to either poetry or verse. The main characteristic of literal prose translation is the preference of the meaning over the form. In this case the translator's main concern is the meaning or content of the poetry, while in verse translation of poetry both form and content are of importance to the translator.

As Frost (1969) puts it "a prose translation of poetry, however deft its workmanship, cannot convey the effect which verse produces; if it could, why do poets take the trouble to write verse?". This statement is somehow challenge of justifiable, since all the aesthetic features and poetic effect of the original poem is contained in its form. If the translator renders a piece of poetry into verse, its affective function will be lost. It also noteworthy that the degree to which components of the form of the original poem is to be reproduced in the TL version depends on the nature of the TL language. Some languages have different structures which in such a way that all aesthetic aspects.

Strategies of poetry translation have mentioned that literal verse translation itself can be subdivided into several categories. They are presented below:

5.1. **Different Types of Literal Verse Translation**

5.1.1. **Phonemic translation**

This type of translation which is more literal and faithful type of translation each phoneme is rendered to a phoneme in the target language. This strategy is applied in languages which have similar phonemic systems such as English and French, so it is very rare.
5.1.2. Stanza Imitation

In this strategy translator presents a literal rendering of the original poem and at the same time he/she imitates the stanza pattern or the structure of the source poem. In other words translator tries to be faithful to the original content and also reproduce something of the form.

5.1.3. Meter Imitation

Translator in this strategy tries to give a literal verse rendering of the content of the original poem and at the same time reproducing the metrical pattern of it.

5.1.4. Imitation of the Rhyme Scheme

In this strategy the translator imitates the rhyming pattern of the original and produces a verse translation.

5.1.5. Literal Blank Verse Translation

Poetry translator tries to give the literal translation of the content of the original poem in blank verse. Using this strategy the translator is not forced to follow the rhyming pattern or structure of the original poem. His only concern will be to render the meaning off the poem in a fluent way.

5.2. Types of Free Translation Strategies

5.2.1. Rhymed Translation

Based on this strategy translates poetry into rhymed verse regardless of the structure of the original text. In this strategy meaning is sacrificed for the formal beauty. The translator tries to produce a text which is based on the norms and conventions of the target culture.

5.2.2. Blank verse translation

In free blank verse translation the content is of primarily importance to the translator. If a translator uses this strategy, there is no need to be concern about formal features of such as rhyme, rhythm and etc.
5.2.3. Interpretation

Interpretation is the freest type of translation strategy for translating poetry. Applying this strategy, the translator extracts the main concepts of the original poem and recreates it based on his/her style. The other name of this strategy is *imitation*. Generally speaking some of the Roman poets like Horace imitated Greek poets.

**Examples:**

**Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam**

ای پویا با تو بخواهیم چه گوییم را
ای اول و ای آخر و چج تو همه هیچ

A
And this I know: whether the one True Light,
Kindle to love, or Wrath consume me quite.
One Glimpse of It within the Tavern caught,
Better than in the Temple lost outright.  

*Edward Fitz Gerald*

B
In tavern better far commute with Thee,
Than pray in mosques and fail thy face to see,
O! First and last of all Thy creatures, Thou,
‘ Tis Thine to burn, and Thine to cherish me.

*Edward Henry Whinfield*

C
In some low inn I’d rather seek Thy face,
Than pray without Thee toward the Niche’s place.
O! First and Last of all, As Thou dost will,
Burn me in Hell -- or save me by Thy grace.

*John Medows Rodwell*

D
Better at Tavern, and with wine,
To lay Thee all my Secrets bare,
Than to intone the parrot prayer,
And Thou not with me, in the Shrine.
Thy Name is last and first to tell;
Whatever is save Thee is nil;
Then cherish me, if so Thy will,
Be done—or burn my Soul in hell.   

Arthur John Arberry

E
I would rather in the tavern with Thee pour out all the thoughts of my heart, than without Thee
go and make my prayer unto Heaven. This truly, O! Creator of all things present and to come, is
my religion; whether Thou castest me into the flames or makest me glad with the light of Thy
countenance.   

Justin Huntley McCarthy

F
If I tell Thee my Secret thoughts in a tavern it is better,
Than if I make my devotions before the Mihrab without thee.
O! Thou, the first and last of all crated beings,
Burn me and Thou wilt, or cherish me and Thou will.   

Edward Heron Allen
6. Translation Criticism

Holmes (1988) in his paper 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies' maps out the new field, 'Translation Studies', like a science dividing it into 'pure' translation studies, encompassing descriptive studies of existing translations, general and partial translation theories, plus 'applied' studies, including translation training, translation aids and translation criticism, amongst others.

As Newmark (1988) contends, translation criticism is an essential link between translation theory and its practice. He also adds that as an academic discipline, it ought to be the keystone of any course in comparative literature, or literature in translation and a component of any professional translation course.

However, it is worth considering that, translation criticism is not a prescriptive process giving rules for how a translation ought to be done; rather, it is a descriptive task for evaluating and describing the quality of a translation, which is also, in this sense, called translation quality assessment (TQA).

As House (1998), mentions, approaches to translation quality assessment fall into a number of distinct categories: anecdotal and subjective, including neo-hermeneutic approaches; response-oriented approaches; text-based approaches. House himself proposes a model in 1977 which attracted criticisms that she tackles in her later revision in 1997 (Monday, 2000). The functional-pragmatic model of House is based on pragmatic theories of language use. For him, the basic requirement for equivalence of original and translation is that the translation should have a function (consisting of an ideational and an interpersonal functional component in the Hallidayan sense) which is equivalent to that of the original (House, 1998).

As it is mentioned by Monday (2000), House' model involves a systematic comparison of the textual 'profile' of the source text and target text. Monday also notes that House' comparative model can be reduced to a register analysis of both source text and target text according to their realization through lexical, syntactic and textual means. Concerning the other models mentioned above, the following explanations by House (1998) are worth considering:

1. Anecdotal & Subjective Approaches

Proponents of these approaches tend to see the quality of a translation as dependent on the translator and his/her personal knowledge, intuitions and artistic competence. However, here a
central problem is the operationalization of concepts such as "faithfulness to the original" or "the natural flow of the translated text" (p. 197).

Such intuitive treatments of translation quality are atheoretical in nature, and the possibility of establishing general principles for translation quality is generally rejected. In neo-hermeneutic approach, the hermeneutic interpretation of the original and the production of a translation are individual, creative acts that defy systematization, generalization and the development of rules.

2. Response-Oriented Approaches
These approaches are communicatively oriented and focus on determining dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964) between source and translation, i.e. the manner in which receptors of the translated text respond to it must be equivalent to the manner in which the receptors of the source text respond to the source text. Nida postulated three criteria for an optimal translation: general efficiency of the communicative process, comprehension of intent, and equivalence of response. However, these criteria prove to be as vague and non-verifiable as those used by proponents of the intuitive-anecdotal approaches.

3. Text-Based Approaches
In these approaches, pairs of source and target texts are compared with view to discovering syntactic, semantic, stylistic and pragmatic regularities of transfer. An early and influential text-based approach to translation quality assessment is Reiss.

As Maier (1998) contends, the majority of critics expect that both description and criticism will involve originals as well as translated texts, even when they advocate varying degrees of comparison, seek to answer different questions, or document the possibility of more than one competent translation. Thus, the present study is based on the text-based approach in general, and the model proposed by Reiss in particular to evaluate Clarke's translation of Ghazal 167 by Hafez at linguistic level.

The Model Proposed by Reiss (2000)
Reiss' model as a text-based approach to TQA is a detailed analytical, descriptive and objective approach to TQA. She believes that a comparison with the original text is essential, and
judgments must be based on strict and objective criteria. It is the intelligibility, naturalness, and fluency of translation that can be evaluated in one-sided translation criticism; faithfulness to the meaning of the source text can be discovered only by a strict comparison of the translation with the original (Reiss, 2000).

In Reiss’ terms the evaluation of a translation solely on the basis of the target language can be valuable for strictly limited purposes. But a conclusive evaluation cannot be made without comparing the translation with the original. One of the most important principles for translators is complete fidelity to the intent of the original author. Only by a comparison with the source language can it be discovered whether this fidelity has been achieved, how well the intent of the author has been understood, how it has been interpreted, and how successfully it has been expressed in the target language. Evaluation on the basis of the source language represents criticism which takes this fact into account (Reiss, 2000).

Reiss also believes that before an overall evaluation of a translation can be made, it must be examined from a variety of perspectives. In other words, criticism should begin with observing the type of text represented, which has significant implications for a valid translation, and then consider both the linguistic and non-linguistic factors which are of essential significance for the translation process. To determine the type of the text, Reiss refers to Buhler (1990) and his three basic functions which are representation, expression, and persuasion. She then distinguishes the types of texts by the function dominant in them which are respectively as follows: content-focused (informative), form-focused (expressive), appeal-focused (operative). To these three function-based text types, Reiss adds a fourth group of texts that are audio medial type written to be spoken or sung, not to be read but to be heard.

In evaluating the translation of linguistic elements she considers four kinds of elements that must be examined: the semantic elements for assessing the “equivalence”, the lexical elements for evaluating the “adequacy”, the grammatical elements for the evaluation of the “correctness”, and stylistic elements for checking the “correspondence”.

Additionally, there are some extra-linguistic determinants that Reiss takes them into account and are related to immediate situation or context, subject matter, time, place, audience, speaker, and affective implications. The diagram below summarizes the model presented by Reiss (2000):
Evaluation of Linguistic Elements

1. The Semantic Elements

As Reiss contends, concerning the semantic elements, there are a number of dangers for a translator: failure to recognize polysemous words and homonyms, lack of congruence between source and target terms, misinterpretations, arbitrary additions and deletions. In this Persian poem, which is a form-focused text, there is just one case of polysemous word which is in the ninth line: ______ /dolatiyan/. According to Zo-alnur (1983), this word can have two meanings: 1) who are in the position of power, 2) happy and blessed people. However, this word is rendered as "the wealthy" which is not an exact equivalent for the original word. In fact, by conveying just one of the senses, Clarke has limited the meaning of the original.

Regarding the second danger, seven cases were identified in the Persian poem that is not rendered correctly. The first one is the word ____ /modares/ in the second line which means "teacher"; however, it is rendered as "school". It is likely that Clarke has misread it as /madras/ which denotes school. The second one is the word _____ /ghamze/ in the same line whose amorous connotation is lost when it is rendered as "glance" which denotes "a short look".
The same thing happens in translating the word ____ /kereshme/ in the eighth line. The fourth one is the word ___ /bu/ in the third line which is translated as "perfume" and some kind of positive connotation is added to it. The next one is the word ____ /nasrin/ in the same line which is a kind of narcissus not a type of rose. However, it is rendered as "wild rose".

In Clarke has used a cultural equivalent because in source text it is ___ ____ /'arez nasrin/ (a face that is like this flower) and in English language the face and cheeks of the beloved are always likened to rose. The last two cases are the words ______ /bi khabar/ and ______ /bi hes/ in the eighth line which are rendered as "senseless" and "void of understanding" respectively. It is likely that these equivalents are mistakenly transposed by the translator.

Regarding the misinterpretations, two cases were identified. The first one is the verb ___ ____ /fada shodan/ in the third line which literally means "to be sacrificed" and here, according to Khoramshahi (1988), it means "to be fascinated by something". The literal translation of Clarke is "to become a ransom" which is a mistranslation because the Persian verb has nothing to do with ransom which is a "money that is paid to somebody that they will set free a person who is being kept as a prisoner by them" (Oxford, 2003). However, Clarke conveys the correct sense of this verb by adding a footnote: "this is a description of exceeding longing". The second instance is the verb ______ /mowaswes shodan/ in the same line which means "to be tempted"; but it is mistranslated as "a mutterer to itself become". The verb "mutter" denotes "speaking or saying something in a quiet voice that is difficult to hear especially because you are annoyed about something" (Oxford, 2003), which does not convey the sense of temptation of original verb.

The last danger is related to arbitrary additions and deletions (parenthetical elements). Generally, Clarke's translation is filled with additions, either in the form of parenthetical phrases or in the form of footnotes. Some of the additions by Clarke are useful and necessary but some are not. For instance, the explanations about where and when the Arab poets met, where the best poems were kept and the development of Arabic alphabets are among the unnecessary information given in footnotes. (see appendix).

Clarke also tries to specify the referents of metaphors as in the following cases: the star (Mohammad) and assembly (of the world) in the first line, Idol (Mohammad) in the second line. In three other cases of additions, there are evidences of Clarke's interpretations of the beloved
as God. They are as follows: "(the true Beloved's) perfume", "lovers (of God)" in the seventh line, "(O Beloved!) to lovers thy glance", in the fourth line. In the fifth line, the addressee of the imperative verb _________ ( /pak kon/ (to wipe) is added and the translator has taken the poet, Hafez, as the addressee. In a footnote, Clarke adds that the sentence can be "addressed to the beloved".

As Dadbeh (1996) contends, there are two points of views towards Hafez poetry. In the first one, only a single layer of meaning is taken as the true interpretation of the poem and the insistence is on a special interpretation of it. In the second point of view, even a line of the poem can be considered as a compound that consists of different elements. In this case, the existence of various layers of meanings is possible.

In Clarke's translation, the second view is at work. In fact, Clarke has not been consistent in identifying the one about whom this poem is written. In he first two lines, the words "star" and "idol" are considered as metaphors for the Prophet Mohammad; then in the third line where it is said _________ /taq e abru e yar/ (the arch of my beloved's eye-brow) the word " ________ " /yar/ (friend) is translated as "beloved" with little "b" in contrast to other lines where the capital "b" shows that the word refers to God. What is worth considering is that, in identifying the referents of the metaphors, especially in the second line, Clarke has missed to mention Shah Shoja among others.

Dadbeh (1996) fully explains about the possibility of existence of different referents for the implicit metaphor _________ /negar/ (idol) in the second line. He contends that the poem can be seen from religious-mystical point of view, or taken as a panegyric, or love poem about the beloved or any other favorite character. On the religious-mystical level, the referent can be the Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) who was illiterate and at the same time became the master of Islamic teachings. As a panegyric, the poem is written in praise of Shah Shoja who is also called

2. The Lexical Elements
As Reiss states, here the critic must see whether the components of the original text have been adequately carried over to the target text on the lexical level or not. Observing whether the translator has demonstrated competence in dealing with technical terminology and special idioms, false friends, homonyms, untranslatable words, names, metaphors, plays on words, idiomatic usages and proverbs is important here.
In the Persian poem there is no instance of technical terminology, false friends, homonyms, plays on words and proverbs. However, the following metaphors are identified in the first, second, sixth, eighth and ninth lines respectively: the words ________/setare/ (star) and ___./negar/ (Idol) are metaphors for the beloved, _______/taq e abruye yar/ (the arch of the beloved's eye-brow) is a metaphor for the line of the eye-brow, _______/kereshme/ (glance) is a metaphor for Saqi (/saqi/ ________, the one who gives others wine) and "__./mes/ (copper) is a metaphor for the poem (Khoramshahi, 1989). There are also seven cases of simile in the third, sixth and ninth lines: _______/del e bimar e asheqan cho saba/ (the sick heart of the lovers like breeze), in which, the sick heart of lovers is likened to breeze_________/arez e nasrin/ (the face of a special type of narcissus), in which the face of the beloved is likened to the flower, "______/cheshm e narges/ (the eye of the narcissus) in which, the eyes of the beloved are likened to narcissus; _______/tarab saray e mohebat/ (the inn of affection) in which, affection is likened to an inn, ____________/cho zar aziz e vojud ast nazm e man/ (like gold, my verse is dear), in which the poet's verse is likened to gold, and ____________/qabul e dolatiyan kimiya e in mes shod/ (the acceptance of the wealthy became the alchemy for this copper), in which the acceptance of the wealthy is likened to the alchemy.

In the translated version, the metaphors are preserved which is in correspondence with what Reiss believes in, the metaphors must be unchanged. Of course in two cases ("idol" and "star") the sense is added in parenthesis. As Clarke mentions in his introduction, his translation is a literal one and that is why effort is made to keep the similes intact too. Since in English language simile denotes a comparison plus using particles like, "like", "such as" or "as", in the translated version just two cases of similes are rendered as similes: "the sick heart of lovers (of God), like the (swift) breeze" in the seventh line and "like the precious gold of existence is my verse" in the ninth line.

3. The Grammatical Elements

Due to the fact that there are differences between the grammatical systems of languages, the critic should be careful about the syntax in two texts to see whether the relevant semantic and stylistic aspects of the grammatical structure of the source language have been understood and adequately rendered or not (Reiss, 2000). Four cases were identified in this regard. The first one concerns the definite article "the" which is mistakenly used in the first line of the translation and
before the word "star". In fact the word _______ setare i/ in the original Persian text should be rendered as "a star" not "the star".

The second one is related to the misreading of the clause __________ /khiyal e ab e khezr bast/ in which the subject is ________/geday e shahr/ (city beggar) or the poet. Hafez (Khoramshahi, 1989, Zo-alnur, 1984). However, Clarke has considered the word 2__ /khiyal/ (fancy) as the subject and the result is a nonsensical rendering: "fancy established the water of Khizr". The third instance is in the same line where the same grammatical mistake is repeated again and the word _______ is taken as the subject of the verb __ /shod/ (became), while the meaning which is "the poet became the accompaniment of Shah Shoja" is lost.

The last instance is in the sixth line where in the phrase __________ /tarab saray e mohebat/ (the inn of affection), affection is likened to an inn _________; in fact the compound word _______ /tarab sara/ (inn) means "a place for enjoyment" and it is the subject of verb ______ /ma'mur shodan/ (to become prosperous) not the word "joy" which is considered as subject in Clarke's translation.

3.1.4. Stylistic Elements

As Reiss maintains here the primary interest is whether the translator gives due consideration to the differences between colloquial and standard or formal usages observed in the original, and whether the differences between the language levels in the languages are actually comparable.

Three cases were identified which worth consideration in this regard. The first one is the archaic word _______ /maktab/ in the second line which is more formal than the English equivalent "school". The second one is the word _____ /mohandes/ (engineer) in the sixth line which is used frequently today but Clarke used a more formal equivalent that is "geometrician". Finally, the last instance is the word _____ /arez/ (face) which is a formal word for "face and cheeks" while its translation, "cheek", is not at the same level of formality.
ستارهای بدرخشید و ماه مجلس شد
دل رمیده ما را رفیق و مونس شد
نگار من که به مکتب نرفت و خط ننوشت
به غمزه مساله آموز صد مدرس شد
به بوی او دل بیمار عاشقان چو صبا
فدا عارض نسرین و چشم نرگس شد
به صدر مصطلبهام می نشاند اکنون دوست
گدای شهر نگه کن که میر مجلس شد
خیال آب خضر بست و جام اسکندر
به جرعه نوشی سلطان ابوالفوارس شد
طبرسراً محبت کنون شود معمار
که طاق ابروی یار مهندس شد
لبه ترشح می باکد کن برای خدا
که خاطرم به هزاران گنه موسوس شد
کرشه تو شراپی به عاشقان یهمود
که علم بی خبر افتاد و عقل بی حس شد
چو زر عزیز وجود است نظم من آری
قبول دولتیان کیمیای این مس شد
ز راه میکده باران عنان بگردانید
چرا که حافظ از این راه رفت و مفلس شد
1. The star (Muhammad) gleamed; and the moon of the assembly (of the world) – became:
   Of our affrighted heart, the consoler and comforter - became.
2. My idol (Muhammad), who to school went not; and writing wrote not:
   With a glance, the precept-teacher of a hundred schools-- became.
3. Now, became prosperous the joy of the palace of love:
   When, its geometrician, the arch of my beloved’s eye-brow – became.
4. (O Beloved!) to lovers, thy glance poured such a draught of wine
   That senseless fell (their) science; void of understanding, (their) reason – became.
5. (Hafiz!) make pure thy lip of the excess of wine – for God’s sake:
   For, with thousand of sins, a mutterer to itself, my heart-- became.
6. Now, in the chief seat of the inn, the Beloved placeth us:
   Behold the city-beggar who, the chief of the assembly-- became.
7. By his (the true Beloved’s) perfume, the sick heart of lovers (of God), like the (swift) breeze,
Translation Criticism (continuation)

Textual analysis
Textual analysis of poetry is to examine first the general form of a poem, which itself is divided into several parts:

1. **Rhyme** which is two words that sound alike. The vowel sound of two words is the same, but the initial consonant sound is different.

2. **Stanza**, a stanza is a grouping of the verse-lines in a poem, set off by a space.

3. **Structural patterns, punctuations**, and kind of a poem are the other items.

4. **Sound of a poem**: alliteration that occurs when the initial sounds of a word, beginning either with a consonant or a vowel, are repeated in close succession, stress patterns, the speed of the poem.

5. Words used in the poem: if they are simple or complex, given or new, concrete or abstract and the meaning suggested by them.

6. **Images** existed in a poem by which we mean figures of the text such as implicatures, similes, metaphors, and other tropes.

7. **Tone** of the poem. Richards defined tone as the expression of literary speaker’s “attitudes to his listeners”. It could be light or serious, elegiac or panegyric, lyrical or admonitory, ironic or straightforward angry or loving, and so on.

8. The last item that should be examined is the **content** which is the message of the text, which is realistic, mythical, or descriptive.
Example:
Analyzing poem

خود ز فلک برتریم وز ملک افزونتریم
زین دو چرا بگذریم منزل ما کبریا ست

We are above the skies
And angels we transcend
Why should we compromise?
The House of Song is our end.

As for the music of this line in the original form, there is consonance of /ز/ sound in

 المنزل وز فلک برتریم وز ملک افزونتریم وز دو چرا بگذریم منزل ما کبریا ست. And again the translated version just show the rhymes that exist between words skies/compromise and transcend/end.
Extra textual analysis

Extra textual analysis of poetry is to examine the pragmatics of the source and target texts, with especial focus on the cultural aspects of the text. According to Newmark (1988) transference in translation, preserves the local color of the SL. Since we can not separate translation and culture from each other, procedures to preserve the locality of the SL, should be involved through the process of translation. But transference is not applicable in all cases, because just by transferring, the TT reader will not understand parts of the intended meaning and cultural concepts of the ST writer.

Another method introduced by Newmark is Componential Analysis as “the most accurate translation procedure” (Newmark, 1988). This procedure excludes the culture and highlights the message. Again by applying this method, while the TT is comprehensible to the TT reader, part of the aesthetics of the text will be impaired. So, none of these procedures alone, can not meet all of the needs, so it is desirable that the translator benefit from a synthesis of the two methods.

To find extra textual elements in this stanza, we see that کبریا is likened to the House of Songs. Regarding the last line of the same stanza, here the TL reader may find out that what he meant by song of love in the first stanza is a spiritual one. But it seems the house of songs for
the کبیریا has been completely wrong interpretation here. کبیریا is the especial place for the majesty of God, the especial place of God’s manifestation. What readers understand of this phrase is that those songs are spiritual. In fact he has interpreted song as God, while we are the songs, God is the love itself. According to Molana the physical world is the house of songs, and these songs are realizations of God, love of God. Using house of love instead of house of songs is a more accurate interpretation. The religious ties should be easy to understand for TT readers. Other lines of this stanza are properly translated, with regard to fidelity to both accuracy of the message and the source text’s aesthetics. Although the line: “خود ز ملک برتریم وز ملک افزونتریم” is an allusion, but the loss of this knowledge for TT readers does not impair the convey of this meaning.

Figure 2. A Tentative Model of Poetic Translation Analysis and Assessment: extra-textual Level
7. Stylistic Analysis of Poetry

An acceptable and reliable evaluation of every translation must be based on some framework containing some relevant parameters. This point is highlighted when dealing with form-sensitive texts such as poems. One of the most difficult concepts about translating such texts are how one says something can be as important, sometimes more important than what one says (Landers, 2001). As Cleanth Brooks (As cited in Newton, 1988) maintains “in a successful literary work, form and content cannot be separated, form is meaning”.

One of the most outstanding features of every literary work is its style. As Abrams and Harpham (2005) put it “Style has been defined as the manner of linguistic expression in prose or verse - as how speakers or writers say whatever it is that say”(p. 216). The analysis and assessment of style involve the examination of a writer's choice of words, his figures of speech, the devices (rhetorical and otherwise), the shape of his sentences (whether they be loose or periodic), the shape of his paragraphs - indeed, of every conceivable aspect of his language and the way in which he uses it (Cuddon, 1999). Landers (2001) suggests that “the translator should adapt to the style of each author translated – now terse, now rumbling, sometimes abstruse, but always as faithful to the original as circumstances permit” (p. 90). Therefore, style is one of the defining features of every literary text and should be preserved as faithfully as possible.

Furthermore, it has been suggested by Dongming & Xiaoshu (2003), that for reproducing “the original style satisfactorily, one must bear two points in mind before undertaking the translation. First, the translator must have a macroscopic point of view, namely, a view of the whole” to render a translation “in conformity with the thought, feeling, and style of the original… Second, he must have a microscopic point of view”, as an illustration, “the linguistic point of view”. In other words, “all the paragraphs, sentences, and words” should be studied so that the feeling, spirit, thought, and style of the original can be produced.

7.1. A Model for Evaluation

As mentioned earlier, any reliable evaluation of every work of translation must be based on some particular scientific evaluation model. Evaluations based on personal impressions and gut feelings, if acceptable, lack reliability and consistency and are unsystematic. Any evaluation framework must possess some parameters for gauging the desired points. Khomeijani Farahani
has suggested a framework for an acceptable and systematic evaluation of works of translation. This framework consists of a set of criteria, which he in his own terms chooses to call “translation evaluation criteria”. These criteria are as follows:

1. Accuracy
2. Formal Loyalty
3. Naturalness

When dealing with translation of long texts, two other criteria should be added to the above list:

4. Consistency
5. Unity

7. 2. Naturalness
By naturalness, it is meant that how natural or artificial the translation sounds in the target language. There are two ways to determine the naturalness of any job of translation. The first possible way is to show the TL text to a native speaker of that language ask him or her what s/he thinks about the translation and to judge whether the translation sounds natural and reads smoothly and fluently in his or her mother tongue or not. The second way to determine the degree of naturalness of the translation is to see whether the translator has followed the syntactic structure and word order of the target language or those of source language. To check the naturalness of the translated texts, the evaluator can also look at the translation of idiomatic expressions (Farahani, 2005).

7. 3. Introducing the poet
Akbar Jamshidi, born in 1900 in Isfahan is a poet, mostly famous for his comic poems containing sardonic, informal tone, and a wry humor. He often uses colloquial expressions to teach lessons. Of his works we may name “Foloon kasak” (Literally means somebody), ”sholoogh poloogh” (pell-mell), and “Labkhand” (smile).

7.4. Analysis
Analysis of the selected poem will be conducted stanza by stanza. Each stanza is given, following its translation and then the choice of word, level of formality, tone, the feelings the
translation brings about and consideration of stylistic features will be highlighted and analyzed in
different respects applying the criteria of the given framework.

Smile
Come let’s rejoice in vain,
Let’s laugh and leave our pain,
Let’s be happy with naught,
Let’s abandon what we sought,
Let’s dance with heavens tune,
Let’s sing without fortune,
Oh destiny! We can’t defy,
Why gloomy then….you and I,
Sorrows the file of man’s soul,
Feeble man takes sorrow bowl!
I happen to know a fellow citizen,
In whose mouth sugar tastes of poison,
He’s a millionaire but from avarice,
A goose neck is heavier than his,
In prime of youth, he seems old from sorrow,
And his forehead carries many a furrow,
He has a house blossoming in all seasons,
In its balcony he sits, lonely I mean,
With a hookah-tube under his chain,
For the benefit he is not able to take, 
پی سودی که از مالی نبرده
He writhes in pain as a wounded snake, 
به خود پیچد چو مار زخم خورده
Of this category crabbed, there are many, 
پیلی مانند این مرد ترشروی
In this temporal world of tyranny. 
فراوانند در دنیا به هر سوی

7. 5. Macroscopic and Microscopic analysis of translation style
According to the criteria of macroscopic analysis (Dongming & Xiaoshu: 2003), the translation should generally have a view of the whole to render a translation “in conformity with the thought, feelings, and style of the original”. Considering these factors, generally translation is unsuccessful as the translator has not managed to produce a parallel style because if back translated, is different substantially. Considering the microscopic point of view, “namely, the linguistic point of view, all the paragraphs, sentences, and words” should be studied so that the “feeling, spirit, thought, and style of the original” can be produced. It seems that translation is not acceptable in this case as well due to change of style pursuant to application of some words that pragmatically was not appropriate or were at a different level of formality compared to the original text. Of the other factors contributing to failure of the translator is an unsuccessful translation of some idiomatic expressions that played a great part in transferring the feeling and spirit of the poem.

7. 6. Conclusion
Despite some positive points observed, the translation generally is unsuccessful in producing the image, tone and the feeling a native speaker can easily grasp from reading such a poem. Some factors have contributed to this such as an inappropriate choice of words, unsuccessful translation of some idiomatic expressions regarding stylistic features and tone, not the semantic aspect. By and large, the message has been imparted but translation lacks the feeling and the tone embedded in the poem.
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