

Review

The possibilities and limitations of literary translation: A review of J. Payne's and Henri Clarke's *Translations of Ghazalyat of Hafez*

Behnam Ganjalikhani Hakemi

MA degree in Translation Studies, Iran.

Accepted 29 April, 2013

Literary translation has always been the matter of discussion among translation scholars. Some translation scholars state that this special type of translation could be attempted somehow, provided that the literary translator, in addition to having linguistic knowledge of both source and target language and being familiar with the target culture, enjoys some literary creativity like that of the original author so that s/he can reproduce the flavor of the original in her/his translation. On the other hand, some scholars believe that this very particular type of translation – particularly when rhyme is involved – should not be attempted at all. According to these scholars, in order to enjoy and fully understand literary works, they should just be read in the original language. Such limitations are highlighted even more in the poem of Hafiz whose entire Divan is so replete with amphibologies, puns, word plays and other rhetorical figures which play an important role in enjoying and understanding his poems. This paper aims at analyzing one of Hafez's poems along with its two translations in order to get to the point that despite the limitations a literary translator faces during the act of literary translation, this very particular type of translation can be done somehow. However, rarely does a translated literary work reach the level of the original in terms of conveying the original author's intended meaning and more importantly in terms of conveying the music and flavor of the original.

Key words: Literary text, literary translation, poetry translation, literal translation, rhythm and music of the poem, Hafiz.

INTRODUCTION

Literary translation is still considered as a secondary activity, for this particular type of translation is said to be (and in fact in many cases) inferior as compared to the original. One reason for that is the lack of creativity in many of the translations of literary works where the process is kind of mechanical and artificial which is only aimed at conveying the meaning. As a result, many literary translations fail to achieve the fame and quality of the original. This becomes even more problematic when the literary work to be translated is versified – such as

poem – where its music and rhythm is as important as its content, if not more important. Accordingly, in the act of literary translation, reproducing the music of the original in the translation is as crucial as reproducing the poet's intended meaning, for if a poem is stripped off its rhythm and music, little there remains for its audience. Considering that words in a literary work carry a special energy and extra load other than that found in other types of texts, it could be stated that those translators who translate just using their linguistic knowledge of source

and target language, and fail to include in their translations the creativity, rhythm and nuances of meaning one finds and feels in the original poem, cannot provide their readers with a work which is a good representative of the original.

It is worth mentioning that the *Divan of Hafez* is replete with puns, homonyms, and wordplays, which although being interesting for the Persian readers, seems to be boring, incomprehensible and intolerable for English readers. This is indicative of the fact that even if a literary translator succeeds in rendering the original's intended meaning and conveying rhythm and music of the original in his translation, the translation of a literary work almost never reaches the level of the original.

Should literature be translated or not?

Literary translation has always been the matter of discussion among translation scholars. Some believe that this type of translation cannot and should not be attempted, for it will never reach the level of the original. According to these theorists' views, any literary work should only be read in the original language in which it has been written. Some other translation theoreticians, on the other hand, suggest that this very special type of translation could be done somehow – though with some loss of original author's intended meaning, and more importantly with loss of the beauty and flavor of the original. But there is another aspect which needs to be taken into consideration as well; a literary translation has the ability to elevate an original work in terms of its audience. As a simple example, compare an original Norwegian masterpiece which has five million readers at most with its English translation (which although lacks the beauty and flavor of the original) can earn half a billion readers. In other words, to do a literary translation is to share a literary work – and more importantly the pleasure felt by reading it – with so many other readers who cannot read it in the original language. Newmark puts it this way: "I love certain musical works, poems, plays, fiction and paintings, and I want, rather too concisely, to convey the love to any readers I have ..." (Newmark, cited in Anderman and Rogers, 1999). In exactly the same way, Lefevere describes the situation through which little-known or unknown writers can obtain fame by having their works [properly] translated into other languages, helping them to have more readers. As an example, Lefevere discusses Bentley's translation of Brecht's works (which were not known in Germany before being translated) that lead to his fame. That is how Bentley's and other translators' rendering of Brecht's works (which was much more accepted in England than in US, his home) helped him to be recognized as one of the "classic authors" of the twentieth century out of his own country. Therefore, regarding the fact that literary translators can play a significant role in making literary

works known far beyond their own linguistic boundaries, it can be claimed that this very special type of translation is one which needs greater attention. As put by Marilyn, "without translation, obviously, literatures could not be experienced outside their usual areas of language use. Without criticism, literature cannot build up the traditions that help preserve and disseminate it" (Marilyn, 1997).

How is the flavor of the original reduced in translation?

As mentioned before, there will be loss of beauty and flavor of the original when it is translated into other languages. The issue of possibility or impossibility of literary translation becomes even more crucial when *music* and/or *rhyme* is involved in the original literary work. For instance, imagine this musical piece taken from Shakespeare's masterpiece, *Macbeth*, that goes like this: "A drum! A drum! Macbeth doth come". If its translation is striped off its music, it would be something like this in French: "Un tambur! Un tambur! Macbeth vient" (example taken from *The craft of translation*, by Biguenet and Schulte, 1989). As another example to indicate the integration of form and meaning in literary works, Garcia cites a Portuguese poem by Cassiano Ricardo entitled *Serenata sintetica* which goes like this: *rua torta, lua morta, tua porta*. This short poem refers to a small town with *winding streets* (*rua torta*), a *fading moon* (*lua morta*), and the hint of an enormous affair: *your door* (*tua porta*) (example taken from Hatim and Mason, 1990). As it can be clearly seen, the emotional effect obtained solely through the *close rhyme and rhythm* has not been transferred in the English translation at all [and cannot be transferred into other languages either]. As Yebra himself admits, he could not translate the poem into Spanish – which is a language very close to Portuguese in terms of phonology and vocabulary, let alone other languages which are not that close to Spanish (Yebra, cited in Hatim and Mason, 1990). As could be seen in these two samples, mere communicating the original's meaning into the TL does not suffice in creating the same effect for the target readers as the original had on source readers. Therefore, as Borges stated in another manner, translator should take liberties with the text in order to preserve the spirit of what the original literary author tried to communicate – as far as this deviation from the original does not cause much harm to the original meaning.

The uniqueness of literary translation: Why is literary translation more difficult than other types of translation?

According to Geoffrey (2004), there are four main types of translation: literary, scientific and technical, commercial and business and interpreting. Yet, these four main

translation types could include some subcategories such as philosophical (a branch of literary translation), legal (a branch of technical translation) etc. These main types of translation and their subcategories vary in terms of content and difficulty. If legal translation be considered as the type of translation in which the translator burdens most liability – due to the very fact that even the smallest deviation from the original text (say, a contract for instance) may cause great financial loss or disastrous consequences for the factory, institution, or the person receiving the translated text¹ – literary translation (as many translation scholars argue) can be called the most difficult type of translation – for it entails the translator to have capabilities beyond those found in other types of translation.

As mentioned before, the indirect use of language in a literary text, especially when rhyme is involved such as in poetry, causes the reader to face what Wilss names “semantic open-mindedness”, that is, using words so openly and so creatively that entails the reader to employ all his “resources of semantic and stylistic creativity” in order to fully grasp the meaning. Wilss also indicates that [literary] translation is not a creative, but as he names, a “recreative” activity (Wilss, in Gaddis Rose, 1985). As clearly put by Hermans, “literary translation represents a distinctive kind of translation because it is concerned with a distinctive kind of text” (Hermans, in Kuhiwiczak and Littau, 2007). In fact, as described by American Literary Translation Association (ALTA) in an article by the title of *Getting Started in Literary Translation*, “a literary translator translates a culture, not just a language”. Literary translation enjoys some characteristics which make it different from other types of translation. One difference, and perhaps the most important one, is that in this type of translation, *how* the original is conveyed in the TL is as important as *what* is conveyed, if not more important. Therefore, in the process of literary translation, what makes a lively, moving, interesting translation different from a stilted, rigid, and artificial one depends on the fact that to some extent beauty and flavor of the original is conveyed in the translated literary work (Landers, 2001).

Another characteristic which seems to be applicable solely to literary translation is that the translator has some liberties to render SL sentences in a way which is deemed as ungrammatical or at least substandard forms – as the original author might apply the substandard language in his original work as well. As an example, consider the following hemistich taken from Thomas Hardy's famous poem in condemning the war that ignores the English syntax which specifies the verb to

come after the subject and before the object (SVO), not at the end of the sentence: *Yes; quaint and curious war is! Or Just so: my foe of course he was* (example taken from Perrine, 1974). As put by Lotfi-pour Sa'edi, what makes a literary text different from a non-literary text, is using of such substandard language or particular way of communicating the SL author's idea which give extra beauty and/or literary value and aesthetic dimension to the text (Sa'edi, 2008).

Another characteristic of literary translation is that in this type of translation, unlike technical, scientific, legal, ... translations, the translator should make relationship with the ST and source author, while in other types of translation there are just some technical and specialized terms that – though difficult they may be for the translator – do not entail the translator to make any specific relationship with the original author or be familiar with his culture and his other works. It goes without saying that in other text types, having the linguistic knowledge of the specialized terms in the text is enough, but in literary genre it does not seem to be enough. In fact, since there is no limitation in a literary writer's use of creative language, no boundary for his imagination, having the linguistic knowledge of the two languages does not seem to be enough for producing a successful literary translation. That is especially more crucial when rhyme and/or rhythm is involved as well as in poetry translation. There have been cases where a literary translator had had a trip to the source author's homeland and lived there for quite a time to become familiar with the culture of the original so as to be able to produce a translation similar to the original. However, the more familiar a literary translator is with the original author's style of writing, the more close his translation would be to that of the original. An example of this is Melinawski, the Polish anthropologist who lived for years in Trobriand Islands in New Zealand in order to get acquaintance with their culture, lifestyle and traditions so that he could produce more accurate translations. In doing so, Melinawski even asked the local residents to recite their hunting stories and their fishing techniques for him. Another example of such cases is Najaf Darya Bandari's preface to his translation of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* which is an attempt to make the readers familiar with Hemingway's world, through which the comprehension of his book became easier for Persian readers (Solh-jou, 2009). It goes without saying that Darya Bandari could not have written such a comprehensive preface on Hemingway if he did not know Hemingway thoroughly.

The language of Hafez

A problematic, yet beautiful aspect of Hafez is that his language is multi-dimensional and therefore it lends itself to various interpretations. To mention some, his wines can be interpreted both as mundane wine and theosophical wine; his criticism of religious issues such

¹ For instance imagine the following sentence where the inclusion or omission of the comma can specify whether the person receives the payment or not: the research institute promises to pay you 10000 \$ [,] and give you a full contract if you finish the research within 18 months (example taken from Wallwork, 2011: 101). As a Persian example imagine the following sentence where the inclusion of comma means the person should be released and the omission of it means that he should be executed: بخشش [و] لازم نیست اعدام شود.

as prayer, fast and mosque can be taken as his deep belief in religion or excessive disbelief; and there is no significant difference between mundane, heavenly and theosophical love in his poems. His mastery over his way of language used earned him the title of 'لسان الغیب' which at first was used to describe his poems and later on was used to refer to the poet himself (Khoramshahi, 2011).

Hafez made a revolution in *ghazal* such that unlike the poets before him whose poems enjoyed coherence and cohesion in a way that all verses were related to one another, his *ghazals* were versified such that each verse was independently meaningful; in other words, the unit of meaning in his *ghazals* is each verse rather than the entire *ghazal*. Hence, one may assume at the beginning that his *ghazals* lack surface coherence, whereas it surely enjoys a deeper and superior coherence (ibid, 92). Hafez versifies most of his *ghazals* in a way that three or four verses are devoted to wine, two or three verses are on Sufism and some three or four verses may go for [say] the beloved. This way of composing poems, as mentioned before, may cause his poems to seem somehow incoherence and unrelated at first glance, whereas in fact it is indicative of his superior capability in composing solo-verses (تک بیت‌ها) (ibid, 100).

Amphibology in *Divan of Hafez*

As mentioned before, one of the most wisely used rhetorical figures in the poems of Hafez which should be taken into account while reading his poems is amphibology. Amphibology refers to the case where the poet applies a term in a way that more than one interpretation can be made out of it. Farid in her book, *Amphibologies in Divan of Hafez*, states that applies a term [or a phrase] which has a close meaning as well as a far one. She adds that the reader's mind is directed at the close meaning whereas it is [usually] the far meaning which is intended by the poet [additions mine] (Farid, 1997). However, it should be noted that not everybody can find the hidden meaning of such terms and phrases. In other words, the average readers who are not that familiar with Persian poetry and its rhetorical figures may detect only the surface meaning and fail to detect the other hidden meaning(s) (ibid, 124). Amphibologies, if detected by readers, can give extra beauty to the poem. Yet, due to the differences between vocabulary and grammatical structures of any two languages, amphibologies can almost never be translated by translators. Hence, amphibology (and parallelism) can almost be categorized as untranslatable between languages. Some instances of using amphibology by Hafez are given as follows:

بادت به دست باشد اگر دل نهی به هیچ
که تخت سلیمان رود به باد
Where 'رود به باد' has got two meanings: a) to be destroyed; and b) to travel by wind force, as read in

stories of Solomon the prophet. Or, in the following two verses:

جهان پیرست و بی بنیاد از این فرهادکش فریاد
نیرنگش ملول از جان شیرینم
که کرد افسون و گر چو فرهادم به تلخی جان برآید
بس حکایت‌های شیرین باز می‌ماند ز من
باک نیست

Where 'شیرین' has got two meanings: a) the lover of Farhad² (ایهام تناسب); and b) the opposite of bitter.

Sir William Jones and Hafez

Almost all those researching on Persian poetry agree to the fact that no one has been able to introduce the Persian language and its lyrical poetry to the literary world of the West as Sir William Jones who has been truly named 'the father of Persian studies in the west'. In his book, *Fifty poems of Hafiz*, Arthur Arberry has collected the translations of fifty poems of Hafez which had been translated by Jones, Gertrude Bell, etc. Yet, it should be noted that Jones's translations of *ghazalyat of Hafez* had been printed in Jones's book, *A Persian Song* also. In his book, Arberry states that the Persian *ghazal* which is often used for self-expression is most closely similar with the English sonnet. Arberry then ventures to say that [despite the differences between the Persian *ghazal* and the English sonnet] Hafez's poetry techniques can after little modification "inspire new developments in western poetry" (Arberry, 1947).

In the next part of his book, Arberry states that Hafez's inventive style and characteristic form of mystical lyric is so distinguished that almost any Persian reader can detect his *ghazals* among other poems: "so much so that connoisseurs of Persian literature can immediately recognize his poetry and identify his accent" (ibid). This innovative form of self-expression is not only found in his totally new style, but also in his using of the terms which he innovated himself. For instance, *kharabat* (taverns), *khirqā* (mystic's cloak), *zahid* (ascetic), *shahid* (beauty), *dair* (abbey, tavern) and off course *rend* (a superior, religious, yet an open-minded person) to name a few³. However, it should be mentioned that even if some of these technical terms had been already used by other poets before Hafez, it was Hafez who amply used them in his *Divan*. Arberry praises Hafez's skillful using of rhetorical figures in his language such as *iham* (amphibology), *mora'at-e nazir* (parallelism), *jinas* (play on words), *tashbih* (simile), [*istiare* (metaphor)] and the like (ibid: 18). It should be noted that except for some similes common to the poets before and after Hafez –

² Note that شیرین (Shirin) is a name given to girls in Persia. Yet, its denotative meaning is 'sweet'. Yet, unlike English, the proper nouns in Persian are not written in capital letter. Hence, شیرین can be attributed either to Shirin or sweet.

³ Once again, it should be noted that the proposed English equivalents before the aforementioned Persian terms, given by Arberry and the author of the present paper, are not the exact equivalents for Hafez's original terms. For, these are Hafez's own created terms for which there is no exact equivalent in other languages.

such as comparing the hair with unbelief, a chain, a hyacinth, a snare, a noose, a snake; the brow with a bow; the stature with a cypress; the face with a lamp, a rose, the moon; the mouth with a rosebud, a pistachio – other rhetorical figures of his Divan has been originally his.

An analysis of J. Payne's and Henry Clarke's translation of Hafez's سالها دل طلب جام جم از ما می‌کرد

In order to discuss the possibilities and limitations of literary translation, or to put it another way, in order to see whether literary texts are translatable between languages or not, it seems helpful to analyze Payne's and Clarke's translations of Hafez's سالها دل طلب جام جم از ما می‌کرد. It should be noted that the analysis of the translations and their comparison against the original is mainly done through and from the point of view of Antoine Berman's twelve deforming tendencies in the process of literary translation. However, since a thorough comparison of the two translations in terms of transfer of the meaning, reproduction of the music of the original and

the methods adopted to render different rhetorical figures and poetic images of the original in the translation cannot be discussed only through Berman's twelve deforming tendencies, the author of the present project decided to analyze the two translations according to other proposed concepts such as Laurence Venuti's foreignization and domestication, Peter Newmark's semantic and communicative methods of translation, etc. In other words, the analysis of Clarke's translations of Hafez and that of Payne – though mainly discussed through Berman's twelve procedures – is not restricted to it at all; rather, these two translations would be discussed from the point of view of various Translation Studies scholars' suggested notions. Also, it needs to be mentioned that the two translations are first analyzed from the point of view of transfer of the original meaning, and then from the point of view of aesthetic and musical reproduction. Furthermore, the analyses are made verse by verse. Here is the original poem along with its two translations:

سالها	دل	طلب	جام	جم	از	ما	می‌کرد
وانچه خود داشت	ز بیگانه	تمنا	می‌کرد				
گوهری	کز	صدف	کون	و	مکان	بیرون	است
طلب از گمشدگان	لب دریا	می‌کرد					
مشکل	خویش	بر	پیر		مغان	بردم	دوش
کو به	تایید نظر	حل معما	می‌کرد				
دیدمش	خرم	و	خندان	قدح	باده	به	دست
و اندر آن آینه	صدگونه	تماشا	می‌کرد				
گفتم	این	جام	جهان	بین	به	تو	کی داد حکیم
گفت آن روز که	این گنبد	مینا	می‌کرد				
بی‌دلی	در	همه	احوال	خدا	با	او	بود
او نمی‌دیدش	و از دور	خدا را	می‌کرد				
ای	همه	شعبده‌ی	خویش	که	می‌کرد		اینجا
سامری پیش	عصا	و ید بیضا	می‌کرد				
گفت	آن	یا	کزو	گشت	سر	دار	بلند
جرمش	این بود	که	اسرار هویدا	می‌کرد			
فیض	روح	القدس	ار	باز	مدد		فرما
دیگران هم	بکنند	آنچه	مسیحا	می‌کرد			
گفتمش	سلسله‌ی	زلف	بتان	از	پی		چیست
گفت حافظ	گله‌ای	از دل	شیدا	می‌کرد			

J. Payne translated this ghazal as:

I
Long years my heart had made request
Of me, a stranger, hopefully

(Not knowing that itself possessed
The treasure that it sought of me),
That Jamshid's chalice I should win
And it would see the world therein.
That is a pearl by far too rare

To be contained within the shell
Of time and space; lost vagrants there
Upon the ocean's margin, well
We know it is a vain surmise
That we should hold so great a prize.

II

There was a man that loved God well;
In every motion of his mind
God dwelt; and yet he could not tell
That God was in him, being blind:
Wherefore as if afar he stood And cried,
"Have mercy, O my God!"

III

This problem that had vexed me long
Last night unto the taverner
I carried; for my hope was strong
His judgement sure, that could not err,
Might swiftly solve infallibly
The riddle that had baffled me.
I saw him standing in his place,
A goblet in his grasp, a smile
Of right good cheer upon his face,
As in the glass he gazed awhile
And seemed to view in vision clear
A hundred truths reflected there.

IV

"That friend who, being raised sublime
Upon the gallows, glorified
The tree that slew him for his crime,
This was the sin for which he died,
That, having secrets in his charge,
He told them to the world at large."
So spake he; adding, "But the heart
That has the truth within its hold
And, practising the rosebud's art,
Conceals a mystery in each fold,
That heart hath well this comment lined
Upon the margin of the mind.
"When Moses unto Pharaoh stood,
The men of magic strove in vain
Against his miracle of wood;
So every subtlety of brain
Must surely fail and feeble be
Before the soul's supremacy.
"And if the Holy Ghost descend
In grace and power infinite
His comfort in these days to lend
To them that humbly wait on it,
Theirs too the wondrous works can be
That Jesus wrought in Galilee."

V

"What season did the Spirit wise
This all-revealing cup assign
Within thy keeping?" "When the skies

Were painted by the Hand Divine
And heaven's mighty void was spanned,
Then gave He this into my hand."
"Yon twisted coil, yon chain of hair
Why doth the lovely Idol spread
To keep me fast and fettered there?"
"Ah, Hafiz!", so the wise man said,
"Tis a mad heart, and needs restraint
That speaks within thee this complaint."

And Clarke's rendering of this ghazal goes as:

Search for the cup of Jamshid from me, years my heart
made,
And for what it possessed, from a stranger, entreaty
made.
A jewel that is beyond the shell of existence and that of
time,
From those lost on the shore of the sea, search it made.
Last night, I took my difficulty to the Pir of the Magians,
Who, by strengthening of sight, the solving of subtlety
made.
Him, happy, laughing, wine goblet in hand, I saw:
And in the mirror, a hundred kinds of views he made.
I said: "When gave the All-wise this cup world-viewing
to thee?"
He said: "On that day, when the azure dome He made."
Unknowingly, He was with me everywhere.
I couldn't see and my soul sleekest Him, made.
His magic that He all made here,
Sameri had the cane but the white hands of Moses,
sleekest made.
He said: "That friend, by whom lofty became the head
of the gibbet,
"His crime was this that clear, the mysteries of the sky,
he made."
If, again, the bounty of the Holy Spirit give aid,
Others also may make those, which the Jesus made.
I said to him: "The chain-like tress of idols is for the
sake of what?"
He said: "Of his own distraught heart, Hafez complaint
made."

A general review of the two translations indicates that like his previous renderings, Clarke's translation of this ghazal is literal also. But surprisingly, his translation of this ghazal, unlike the previous ones, enjoys some rhythm and music as well. On the other side, Payne's rendering of this ghazal is a free translation aiming at reproducing the flavor of the original for the target audience. However, his translation is twice as long as the original. This is due to a process during literary translation which Berman names 'the destruction of linguistic patternings'⁴. Here, each verse would be

⁴ Berman's ninth process of deforming tendencies which refers to cases in which a range of techniques such as rationalization, clarification and

analyzed along with its two translations:

Comparing his translation with the original verse, it becomes clear that Payne has almost fully grasped Hafez's intended meaning and transferred it in his translation – though with some additions and alterations on his part. Clarke seems to have grasped the main idea of this verse also, but his literal translation of this verse – though being a bit more musical compared to his previous renderings – fails to attract the English ears. Not only Clarke's rendering lacks sonority and music required in poetry translation, but also his using of a formal term such as 'entreaty' (which suits legal texts) rather than a literary one or at least instead of a more informal term such as *ask* or *request* reduces the flavor of the original.

Payne's translation of this verse is perfect in terms of reproduction of a musical rendering and conveying the original's meaning except for one part. As is gathered from the original poem, 'بیگانه' refers to someone other than the poet himself whereas Payne attributes it to the poet. Yet, as mentioned before, a literary translator is allowed to add to the original or make alterations to it as far as it does not exert much harm to the original author's intended meaning. Payne's additions, clarifications and alterations of this ghazal help the reader get the original meaning and yet do not harm the original to a great extent. He has added in his translation, 'hopefully', 'not knowing that' and 'the treasure'; altered the original (attributing 'بیگانه' to the poet instead of others other than the poet); and clarified what was not clear in the original (by explaining that one could see the world by Jamshid's chalice⁵). This verse is a great example showing why a literary translator is allowed to make few changes to the original. Comparing the two translations against one another, it can be observed that unlike Payne, Clarke did not provide his readers with an explanation about Jamshid's cup or its capability of showing the universe (and its secrets). As a result of this, the reader who is not familiar with this special cup and its mysterious capability cannot get the original's meaning fully by merely reading Clark's translation of this verse⁶. However, it should be mentioned that it is a very rare occurrence that Clarke was able to look and see beyond the mere words before him. By this, the author means his ability in grasping the point that 'جام جم' refers to 'جام جمشید' (Jamshid's cup). In terms of aesthetic reproduction, it could be said that Clarke did intend to

add music to his translation by using 'made' at the end of each verse, but still he was not that successful in creating a musical translation. Unlike his previous rhythmical translation, Payne's musical translation of this verse was not a success either. Considering Payne's translation of the first verse, it could be observed that the terms 'request'/'possessed', 'hopefully'/'me' and 'win'/'therein', though to some extent pleasing to the ear, cannot be considered a perfect musical translation.

Before beginning to analyze the second verse, it seems noteworthy to mention that 'گوهر', though coming at the beginning of the Persian verse, is not the subject of the verse as it might seem at the first glance; rather it functions as the object of the verse. Instead, the object of this verse is 'دل'. Therefore, the meaning of this verse is almost exactly the same as the previous one; that makes a rhetorical figure which in Persian poetry is known as 'اطناب'⁷. By determining the subject and the object of this verse, it becomes clear that like the first verse, Hafez meant to say that "my heart which intended to search (and find out) the mysteries and facts of the universe, asked help from the strangers while it itself had been the truth-finder".

Having failed to detect the real subject and object, the two translators failed to grasp Hafez's intended meaning and consequently failed to accurately convey it into the TL. In fact, neither Payne's free translation and nor Clarke's literal translation reflect what Hafez meant to say. Not only is Payne's rendering replete with additions and changings of the original on his own, but also he mistranslated a part. As could be seen in his translation, Payne's 'lost vagrants' is not a good equivalent for 'گمشدگان' for two reasons: a) vagrant is a legal term which consequently suits legal texts; and b) vagrant refers to *homeless* or even *stray* people which is far different from what Hafez meant by 'گمشدگان'. In short, Payne's translation does make sense for the target reader, but not the sense Hafez meant to communicate. On the other hand, Clarke's literal translation of this verse is unnatural (and meaningless in some parts) as well. As could be seen in his translation, he translated 'گوهر' literally as a 'jewel' which is conducting a search from those who were lost. Reading his translation, anybody asks himself "how can a jewel, a lifeless thing, search for something?" However, Payne's musical translation of the second verse – though with some additions and alterations and a mistranslation – was at least able to meet one of the objectives of producing a poetry translation – to make it pleasant to the ears. As could be seen in his second verse, the rhythmical terms 'rare'/'there', 'shell'/'well'

expansion will be adopted by the translator in the process of literary translation, making the translated literary work much longer than the original literary work [For further discussion on this notion, see Berman's twelve deforming tendencies].

⁵ "جام جم" which was first used by Ferdowsi in the story of Bijan and Manijeh, refers to a cup in which the world and what happens in it can be seen by its holder.

⁶ However, it needs to be noted that some Translation Studies scholars such as Laurence Venuti believe that the translator should not provide his readers with such explanations; rather, it is the reader himself who should look and search for those parts unknown to him.

⁷ A figure of speech in Persian poetry system according to which the poet restates a previously expressed verse in a way that the newly stated verse(s) act (almost) as the repetition of the first verse. Yet, it should be mentioned that 'اطناب' differs from 'حشو' in that unlike redundancy, it does not reduce the flavor of the language by adding repetitive and/or unnecessary parts.

and 'surmise'/'prize' have had a significant role in making Payne's translation of the second verse pleasing to the ear.

Reading Clarke's translation of the third verse, it becomes clear that Clarke has translated 'پیر مغان' as 'Pir of the Magians'. His decision to do so can be reviewed from two points:

a) He has applied a foreignizing method of translation, such that the noun phrase 'پیر مغان' has been rendered as 'Pir of the Magians', a term not familiar for the average English reader. However, the fact that not everybody understands this phrase does not mean that his attempt in conveying the SL phrase into the TL in a way that its original identity is preserved has been a failure. Rather, this method of translation is simply a way to preserve the ST's foreign identity as well as to highlight the translator's presence in the translated text (a debate proposed and discussed by Venuti) [for further discussion, Venutti, 1995].

b) This is an instance of mistranslation: although 'مغ' means boss of the Zoroastrians, Hafez's 'پیر مغان' surely differs from Clarke's equivalent for this term which is 'Pir of Magians' (boss of the Zoroastrians). However, considering the fact that 'پیر مغان' is one of Hafez's created terms for which there is no (exact) equivalent in other languages, Clarke could not have chosen an equivalent among those present in English lexicon. Rather, he should have thought up a new term or selected a similar term in its place.

A meaningless term catches the eye at the end of Clarke's translation of this verse which is most likely a result of misprint by the book publisher. With respect to the collocation of the words in Clarke's translation and also by comparing his translation against the original poem, it could be claimed that *subtly* must have been the term used by Clarke, not 'subtly'. However, this is just a guess by the author of the present research. Stating from the point of view of the music of the poem, it should be mentioned that Clarke's use of the term 'made' in this verse as well as the previous and the next verses in an attempt to create a rhythmical and musical translation has not been that effective. In fact, the music of his translation looks so amateur when compared with that of Payne in terms of creating a rhythmical translation.

Payne's translation of this verse is much longer than that of Clarke which is due to applying expansion⁸ and clarification⁹ in his translation. However, it would have been much better if these additions (such as 'had vexed me long' and 'my hope was strong') and clarifications (such as 'had baffled me') and many more such cases, were limited to few cases in Payne's translation. In terms of aesthetic creation, it should be mentioned that

his clever choice in integrating the rhythmical terms 'long'/'strong', 'taverner'/'err' and to a lesser extent 'infallibly'/'me' makes his translation pleasing for the English ears.

As it was the case in previous verses, Payne's translation of the fourth verse is longer than the original poem which is due to applying additions (such as 'standing in his place', 'he gazed awhile' and 'in vision clear') in his translation. Yet, he did well in finding out the point that 'آینه' in the original poem refers to Jamshid's cup in which the truth and mysteries of the universe could be seen. Comparing Payne's translation of the fourth verse against the original, it becomes clear that he was successful in communicating the meaning in the TL and reproducing the music of the original in his translation. On the other hand, Clarke's literal translation of this verse does not fully communicate the meaning into the TL, for he could not get the main idea of the verse which lies in terms 'قدح باده' and 'آینه'. As could be gathered from the Persian verse, 'قدح باده' and 'آینه' do not mean *the wine cup* and *the mirror* (in which one can see himself) respectively. Rather, as clearly put by Payne, both terms refer to Jamshid's cup which shows its holder the universe and its truths. Clarke's using of the term 'wine-goblet' and 'mirror' as equivalents for 'قدح باده' and 'آینه' might be justified provided that he had used 'wine-goblet' and 'mirror' in their figurative meaning (a metaphor referring to theosophical wine or Jamshid's cup) to refer to 'جام جهان بین' – a low probability though. To put it another way, one cannot judge if Clarke has grasped Hafez's intended meaning on these two terms unless s/he can make it clear whether these terms have been used in their figurative meanings by him or in their denotative meanings. Furthermore, here again, Clarke's totally literal translation, particularly in the phrase 'a hundred kinds of views' for 'صدگونه تماشا', has led to a translation which does not read and flow naturally in the TL. His translation was not a success even in terms of musical reproduction, for he was not able to create any music in his translation of the fourth verse. Contrary to him, Clarke by including in his translation the rhythmical terms 'place'/'face', 'smile'/'awhile' and to a lesser degree 'clear'/'there' reproduced the flavor of the original in the TT to some extent.

Before beginning to review the fifth verse, it should be noted that Payne has changed the place of the fifth verse in his translation such that the translation of Hafez's fifth verse has been placed at the end of Payne's translation. The structure of this verse is such that Clarke's literal translation of this verse fully conveys the meaning in the TL. What sounds interesting is Clarke's insist on giving a literal translation in all parts. In so doing, he even placed the adjective after the noun in the phrase 'cup world-viewing' (instead of *world-viewing cup*), following the Persian syntactic rules which state that the adjective should be placed after the noun. Apart from his success in communicating the meaning

⁸ A term proposed by Berman whereby TTs tend to be longer than the.

⁹ A term proposed by Berman whereby the translator clarifies what tended not to be clarified in the original.

in the TL, his wise choice of archaic/literary terms such as 'dome' and 'thee' need to be praised, for applying literary terms instead of formal ones – either in an original literary text or in a literary translated text – increases the aesthetic value of the work. In general, it can be claimed that Clarke's translation of this verse has been more successful than his previous verses both in terms of reproduction of the meaning in the TL and from the point of view of literary value. However, his translation still is no match for Payne's whose wise choice of the rhymes 'wise'/'skies', 'assign'/'Divine' and 'spanned'/'hand' creates a musical translation.

Payne, on the other hand, has produced a more free translation, exerting expansion and clarification in his rendering which as mentioned before has made his translation longer than the original verse. However, since these additions and clarifications do not harm the original meaning, their use by Payne is not to be blamed. In fact, quite the contrary, this solution by Payne makes the meaning even clearer for the target reader. From the point of view of aesthetic reproduction, it could be claimed that despite the two literary terms used in Clarke's translation of this verse (dome and thee), his rendering cannot be considered a literary one, for it lacks the music required in poetry translation. A point which needs to be praised in the translation of Payne and Clarke is their success in getting the meaning of 'گنبد مینا می‌کرد' which refers to the creation of the universe by the Lord. This phrase was translated freely as 'painting the skies and spanning the heavens' and as 'making the azure dome' by Payne and Clarke respectively. Knowing Clarke and judging from his totally literal translation method, it is a surprise why Clarke did not render this phrase literally and unnaturally as something like 'doing this glass-like dome'!

Once again, before starting to analyze the sixth verse, it should be noted that Payne has changed the place of this verse in his translation such that the translation of this verse appears almost at the beginning of his translation, as he changed the place of Hafez's third verse in his translation. Almost all Persian readers can detect the allusion applied in this ghazal which refers to the fact that God is so close to each and every one of us human beings. The original Qur'an verse goes like this: "و هو معكم اينما كنتم" (and He is with you wherever you go) (سوره ی حدید، آیه 4) [or in this verse: "نحن اقرب اليه من حبل" (سوره ی حدید، آیه 4) (I am closer to you than your vein is to your neck) (سوره ی ق، آیه 16)]. As discussed in previous chapters, allusion is among those rhetorical figures which almost never can be translated (exactly) between two languages (particularly if the applied allusion refers to the Holy Books). The only way to accurately communicate an allusion in the TL is providing the target readers with footnote giving an explanation which is not recommended and is better not be attempted in poetry translation.

Comparing Payne's translation of the sixth verse with

the original, it could be observed that he has almost fully grasped Hafez's intended meaning and communicated it in the TL (except for one changing of the meaning). Reading his translation, it could be seen that Payne's chosen equivalent for 'خدا با او بود' which goes as 'God was in him' (خدا درون او بود) is different from the original¹⁰. Yet, his translation method is neither that different from the original's intended meaning to be called a domesticating method¹¹ (almost the same as free translation), nor is it that close to the original in terms of form and content to be called a foreignizing (almost the same as literal) method of translation. Instead, his adopted method of translation in the sixth verse could be called communicative method¹². Here again, Hafez has applied an amphibology in this verse concerning the term 'احوال'. Reading the original sixth verse, it can be seen that 'در همه احوال' lends itself to two interpretations: a) all the time; and b) in all states¹³. Yet, both Payne and Clarke had to adopt one of the two interpretations. Hence, they communicated 'در همه احوال' as 'in every motion of his mind' and 'everywhere' respectively. Comparing Payne's proposed equivalents in his translation such as 'a man who loved God well' for 'عاشقی', 'in every motion of his mind' for 'در همه احوال' and 'and cried, have mercy, O my God!' for 'خدا را می‌کرد' shows his tendency to make the TT as effective for the target readers as it was for Persian readers. Payne's creation of rhyme in his translation using 'well'/'tell', 'mind'/'blind' and to a lesser degree 'stood'/'God' should be praised also.

Comparing Clarke's rendering of this term against the original poem, it could be observed that he has changed in his translation of the term 'بیدل' (one in love) to 'me' (which refers to Hafez). This changing of meaning on his part could be interpreted in two ways:

- a) By using 'me' instead of 'بیدل', Clarke wrongly gathered from the original poem that Hafez tried to liken himself to the lover in his poem; or
- b) By changing the original's intended meaning, Clarke tried to liken Hafez to the lover on his part – despite knowing that it was not what Hafez meant to say.

One cannot say for sure whether this mistranslation resulted from the translator's misinterpretation of the original or as result of his tendency to change the original as he had pleased, but based on one reason, the author of this research favors the first interpretation, abandoning the second. Knowing Clarke and his

¹⁰ The correct translation is God was with him, not in him.

¹¹ A term suggested and discussed by Laurence Venuti which refers to a translation procedure in which the translator aims at minimizing the foreignness of the TT by translating the ST structures according to TL norms.

¹² A term suggested by Peter Newmark which refers to a translation method which aims at producing as far as possible the same effect for the target readers as the source text had on source readers.

¹³ Note that 'احوال' in Persian language has got two meanings: a) times; b) states (moods).

excessive insist on being so close and so faithful to the original, it is not highly probable that this mistranslation is an attempt to change the original. Therefore, this mistranslation could be explained such that it was a misunderstanding of the original. Anyway, whatever the reason, the term 'بیدل' which is a rather easy and clear term used by Hafez in his *Divan* as compared to his complex terms, has not been accurately translated by Clarke. In general, this verse could be considered the first verse among previous verses and previous ghazals which has not been translated literally by Clarke. His substitution of the term lover 'بیدل' with 'me' (the poet), and deleting the phrase 'از دور' in his translation is quite unheard of Clarke who had always tried to stick as close as possible to the ST in terms of lexicon and syntax. Comparing the two translations from the point of view of musical translation, it could be stated that unlike Clarke who did not produce a musical translation, Payne did well in including the rhymes 'well'/'tell', 'mind'/'blind' and to a lesser degree 'stood'/'God' in his translation, making it pleasing to the ear.

Hafez has applied an allusion in the translation of the seventh verse which refers to the time when Moses left his clan for twenty days, giving Sameri the opportunity to claim prophecy using a sheep. The original Qur'an verse goes like this: "فَالْقَىٰ عَصَاهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ ثُعْبَانٌ مُّبِينٌ وَنَزَعَ يَدَهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ بَيْضَاءُ لِلنَّظِيرِينَ" (سوره اعراف، آیه 107 و 108) "هی بیضاء للنظرین" (main miracles of Moses) play a pivotal role in this verse, which if not understood or if not translated properly, the main idea of the original remains unsaid. Before moving to the analysis of the two translations, providing the readers with the clear interpretation of this verse (which is closely related to the previous verse) seems useful. Hafez in this verse states that all the tricks and magic that the lover ('بیدل' in the previous verse) presents in this world was for his own benefits, which can be compared to the tricks and magic used by Sameri in Moses's absence. Having understood the original's meaning, the two translations can now be analyzed in detail.

Payne's translation of this verse is a free one which although it flows naturally in the TL and pleases the ears, is not that faithful to the original. As explained above, Hafez meant to compare the lover's in vain attempt in using his tricks and magic against Sameri's useless attempt in taking Moses's place among the clan. Whereas Payne's translation compares Moses's miracles against Pharaoh's hired magic-users who were at the end defeated by Moses. To put it another way, despite the fact that 'عصا' and 'ید بیضا' are considered as Moses's miracles, this is not Moses who has been compared against the lover's in vain attempt; rather this is Moses's fake, Sameri, who has been compared against the lover's in vain attempt (How can Moses, a prophet sent by God, be compared to a deceitful person?) Therefore, it could be observed that Payne, as a result of not understanding the original's idea fully and

properly, or in an attempt to knowingly change the original as he pleases, fails to communicate the exact meaning of the original. Not only does Payne change the original, but also he deletes some parts from it (for instance, the part related to Sameri or the white hand of Moses) and adds some other parts to it (for instance, the part related to Pharaoh and the entire last line of his translation). However, his failure in conveying the original meaning in his translation has been partly¹⁴ compensated by his musical and rhythmical reproduction. To put it more clearly, his rhymes which go as 'stood'/'wood', 'vain'/'brain' and to a lesser degree 'be'/'supremacy' help much in attracting the target audience.

Clarke's rendering of Hafez's seventh verse is neither a literary one aiming at reproducing the original music nor a faithful one attempting to exactly communicate the meaning in the TL. Attributing the cane to Sameri whereas it is in fact Moses's miracle is indicative of his misunderstanding of the original poem. Not only did he fail to grasp the original meaning, but also Clarke seems to be unfamiliar with the details of story of Moses and his miracles. In other words, had he known the story of Moses and his miracles, he could have comprehended the meaning of the original. His mistranslation aside, his unmusical/rhythmless translation adds further negative point to his poor translation. Comparing Clarke's translation with that of Payne, it is quite clear that Payne's rendering of this verse has been much better than Clarke's in terms of form and content.

Fully understanding and consequently accurately translating the eighth verse needs familiarity with the story of حسین بن منصور حلاج بیضاوی which has been applied in Hafez's poem as an allusion to his life and his death. In short, his life story goes like this: Hallaj was a great theosophist of his time who became so close to God that he once said "انا الحق" which *literally* means "I am God". Unfortunately, his claim was misinterpreted such that it was rumored that he claimed to be God. As the penalty for such a crime was death, he was tortured and sent to the gallows.

Not knowing about Hallaj or judging that his story is not interesting for the target readers, both Payne and Clarke depicted Hallaj's death scene in general, not mentioning Hallaj's (or anybody else's) name. Yet, it should be noted that Hallaj's name has not been mentioned in Hafez's *ghazal* either, but any Persian reader having some historical knowledge and knowing Hallaj's well-known statement when being hanged which went as معراج مردان سر دار است (meaning great men die on the gallows) can perceive that this verse depicts

¹⁴ Partly, because Jones has at least done well from the point of view of musical reproduction. Therefore, with respect to the fact that form and content go hand in hand in literary translation, such that sticking too much to one and letting go of the other harms the result of the work (or the translated text), Jones's translation of Hafez's seventh verse is not a total failure, but a partial one.

his death. In short, the term 'یار' in this verse refers to Hallaj. Whether Payne and Clarke did well in turning a completely unknown story for the English audience into a general story, or should they have communicated the original story as it was (by using a foreignizing method of translation) and made the target readers go after Hallaj's story and find out about him, are two contradictory prescriptions in such situations which have not been settled to date. Such hard-to-translate situations and untranslatable figures of speech such as amphibology and wordplays cause limitations in the act of poetry translation, disabling the translator to reproduce a translation at the level of the original in terms of aesthetic reproduction and transfer of the meaning. Yet, despite these limitations of this kind for which no definitive solution has been proposed, both Payne and Clarke delivered acceptable translations which convey the main message of the original poem: that great men devote themselves to explain facts which are far beyond the comprehension of the ordinary people, or die trying to. To put it another way, this verse tries to say that during the history, so many great men have lost their lives as a result of not being accurately understood by ordinary people and/or by those in power.

Clarke has made a trivial mistake in his use of 'sky' instead of *heavens*. In fact, this is the heavens in which the mysteries exist not the sky, for sky refers to the physical blue-colored space above the surface of the earth rather than the spiritual space meant by Hafez. In other words, one does not reveal the mysteries of the sky; rather s/he reveals the mysteries of the heavens. As a final word on this verse, it should be said that Payne's translation of this verse receives double praise, for in addition to the transfer of the meaning – though not exactly as what Hafez meant – he has included in his translation the rhymes 'sublime'/'crime', 'glorified'/'died' and 'charge'/'(at) large', creating a musical translation. However, once again Payne has changed the order of the verses such that this verse has been placed not at the end (as the Persian verse and Clarke's translated verse are), but at the middle of Payne's translation.

Although somehow unrelated, and despite the fact that amphibologies cannot be translated from one language into another, before discussing Clarke's translation of this verse, the amphibology applied in this verse would be discussed so that the aesthetic aspects of Hafez's language become even more highlighted. This skillfully used amphibology which is difficult to detect for those not fully familiar with rhetorical figures has been applied in the phrase "گشت سر دار بلند" which can be interpreted two ways: a) the gibbet was placed high from the surface so that Hallaj could be hanged from it; and b) Hallaj was elevated (honorifically) when he was hanged, for great men die on gibbet. In short, both the gibbet and Hallaj can be meant to be high in the air.

Before setting up to analyze the two translations of

the ninth verse, it seems useful to give a clear interpretation of it. This verse states that if once again another man be assigned by God to prophecy, that man, like previous prophets, will be able to perform the miracles bestowed on him by the Lord. Having given the interpretation of the ninth verse, the two translations could be compared against one another.

As could be seen in Payne's translation, he has delivered a free translation of this verse in which he has exerted some additions and expansions. For Example, his chosen equivalents which go as 'in grace and power infinite' for 'فیض' (both expansion and clarification), 'his comfort in these days to lend' (expansion), 'to them that humbly wait on it' (both expansion and clarification) and adding 'Galilee'¹⁵ in his translation are instances of the phrases that either do not exist or tended to remain explicit in the original. In general, it could be said that Payne has somehow communicated the meaning in the TL but he has not been that faithful to the original. To put it more clearly, his expansions, clarifications and his adding of 'Galilee' in his translation seems to be an attempt to reshape the ST meaning according to the target norms, making it more acceptable for the target readers. Yet, his skill in producing a musical translation using the rhythmical terms 'descend'/'lend', 'infinite'/'it' and to a lesser degree 'be'/'Galilee' is to be praised. Note that in order to create rhyme, he even had to change the place of the noun and the adjective (making 'power infinite' instead of *infinite power*¹⁶).

Clarke's literal translation of this verse not only makes little sense for the target readers, but also it sounds so unnatural for English ears. It seems that Clarke has not paid attention to the point that literal translation does not work where figurative language has been used in the original. The only positive point in his translation is his using of an archaic/literary term (bounty) which gives some literary dimension to his translation. However, his rendering is a failure in terms of aesthetic reproduction and naturalness of translation.

Both Payne and Clarke have grasped the main idea of the last verse and communicated it in the TL; the former through literary translation (with some expansions and clarifications) and the latter through literal translation. Using long phrases such as 'yon

¹⁵ It needs to be said that adding Galilee in his translation while it was not written in the original, could be an attempt to somehow translate what Hafez meant to communicate by 'حلاج'. For, both lost their lives trying to communicate what was beyond the comprehension of their contemporaries.

¹⁶ However, it should be noted that although the English syntax specifies that the adjective be placed before the noun not after it, deviating from this grammatical rule (for the purpose of creating rhyme or exerting more influence) is allowed and tolerated in the act of poetry translation. In exactly the same way, in Persian poetry, it can be observed that the poets tend to change the place of the noun and the adjective or even the verb. An example of such cases can be observed in the following verse by Ferdowsi which has been composed about the creation of his masterpiece, *Shahnameh*:

پیرسیدم از هر کسی بی‌شمار
بترسیدم از گردش روزگار

As could be seen, this verse deviated from the Persian grammar which states that the verb should be placed at the end of the sentence not at the beginning of it.

twisted coil, yon chain of hair' for 'سلسله زلف' (expansion), 'to keep me fast and fettered there?' (clarification), 'so the wise man said' for 'گفت' (expansion and clarification) and 'and needs restraint' (expansion and clarification) make his translation much longer than the original verse (forty words versus Hafez's fourteen words). In terms of aesthetic reproduction, as expected of him, once again Payne did his best. His musical translation using the rhythmical terms 'hair'/'there', 'spread'/'said' and 'restraint'/'complaint' gives extra beauty to his translation.

Clarke's literal translation, on the other hand, is limited to transfer of the meaning into the TL, failing to attract the readers with a musical translation. Neither does Clarke's translation of this verse has any mistakes to be blamed for and nor is it something special to be praised.

As for using literary, archaic or formal terms, it can be observed that J. Payne managed to use five literary terms (dwelt, afar, wondrous, mighty and fetter) and five archaic ones (wherefore, err, you, doth and tis) in his translation for which he should be praised, and four formal terms (possess, vagrant, surmise and conceal) for which he should be reprehended. Because using such formal terms in a literary text reduces its flavor. On the other hand, Clarke had only two literary terms (lofty and bounty) and one archaic (thee) in his translation, and a formal one (possess).

Conclusion

As a final word, it should be noted that although much will be lost (untranslated) in the process of literary translation and despite the fact that except for few cases, the translations of literary works of other languages cannot reach the level of the original in terms of aesthetic reproduction and transfer of the meaning, literary translation needs to be attempted, for – with regard to the number of prestigious languages which most have at least few great literary works – it is impossible to read all the literary works of other nations in the original language. Therefore, there remains no other way, but to resort to the translations of the great literary works. In other words, literary translation is the only possible means through which one can read and enjoy literary works of other nations. However, it needs to be reminded again that literary translation does reduce the flavor of the original. Hence, despite the fact that a translation of a literary work will not have the same effect on the target audience as the original had on the original readers – particularly when rhyme is involved – for instance in poems, there are some solutions through which a literary translator can decrease the gap – and not fully filling it – between the original literary work and its translation(s) into other languages. One such solution is trying to convey as far as the poetic norms of the target language allow the

music and the flavor of the original in the translated text. Another solution, is trying to as much as possible knowing the source culture and/or other works of the same author, through which the comprehension of the original becomes much easier and much accurate. Another is having full knowledge of the rhetoric figures and poetic images of the source and target languages. Last and foremost is having full mastery over the source and target languages (almost at the level of the native speakers).

To limit the discussion to the analysis of the English translations of Hafez, it could be said the main idea of Hafez can be communicated into the target language, but the nuances of meaning one finds and feels in his ghazals cannot be communicated. The main reason for the inferiority of the translation of Hafez as compared to the original lies in the very particular language of Hafez which does not lend itself (fully) to translation. Another reason which rises problem when a poem is to be translated from Persian to English or vice versa is the difference between the poetic system of Persian and English. To put it more clearly, since Persian poetic system depends mostly on the rhymes applied in the poem, while English poetic system works largely with alliteration and assonance – with no rhyme used in the poem in most cases. Either Hafez is translated by a native Persian speaker – who is almost fully familiar with Persian poetry and its rhetorical figures as well as the culture of the people, but does not know English at the level of a native English speaker – or he is translated by a native English – who is knows English fully, but is not fully familiar with Persian poetry and its rhetorical figures as well as the culture of the people. The translation will not be a match for the original. In other words, the translation of Hafez can just get close to it, but it cannot reach it.

REFERENCES

- Arberry AJ (1947). Fifty poems of Hafiz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biguenet J, Schulte R (1989). *The craft of translation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Anderman G, Rogers M (1999). Word, text, translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gaddis RM (1985). Translation perspective: Binghamton: State University of New York. Selected papers, 1984-5. (Vol) 2.
- Hatim B, Mason I (1990). Discourse and translator. London and New York: Longman.
- Kuhiwczak P, Littau K (2007). A companion to translation studies. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Landers CE (2001). Literary translation: A practical guide. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sa'edi Lotfipour K (2008). An introduction to principles of translation: A Discoursal approach. Tehran: SAMT.
- Perrine L (1974). Literature: Structure, sound and sense. Poetry. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Geoffrey S (2004). A practical guide for translators. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Venuti L (1995). The translator's invisibility: A history of translation. New York and London: Routledge.

امامی، ک. (1375). از پست و بلند و ترجمه. تهران: انتشارات نیلوفر.

خرمشاهی، ب، و نیکنام، م. (1373). *برگزیده و شرح حافظ*. تهران: فرزانه.
 زیبایی، م، ع. (1367). *شرح صد غزل از حافظ*. تهران: پائژنگ.
 صلحجو، ع. (1388). *گفتنمان و ترجمه*. چ پنجم. تهران: نشر مرکز.
 فرید، ط. (1376). *ایهامات دیوان حافظ*. تهران: قیام.
 هروی، ح. (1369). *شرح غزل‌های تهران*. تهران: مولف.

ایران‌پناه، ا. (1380). *قرآن کریم سه زبانه (عربی، فارسی، انگلیسی)*. تهران: انتشارات دارینه.
 جریزمدار، ع. (1375). *دیوان حافظ (نسخه‌ی قزوینی-غنی)*. تهران: اساطیر.
 خالقی‌مطلق، ج. (1386). *شاهنامه ابولقاسم فردوسی*. تهران: مرکز دایره‌المعارف بزرگ اسلامی.
 خطیب رهبر، خ. (1374). *شرح غزل‌های حافظ*. تهران: صفی‌علیشاه.
 خرمشاهی، ب. (1387). *حافظ نامه*. تهران: شرکت انتشارات علمی و فرهنگی.
 _____ (1390). *ذهن و زبان حافظ*. تهران: انتشارات ناهید