

Translation of Poetic Diction in Literary Translation: A Case Study of *Macbeth* and Its Persian Translations

Sajjad Jahansepar

Department of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran
Email: sajjadjahansepar@gmail.com

Manijeh Youhanaee

Department of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Hossein Pirnajmuddin

Department of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract—This study is an attempt to identify and examine the poetic diction in dramatic/literary texts and their translations. Diction is an important stylistic element of all literary texts. The present study focuses on this element in texts of drama and the strategies used for its translation. To show such strategies at work a dramatic/literary text, namely *Macbeth* by Shakespeare, and its four Persian translations, (Ahmadi (1957) - Shadman (1972) - Ashouri (1992) and Pasargadi (1999)), were selected. A descriptive/comparative analysis was done on the original text and its translations and their use of adjectives as a component of poetic diction. To see how the poetic diction of the ST in terms of adjectives is rendered in the translations the following were considered: the selection of appropriate equivalents in terms of semantic/thematic aspects as well as stylistic aspects and the literary discourse patterns. Also of importance is the role of diction in making a dramatic text performable/speakable, hence its further significance in the translation of such texts. Thus the present study has paid close attention to aspects of each of the translations as the effectiveness of the procedures applied by translators for translating them.

Index Terms—literary translation, drama translation, poetic diction, style, *Macbeth*

I. INTRODUCTION

Many literary and translation critics have written books dealing with the literary translation and translated literature; particularly, the difficulties of “translating well” and being “faithful” either in message or in form, especially in poetry, were the main concern of them. The clash has always been between the beauty of form and fidelity to the message. It is obvious that our definition and identification of translation differs depending on whether we have the product or the process of translation in mind. When the translational stylistics is at issue, then, the stylistic elements of source and target texts are considered more closely.

According to Jakobson, “in nonliterary discourse, the word is a mere vehicle for what it refers to. In literary discourse, the word or phrase is brought into a much more active and reinforcing relationship, serving, as it were, to echo, mime, or somehow represent what is signified, as well as to refer to it” (Lianeri & Zajko, 2008, p.38).

Speaking of stylistics, we have to keep in mind that every piece of written text has its own style, i.e. no written text or in bigger scale no discourse is styleless. In fact, style is one of the most tormented terms in literary criticism because of its controversial meaning and its disputed relevance. All that makes the notion of style a controversial one is the “manner of expression” which differs from one writer to another one or even from one text of a writer to the other text of the same writer.

II. THE STUDY

The present study was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How much the translators of *Macbeth* have considered the elements of diction of the ST in their translations into Persian language?
2. What procedures each translator has used in rendering the stylistic elements of the ST? And how effectively?

III. STUDY BACKGROUND

Hatim and Munday define translation as “an incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways” (2004, p. 3). Nevertheless, as a general understanding of translation they use a simple sentence to clarify the notion,

“more typically it just refers to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also includes interpreting” (Hatim and Munday, 2004, p.1).

Newmark (1988, p.8) defines translation as “in a narrow sense, translation theory is concerned with the translation method appropriately used for a certain type of text, and it is therefore dependant on the functional theory of language.

Literary translation is one of the four principal categories of translation. The others are interpreting, scientific and technical, and commercial/business translation. Literary translation is not confined to the translation of great works of literature. All kinds of books, plays, poems, short stories and writings are covered, including such items as a collection of jokes, the script of a documentary, a travel guide, a science textbook and an opera libretto. Baker believes “the very use and combination of literary and translation is symptomatic of the casual way in which the concepts of literature and of translation have so far been taken for granted. Neither concept is simple nor well defined in most cultures” (Baker, 2001, p.130). Hermans also considers literary translation as a different kind of translation and believes that “literary translation represents a distinctive kind of translation because it is concerned with a distinctive kind of text” (Hermans, cited in Kuliwiczak & Littau, 2007, p.77). According to Peter France's *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (2000, p. xxi) literary translations are “designed to be read as literature” and France cites with approval Gideon Toury's distinction between 'literary translation' and the 'translation of literary texts', the latter, nonliterary form of translation being described as 'informational'. Andre Lefevere downplays the importance of linguistic aspects of translation and highlights instead the role of poetics and of ideological factors and institutional control (Bassnet & Lefevere, 1998).

Aesthetic translation, however, is a kind of translation that emphasizes the aesthetical possessions of a text in its source language and culture. The most important factor about carrying out an aesthetic translation, as Casagrande (1954) puts it, is to keep the text as beautiful in translation as it is in its own language, culture and context. Casagrande (1954) states that the meaning is not sacrificed for the sake of beauty in such a translation. The importance of aesthetic-poetic factor in such a translation does not mean the impossibility of transferring the meaning or content; on the contrary, this means a double burden for the translator to keep them in his translation. Casagrande believes that “of the several aims, the aesthetic-poetic is the most difficult of realization and the most demanding of the translator's art and skills” (p.1). He also names rhyme, meter, imagery, metaphor, onomatopoeia, and style the particular form into which the work of translation is cast. He adds that these are the most difficult elements for any translator to keep in translation. Casagrande considers the style of the writer as an idiolect defying translation (ibid).

Dramatic Translation

Only limited scholarly attention has been devoted to the translation of drama, probably owing to the special problems confronting the translator translating for the stage. Unlike the translations of a novel, or a poem, the duality inherent in the heart of the theater requires language to combine with spectacle, manifested through visual as well as acoustic images and other dramatic components of theater in general. As Van Den Brook puts it (1988), “the translator is therefore confronted with the choice of either viewing drama as literature or as an integral part of theatrical production (cited in Baker, 2001, p. 71).

Toury mentions drama translation as: “here (drama translation), because it forms part of an integrated whole, greater demands are also placed on the translation with respect to its performability”, thus increasing the tension between the need to establish relationships between the target text and its source (the adequacy factor), and the need to formulate a text in the target language (the acceptability factor)” (1980, p. 29).

Satisfying the linguistic requirements of preformability may require adjustments on a number of different levels. Further difficulties arise if the play is in verse or, as in the case of the play like Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in variety of verse and prose text. On his book about literary translation, Lefevere writes, “there is practically no theoretical literature on the translation of drama as acted and produced” (1980, p.178).

“The main purpose of translating a play is”, as Newmark puts it (1988, p. 172), “normally to have it performed successfully”. Therefore, a translator of drama inevitably has to bear the potential spectator in mind though. Newmark (1988, p.173) continues “unlike the translator of fiction, drama translator, cannot gloss, explain puns or ambiguities or cultural references, nor transcribe words for the sake of local color”. He also quotes a sentence from T. Rattigan: “the spoken word is five times as potent as the written word –what a novelist would say in thirty lines, the playwright must say in five” (Newmark, 1988. P. 173). Newmark finishes his words on dramatic translation warning the translators about drama:

[F]inally a translator of drama in particular must translate into the modern target language if he wants his characters to ‘live’, bearing in mind that the modern language covers a span of, say 70 years, and that if one character speaks in a bookish or old-fashioned way in the original, written 500 years ago, he must speak in an equally bookish and old fashioned way in translation, but as he would today, therefore with a corresponding time-gap – differences of register, social class, education temperament in particular must be preserved between one character and another. (p. 174)

Stylistics and Style

According to *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought* (1988, 2nd ed.), “Stylistics is a branch of linguistics which studies the characteristics of situationally-distinctive uses of language, with particular reference to literary language, and tries to establish principles capable of accounting for particular choices made by individuals and social groups in their use of language”.

According to Thornborrow et. al (1998, p. 2), “stylistic analysis of the styles of the writers could include their words, phrases, sentence order, and even the organization of their plots”. Accordingly, some key aspects of stylistics are:

1. The use of linguistics (the study of language) to approach literary texts
2. The discussion of texts according to objective criteria rather than according to purely subjective and impressionistic values
3. Emphasis on the aesthetic properties of language, for example, the way rhyme can give pleasure

Briefly, stylistics is the study and interpretation of texts from a linguistic perspective, and as an interdisciplinary it links literary criticism and linguistics. Watson and Zyngier consider it as “sitting uncomfortably on the fence between the linguistic and the literary studies, and as a bit uneasy within either domain” (2007, p.vii).

Stylistics in Drama

According to Brown (2007) the first attempts to analyze the style of drama “was carried on the factors of analyzing poetry and as it is obvious these factors are not able to clarify all the potentials of plays, as dramatic texts are multifunctional ones” (p.2702). It is only by the advent of more appropriate tools from linguistics that the stylistic study of plays becomes completely possible for stylisticians. Stylisticians have used different tools of linguistics for analyzing plays such as pragmatics, conversation analysis, and discourse analysis to name some. Culpeper et.al add one more item to the obstructions of the stylistic analysis of plays. As Brown puts it, according to them “a further obstruction to the linguistic study of dramatic texts was the long-held view that in the analysis of drama, performance was of greater significance than text (2007, p.2702).

The dilemma of the dramatic texts functions were solved by Short (1981) who says, “both meanings and values will change not just from one production to another but also from one performance of a particular production to another” (Short, 1981: 181). Brown (2007) maintains, “what this suggests for the stylistic analysis of drama is that the ‘play-text’ should be the object of study, rather than performance” (Brown, 2007, p.2703). On the contrary, many researchers who believe in the importance of the style in dramatic texts such as Clifford Landers strongly states “even style, which is by no means unimportant in dramatic translation, sometimes must yield to the reality that actors have to be able to deliver the lines in a convincing and natural manner” (Zatlin, 2005, p.7).

In the Elizabethan period plays were primarily written for performance. Particularly in earlier periods plays did not just present dialogue, but would also include monologues, songs, and letters (to be read out). However, dialogue was and is the central characteristic of play texts. Generally, play dialogues of all ages are considerably neater – closer to the norms of prose writing. Biber and Finegan (1992, p.699), considering dialogue in fiction and in drama over four centuries beginning with the 17th century, point out that literary dialogue in all periods is unlike modern conversation with respect to its higher informational load, perhaps due to the need to advance the plot. The main finding of their 1992 paper was that all genres have ‘drifted’ over the four centuries towards a more ‘oral’ style (i.e., have become more involved and situated, but less abstract), except for some counter-developments towards more literate styles in the 18th century.

As Mao Dun (2003) puts it if a translator wants to reproduce the original style satisfactorily in his translation, s/he must keep two points in mind before undertaking the translation, namely,

1. The translator must have a macroscopic point of view, namely, a view of the whole, and should always remember that what he is working at is a literary work written by somebody else and try his utmost to turn his translation into a work of art, which is in conformity with the thoughts, feelings, and style of the original.
2. He must have a microscopic point of view, namely, the linguistic point of view. In the process of translating, all the paragraphs, sentences and words should be attentively studied so that the best expressions may be chosen to satisfy the needs of reproducing the thoughts, feelings and style of the original. From this point of view, style is formed by the coordination of paragraphs, sentences and words.

Poetic diction and style

The phrase poetic diction gains importance in English literature about the 19th century, when the Preface to Wordsworth’s *Lyrical Ballades* (2nd ed. 1800) raised the question whether the language of poetry was essentially different from that of prose or not. For some writers poetic diction means the collection of epithets, periphrases, archaisms, etc., this was common property to most poets of the 18th century. On the other hand, there are some others for whom poetic diction means specifically poetic words and phrases that express the imaginative impassioned nature of poetry (Preminger et.al, 1986, p.194).

In Shakespeare’s time, poetic diction was scarcely distinguished as a subject by itself, but belonged to the study of rhetoric, the making of tropes and distinguishing of figures, and was learned by the poets, as by other men, of school masters, and in the grammar school.

Adjectives in diction of a text

Adjectives and adverbs are extremely common in all registers, but considerably less common overall than nouns and verbs, the other two lexical word classes. Further, these two word classes distributed very differently across registers. According to Biber et.al (1999) “adjectives are most frequent in the written registers, especially academic prose” (p.504). Central adjectives are defined by their morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics. They can serve both attributive and predicative syntactic roles. Central adjectives are descriptive, typically characterizing the referent of a nominal expression (e.g. good and hardy soldier, artificial spirits). Further, they are gradable in meaning, that is, they

can denote degrees of a given quality. This means that they can be modified by an adverb of degree: *most kind hostess*, *too weak*. They also take comparative and superlative forms as above. Many of most common adjectives are central adjectives that have all of these characteristics, they include adjectives of color (e.g. *black*, *red*, *dark*), adjectives of size and dimension (e.g. *big*, *small*, *long*, *thin*), and adjectives of time (e.g. *new*, *old*, *young*).

Other adjectives are more peripheral in that they do not have all of the central defining characteristics above. Further, other word classes can be used in similar ways to adjectives (especially nouns, adverbs, and semi-determiners), so that the boundaries of the adjective category are not easy to draw in terms of these defining characteristics (Quirk et.al, 1985, pp. 402-437). According to Quirk et.al (1985), the greater frequency of adjectives in the written registers, especially in an attributive role, reflects the heavy reliance on noun phrases to represent information.

Translation and Reception of Shakespeare

The introduction of Shakespeare into Persian language dates back to the Qajar dynasty by Mirza Saleh-e-Shirazi. He was introduced to Shakespearean plays during his trips to Britain and his studies in British universities. The other way for Iranian intellectuals to know of Shakespeare was by their trips to Russia, Moscow, St. Petersburg and other southern Russian cities. The publication of the literary and art magazine *Bahar* could be named a turning point in Iranians' acquaintance with Shakespeare. Yusef Etesami, father of Parvin Etesami, was the one who translated Shakespeare in order to be published in magazines in Iran. From then on Shakespeare was an important name in theatrical literature for the Iranians, and even the news of Shakespeare's birthday party in Stratford was published in Persian magazines.

The first play ever translated and published in Iran is *Misanthrope*, a play by Moliere, from French into Persian in 1249 or 1890. The problem of initial translations of foreign plays into Persian was that usually the task was done by the poets not by the theater experts. Hence, the literary aspects of the text were dominant over the theatrical ones. This problem is more vivid in translations of Shakespeare into Persian language, and perhaps it is because of Shakespeare's unique way of applying English language as a medium in his plays. The literary load of the plays overweigh the dramatic values of plays in the first translations of Shakespeare into Persian.

The first full translation of a Shakespearean play dates back to Naser-ol-Molk who translated *Othello* into Persian after the Mashrouteh era. According to the critics, the translation was successful in keeping the beauty and fidelity in his translation. Naser-ol-Molk was a graduate from Oxford University who did the job. *Macbeth* is one of the plays that was introduced to Iranian readers but was not fully translated into Persian at the initial phase of translating Shakespeare into Persian in the Qajar period (my translation from: http://www.aftabir.com/articles/view/art_culture/literature_verse/c5c1285589464_theater_iran_p1.php -نگاهی به جریان- ترجمه ادبیات نمایشی در ایران).

Shakespeare writes in a formal manner; he writes the dialogue in a poetic manner. However, the poetic speech often seems forced and difficult to understand. The vocabulary and writing style suggests that Shakespeare was highly educated in the English language. Reading any one of Shakespeare's plays feels like reading a lengthy poem and that is because they are written in a combination of verse and prose.

Shakespeare carefully writes the syntax in *Macbeth*. The sentences are carefully formed. Most sentences are long, compound, and complex. This sometimes makes the play difficult to understand and translate. Practically all of Shakespeare's plays are comprised of two very different stylistic patterns: verse and unversified speech. Often the distinction between blank verse and prose mirrors the distinction between the social status and behavioral patterns of the characters (Bradford, 1997, p.119). In *Macbeth* the noble characters mostly speak in unrhymed "iambic pentameter" also called blank verse (<http://www.shmoop.com/macbeth/writing-style.html>). The witches also speak in verse but it is done in a way that sets them apart from other characters. In fact, they often chant in a sing-song way that sounds like a scary nursery rhyme. Many of their lines are delivered in what is called "trochaic tetrameter" with "unrhymed couplets." Not everyone in the play speaks in verse. Ordinary folks do not talk in a special rhythm – they just talk, like the porter scene. It is not just the type of speech that sets the Porter apart from the nobles- it is also the content of what he says which is "low" or "common" (ibid).

IV. METHODOLOGY

The first step in doing the task was to read the original version and extract the chunks containing the adjective as the identified diction type in the text. The second task was to extract the equivalents from the Persian translations. The problem here was to keep all the information manageable. therefore all the chunks are exactly compared and doubly checked to exactly match the original chunks extracted from Muir's version.

The next step was calculating the frequency of the diction in the play. All the adjectives frequent more than five times were chosen to be discussed in the final analysis as key adjectives in the text. All the equivalents of these key adjectives were also extracted and were placed in tables to make it easy to compare and analyze them with the original adjectives and also with the other three translations.

The last step was to draw conclusions based on the analysis of the data using I.A. Richard and Casagrande's models, and to determine the equivalency value of the words chosen by each translator to assess the extent to which this stylistic feature is conveyed in translation.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

TABLE 1
ADJECTIVES' PERCENTAGE IN *MACBETH*

Word class	Total	Percentage
Adjectives	1102	6.02%
Other word classes	17199	93.98%
All words in the play	18302	100%

As the table shows only about %6 of the words in *Macbeth* are adjectives.

TABLE 2
WORD REPETITION IN THE SOURCE TEXT (ST)

Frequency	Number of words	Total	Percentage
Occurring only once	395	395	35.84%
Occurring two times	61	122	11.07%
Occurring three times	35	105	9.52%
Occurring four times	16	64	5.8%
Occurring five or more times	46	416	37.74%
Total	553	1102	100%

As it is shown in the table, many of the words, in fact most of the adjectives, nearly thirty six percent, used in the play occur only once and are not repeated at all. However, a number of adjectives are repeated. A small number, analyzed in this study, occur more than five times which indicates that they are thematically and stylistically of greater significance.

TABLE 3
FREQUENCY OF LATIN AND ANGLO-SAXON ADJECTIVES IN *MACBETH*

Etymological Relation	Frequency in all	Percentage
Latinate words in key adjectives	27	58.69 %
Anglo-Saxon words in key adjectives	19	41.31 %
Total in key adjectives	46	100 %

Many scholars believe that Shakespeare has studied Latin at school and it is claimed that his plays are full of Latinate words and grammar. As it is shown in the table the idea is not far from truth. Among forty-six key adjectives extracted from the play twenty-seven of them were Latin words and only nineteen had Anglo-Saxon roots. More than half of the used key adjectives are Latinate. It should be mentioned that one of the aspects to be considered in analyzing diction is the etymological one; that is, whether the words are mostly of Latinate or Anglo-Saxon ancestry.

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY OF SHORT AND LONG ADJECTIVES IN *MACBETH*

Length of adjective	Frequency in all	percentage
Short adjectives	44	95.65 %
Long adjectives	2	4.35 %
Total in key adjectives	46	100 %

Based on the analysis not only the whole play is short but also the words used are short too. From all forty-six key adjectives, forty-four of them were short words and only two of them were long. Shakespeare has tended to make *Macbeth* as short as possible both in terms of the length of words and length of the whole play.

TABLE 5
FREQUENCY OF CONNOTATIVELY POSITIVE ADJECTIVES IN *MACBETH*

Connotation of Adjective	Frequency	Percentage
Positive	23	50 %
Negative	17	36.95 %
Positive or negative	6	13.05 %
total	46	100 %

It is claimed that *Macbeth* is a dark and black tragedy, even some have gone further and named it the bloodiest play by Shakespeare. Although the word blood is repeated in the play nearly 45 times but the adjectives are of positive connotation. It seems that Shakespeare was aware of it and has done his best to compensate for the darkness of the play's plot. Also, it could be argued that this balance in terms of positive and negative adjectives contribute to the ambiguity and complexity of the play.

TABLE 6
FREQUENCY OF ADJECTIVE RETAINED IN TRANSLATION BY EACH TRANSLATOR

	Key Adjectives	percentage
Ashouri	303	69.49 %
Pasargadi	297	68.11 %
Ahmadi	309	70.87 %
Shadman	360	82.56 %
Total key adjectives	436	--

Keeping the form of the ST in TT is desirable but not totally possible. Since this study is on the formal aspects in translation the percentage of keeping the adjectives in each translation was calculated. Among all, Shadman did the best by keeping eighty-two percent of the adjectives in the play and Pasargadi did the worst in this regard.

TABLE 7
FREQUENCY OF NON-TRANSLATED ADJECTIVES BY EACH TRANSLATED

Translator	Frequency	Percentage
Ashouri	133	30.51 %
Pasargadi	139	31.89 %
Ahmadi	127	29.13 %
Shadman	76	17.44 %
Total key adjectives	436	--

Deletion or ignoring a part of ST is one of the last resorts that translator use in their translations. Deletion is, in fact, found nearly in all translations and translated canon all over the world. This could be either because of not having similar structures in the TL or because of other reasons such as carelessness or incompetence of the translator. Considering Persian translations in this research deletion is in most in Pasargadi's translation and at least quantity in Shadman's.

Some Examples

Schleiermacher (1768- 1834) believes that "if all translations read and sound alike the identity of the source text has been lost, leveled in the target text" (Bassnet & Lefevere, 1998, p.8). Analyzing the data, the researcher found some cases of such condition in translated parts by translators. Remaining faithful to the ST has reduced the aesthetic character of the dialogue, as with the following example:

1. When shall we three meet again?

In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

When the hurly-burly's done,

When the battle's lost and won.

(act I, scene I)

آشوری:

کدامین گاه دیگر بار خواهد بودمان دیدار
به تندرکوب و رخس انداز و باران بار؟
دنیشنب بدان هنگام کاین آشوب
شکست آید یکی را دیگری روی ظفر بیند.

پاسارگادی:

کی یکدیگر را باز خواهیم دید؟
هنگامی که رعد و برق یا بارانی باشد؟
دشاب هوش نایم گنج وقتی که آشوب پایان یافته و نتیجه شکست و پیروزی.

احمدی:

دانی کدامین دم دگر بار
بایکدیگر داریم دیدار
در برق و در بوران و باران.
نیاک آن ساعت مسعود سرگشتگی سامان پذیرد
وین فصل، بافتح و فرار این و آن فرجام گیرد.

شادمان:

کی باز یکدیگر را ببینیم ماسه نفر
هنگام باران یا برق یا تندر؟
وقتی که آشوب و غوغا بسر رسیده
وقتی که نبرد بشکست و ظفر انجامیده.

Comparing the ST and the translations there are twenty-four words and a rhyme at the end of the lines in the ST. Ashouri's translation has twenty-six words and the rhyme at the end of the lines. He also has created a musical piece that sounds perfect for the beginning of the play as the first impression on the reader.

Pasargadi has used exactly the same number of words but the texts sounds dull and boring, in fact the text pace is really slow for being a kind of play in which the text should move smoothly in order to keep the reader in touch with itself. There is no rhyme or musicality in the text and the last line is twice long compared with other lines. The four

lines of the ST is translated into three lines which is again another case of not being faithful to the ST. In general it reads like an interpretation of the text into Persian.

Ahmadi, who has translated *Macbeth* from another translation in French, has done his job better than Pasargadi in general. The text does not seem dull and boring and he has tried to keep the poetic pattern of musicality in his translation. Although the length of translation is more than thirty-five words the music in the lines compensates for the lack of fidelity of the piece.

Shadman has translated the text exactly in a way any translator would call literal translation. The only translator who mentions the number of witches is Shadman. The only translator who keeps the texts in its SL resonance is Shadman. Although she uses twenty-eight words the text does not move as smoothly it as does in the ST. She has sacrificed the form for the sake of meaning, still it reads better than Pasargadi's translation aesthetically.

Stylistic and Aesthetic Faithfulness

Considering the definition of aesthetic translation by Casagrande (1954) in the following extracts from the play and their four translations will be analyzed to judge about their formal beauty compared with the content they transfer. We should bear in mind what Sirkku Aaltonen says about translation. For Aaltonen translation represents a struggle against the foreign: "for this reason, a complete translation will always be a reflection of the receiving culture rather than that of its source text" (2000, p.114).

2. Fair is foul, and foul is fair;
Hover through the fog and filthy air
Act I. scene I

آشوری:
هچ زشت است زیبا، چه زیباست زشتی.
پیشلپ بگردیم در میغ دود.
پاسرگادی:
هچنا زیبا باشد برای ما پلید، و آنچه پلید باشد برای ما زیباست، پس از میان مه و غبار و هوای آلوده به پرواز در آییم.
احمدی:
زیبا همه زشت آمده است و زشت، زیبا
در این هوای پر مه و پردود بگشاییم پر ها
شادمان:
پاک پلید است و پلید پاک
بپریم در مه و هوای ناپاک.

Clearly, in reading Shakespeare's text sounds as a piece of poetry. Everywhere the weird sisters in the play speak, they do speak in verse. Ashouri, Ahmadi, and Shadman have tried to keep the rhythmic pattern of the original in their translations but Pasargadi has not. The only translation in which there is no difference between the verse and prose is Pasargadi's. Ashouri has done his best to keep the form of the play just by creating verse where required by the ST. Considering the meaning, we can judge that all translators have translated the meaning of the text precisely and only the formalistic values are different. Ashouri is either shorter than Shakespeare himself by translating the part by twelve words and keeping the poeticity of diction in his translation. The word غیم used by Ashouri makes it more beautiful since it is both short word and poetic. Pasargadi has translated this part using twenty-four words. Considering in mind the advice of Newmark (1988), the translator or even playwright do not have the space of a novelist and they should keep the limits of dialogue in their texts. There is no rhyme pattern in Pasargadi's version and no word is to be considered as poetic in his translation. Ahmadi has translated *Macbeth* from a French translation, it means it is a translation of a translation in raw (indirect translation) from English to French then into Persian. In this case first law is not considered which prescribes "if at all possible, one should not translate a translation" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p.76). He is able to manage to keep pace with the original text by translating the part into sixteen words. He has tried to keep the rhyme of the verse and the adjectives are kept in Persian translation remaining consistent in the translation. Shadman can be said to be the most literal translator among all four translators. She is terse in her translation; she uses twelve words, shorter than Shakespeare, but the translation is not as beautiful as Ashouri's or even Ahmadi's. The words themselves hinder the fluency of reading, they sound a little motionless in their attire. However, she has tried to make a resonant /p/ sound in her translation to compensate for its literalness.

Another example that clarifies the stylistic translation is found in the following extract:

3. Life is but a walking shadow; a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.
Act V. scene V

© 2012 ACADEMY PUBLISHER

his version. Although, in some cases the transference of the content caused some faults in the beauty of the text, the overall result is the most satisfactory among all Persian translations available. It should again be reminded that Ashouri, as a professional literary/philosophical translator has used Ahmadi's and Shadman's translation for comparison; but this does not devalue his great job on the text. His approach to translation is a cultural one. He considers the reader in his translation and the TL culture; Ashouri translates for the TL but he never overlooks his ST. Deletions in his translation, although often found, do not disturb the flow of the reading, they only omit the information which are in nature culture-bound terms and the translator needs to clarify them in the foot-note or such space-demanding techniques. Ashouri translates for theater and literature as well.

Pasargadi's translation lacks the technicality needed for a translation to be called professional theatrical translation. The text is monotonous; there is no verse to verse translation, all dialects are similar to each other and the characters speak just like each other without any minute difference. Moreover, the text style is not even; it seems that there are a few translators for one text. Mostly the text is translated literally but carelessly, and in some cases the deletion is done in a way that hinders the understanding of the text. Short adjectives are translated as long phrases or even sentences. The diction on some cases are not poetic at all and the text reads like a newspaper.

Ahmadi, as mentioned before, has translated *Macbeth* indirectly from a French translation into Persian. As obvious, Persian modern literature begins with translations from French and the custom applies about Ahmadi's translation also. Although an indirect translation, Ahmadi's version is still a readable translation for Persians. Deletions are rare, and he has tried to compensate for his deletions as much as possible. Ashouri, in fact, owes a lot to Ahmadi's translation. As mentioned before, the similarity between their translations are so much that everyone can approve the notion. In fact Ahmadi has done relatively a good job in his translation. He is faithful to the author and in his case to his French translator.

Shadman's translation is technically the most literal translation among all available translations. She follows Shakespeare in her translation and sometimes ignores the Persian language's limits on structure. Her translation is a good example of being over-faithful to the ST; being so much faithful destroys the beauty and overlooks the style of the author. The verse is translated into prose, although in some cases there are some compensations in the text for the lack of beauty. Technically her translation cannot be named a speakable/performable theatrical translation. It lacks the beauty needed. Sometime it overloads the reader/audience with the information and sometimes surprises them with bizarre combinations or collocations. She uses deletion as least as possible among the translators, she adheres to the ST. Her translation is useful for English students to learn about comparative structures between two languages, but it is not a performable version for theatrical use.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abrams, M. H. (1993). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (6th ed). Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- [2] Aaltonen, S. (2000). *Time-Sharing on Stage; Drama Translation in Theater and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [3] Ahmadi, A. R. (1975). *Macbeth*. Tehran: Andisheh Publications.
- [4] Ahmadi, B. (2007a). *The Text-Structure and Textual Interpretation*. Tehran: Markaz Publications.
- [5] Ahmadi, B. (2007b). *Truth and Beauty; lectures on the Philosophy of Art*. Tehran: Markaz Publications.
- [6] Anderman, G. & Rogers, M. (2003). *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [7] Ashouri, D. (2006). *Macbeth*. Tehran: Agah Publishing House.
- [8] Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [9] Baker, M. (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [10] Baker, M. (2010). *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.
- [11] Baker, M. & Saladanha, G. (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [12] Barfield, O. (1987). *Poetic Diction; a study in meaning* (2nd ed.). Middletown/ Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.
- [13] Bassnett, S. (2006). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). London/New York: Longman.
- [14] Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [15] Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and Translating; Theory and Practice*. London/ New York: Longman.
- [16] Biber, D et. al. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London/ New York.
- [17] Boyce, C. (2005). *Critical Companion to William Shakespeare, a Literary Reference to his Life and Work*. New York: Facts On File.
- [18] Brown, K. et. al. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Elsevier.
- [19] Bushness, R. (2005). *A companion to Tragedy*. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [20] Casagrande, J. B. (1954). *The Ends of Translation*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1954), pp. 335-340.
- [21] Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The Grammar Book* (2nd ed). USA: Heinle & Heinle.
- [22] Childs, P. & Fowler, R. (2006). *A Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London/ New York.
- [23] Cuddon, J. A. (1998). *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (4th ed). London/ New York: Penguin Books.
- [24] Culpeper, J. & Short, M. et. al. (1998). *Exploring the Language of Drama*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [25] Dobson, M. & Wells, S. (2001). *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. London/ New York: Oxford University Press.
- [26] Davis, S. et. al. (2009). *A Companion to Aesthetics* (2nd ed.). Malden/ Oxford: Wiley Blackwell Publishing.
- [27] Dillon, J (2007). *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Cambridge/ New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [28] Dutton, R & Howard, J. E. (2003). *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*. Vol 1, the tragedies. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- [29] Elliott & Valenza (1991). Was The Earl of Oxford the True Shakespeare? A Computer -Aided Analysis. Retrieved April 7, 1991, from <http://shakespeareauthorship.com/elval.html>.
- [30] Farahzad, F. et. al. (2006). Dictionary of Translation Studies. Tehran: Yalda-Galam Publications.
- [31] Goddard, H. C. (1960). The Meaning of Shakespeare (vol. 2). Chicago/ London: The University of Chicago Press.
- [32] Gottfried Herder, J. (2006). Selected Writings on Aesthetics. Princeton/ Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- [33] Grady, H. (2009). Shakespeare and Impure Aesthetics. Cambridge/ New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Groom, B. (1961). Macbeth. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [35] Groote, P. D, et.al. (2009). Formal Grammar. London/New York: Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht.
- [36] Guerin, W. L. et. al. (1996). A handbook of Critical Approaches to literature (5th ed). London/ New York: Oxford University Press.
- [37] Hatim, B & Munday, J. (2004). Translation, An Advanced Resource Book. London/ New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- [38] Haynes, J. (1995). Style. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [39] Kinney, A. F. (2002). A Companion to Renaissance Drama. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [40] Kuhiwczak, P. & Littau, K. (2007). A companion to Translation Studies. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [41] Landers, C. E. (2001). Literary Translation; a Practical Guide. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [42] Leech, G. and M. Short. (1981). Style in Fiction. London: Longman.
- [43] Lefevere, A. (1992). Translation, History, Culture, a Sourcebook. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [44] Lefevere, A. (1995). Translation, Rewriting, and Manipulation of Literary Fame. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [45] Lianeri, A. & Zajko, V. (2008). Translation and the Classics. Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.
- [46] Lott, B. (1999). Macbeth. London/ New York, Longman.
- [47] Maguire, I. E. (2004). Studying Shakespeare, a Guide to the Plays. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [48] McDonald, R. (2006). Shakespeare's Late Style. Cambridge/ New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [49] McEvoy, S. (2000). Shakespeare, the Basics (2nd ed.). London/ New York: Routledge.
- [50] McNally, L & Kennedy, C. (2008). Adjectives and Adverbs, Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- [51] Moschovakis, N. (2008). Macbeth, New Critical Essays. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [52] Muir, K. (1995). Macbeth. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [53] Munday, J. (2001). Introducing Translation Studies. London/ New York.
- [54] Murphy, A. (2007). A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and Text. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [55] Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. Prentice Hall.
- [56] Newmark, P. (1991). About Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [57] Newton, K. M. (1990). Twentieth Century Literary Theory, a Reader. London/ New York: Mc Millan Education.
- [58] Pasargadi, A. (2003). The Complete Plays of William Shakespeare (vol. 2). Tehran: Soroush Press.
- [59] Quirk, R et. al. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language. London/ New York: Longman.
- [60] Rezayi, A. A. (2003). A Descriptive Dictionary of Literary Terms. Tehran: Farhang Moaser Publications.
- [61] Richards, I. A. (2001). Principles of Literary Criticism. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [62] Ryan, K. (2000). Shakespeare Texts and Contexts. London/ New York: The Open University.
- [63] Samuelsson-Brown, G. (2004). A Practical Guide for Translators (4th ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [64] Schwerin-High, F. V. (2004). Shakespeare, Reception and Translation, Germany & Japan. London/ New York: Continuum.
- [65] Shadman, F. (1995). Macbeth. Tehran: Scientific Cultural Publication Co.
- [66] Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). Dictionary of Translation Studies. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- [67] Simpson, P. (2004). Stylistics, a Resource book for Students. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [68] Smith, E. (2004). Shakespeare's Tragedies. Malden/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [69] Stockwell, P. (2002). Cognitive Poetics, an Introduction. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [70] Thornborrow, J & Wareing, S. (1998). Patterns in language, an Introduction to Language and Literary Style. London/New York: Routledge.
- [71] Venuti, L. (2000). The Translation Studies Reader. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [72] Wechsler, R. (1998). Performing Without a Stage; the Art of Literary Translation. New York: Catbird Press.
- [73] Williams, J & Chesterman, A. (2002). The Map, a Beginners Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- [74] Wright, L, & Hope, J. (1996). Stylistics. London/ New York: Routledge.
- [75] Zatlin, P. (2005). Theatrical Translation & Film adaptation; a Practitioner's View. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sajjad Jahansapas is an English teacher in ACECR in Isfahan, Iran. He has an M.A. in translation studies from the University of Isfahan. Field of interest: translation studies, literary translation, theatrical translation

Manijeh Youhanaee holds a PhD in language and linguistics from the University of Essex. She has co-authored with Badrizadeh "A Descriptive Dictionary of Theories of Generative Grammar". She has published a number of articles on the teaching/ acquisition of different English syntactic properties by native speakers of Persian. She teaches MA and PhD courses in linguistics, generative grammar, TEFL and SL A. Her areas of interest include syntactic theory, acquisition of L2 & L3 syntax and issues in teaching and learning English as a second/foreign language.

Hossein Pirnajmuddin Born in 1972 in Isfahan. BA in English from Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman 1994. MA in English Literature from university of Tehran 1996. PhD in English Literature from University of Birmingham 2002. Assistant professor of English Literature at University of Isfahan. Visiting professor at University of Tehran. Field of interest: modern literary theory, colonial and post colonial studies, renaissance studies, translation studies.