Translating Translations:

A study of Ngā Rūpaiaha o Oma Kaiama, a Māori translation of the English version of the Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Arts

at

The University of Waikato

by

Hariru Te Aroha Roa

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2013

Abstract

Omar Khayyám, a Persian poet who died in 1131, wrote a number of quatrains in Farsi which are regarded by some as representing the very summit of Sufism (that is, of the mystical dimension of Islamic thought) and by others as being essentially agnostic and hedonistic in nature. Those who are of the latter view are often strongly influenced by the 'translation' into English of some of these quatrains by Edward Fitzgerald, a British poet and writer whose first edition of the *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* appeared in 1859, at the height of the Victorian era. Although there have been several other translations of Khayyám's quatrains, none has been as popular or, perhaps, as highly regarded as an artistic work as that of Fitzgerald. It has rarely, however, been regarded as a work that is faithful to the intent of the original. In deciding to translate into Māori Fitzgerald's rendering into English of some of Khayyám's Farsi quatrains (5^{th} version), Pei Jones was faced with a peculiarly complex set of problems (linguistic, literary, cultural and religious). Pei Jones' translation, a translation of a translation, is generally regarded as being faithful to Fitzgerald's version of the *Rubáiyát.* It would appear, therefore, that he decided to treat Fitzgeralds's text, in spite of the reference in its title to the original text, as his source text. This gives rise to a number of questions, including questions about what it means for a translator to be faithful or unfaithful to a source text. With particular reference to Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*, this thesis explores the concept of 'fidelity', a concept that, it is argued here (see *Chapter 3*), is often treated in the literature on translation in a way that belies its extremely complex nature. The thesis proposes a new approach to the concept of fidelity, one that is based on nine fidelity types: *grammatical, lexical, informational, metrical, imagistic, rhetorical, historical, didactic* and *functional* fidelity. In terms of this nonagonal analytical model, twenty-five of Pei Jones' quatrains are analysed in relation to the equivalent quatrains in Fitzgerald's version (*Chapter 4*). The analysis indicates that Pei Jones' translation has neither *metrical fidelity* (a consequence of the very different nature of the source and target languages) nor *functional fidelity* (a consequence of the very different expectations and sensibilities that a Māori audience has in relation to the verbal arts). Metre and function are both, however, fundamental to the enduring appeal of Fitzgerald's quatrains. The overall conclusion is that since it is often impossible to achieve all nine types of fidelity, translators need to carefully consider what their primary aim is in undertaking the translation of artistic works and be prepared to sacrifice certain types of fidelity (e.g. *historical* and *informational* fidelity) in order to create a work that fulfils the aesthetic expectations of the target audience. Pei Jones

was undeniably successful in achieving those types of fidelity that were possible. However, the work may have had more widespread appeal if he had sacrificed some of them in order to create a work that was more closely aligned with the aesthetic expectations of Māori readers.

He Mihi

Whakataka te hau ki te uru
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga
Kia mākinakina ki uta
Kia mātaratara ki tai
E hī ake ana te atakura
He tio
He huka
He hauhunga
Tihei Mauri Ora

Ko te mihi tuatahi e wehi ana ki te Atua, e whakahōnore ana i a Kīngi Tūheitia e noho mai nā i runga i te ahurewa tapu o ngōna mātua tūpuna, o tōna whaea. Kia tāwharautia ia ki te korowai aroha, ki te korowai atawhai.

Ki ngā tini mate o te wā, ngā rau o piopio, rātou kua pania ki te kōkōwai o Hinenuitepō, haere, oti atu ai e. Tātou te hunga ora ki a tātou, paimārire.

Tēnei rā te whakamānawa i ngā kaihoe o taku waka rangahau. Tuatahi, ki taku kaiārahi, ki a Sophie Nock, nāna ahau i āwhina kia whakatere i taku waka, tēnā koe. Ki a Winifred Crombie, mei kore ake a ia, kua kore taku waka e ū ki uta, nō reira e kui, tēnā koe. Ki taku pāpā, ki a Tom Roa, nānā te kaupapa i whakatakoto ki mua i taku aroaro, tēnā koe. Ki aku rangatira mahi, aku hoa mahi, tēnā anō hoki koutou, otirā ki Te Wānanga o Aotearoa i whakawātea mai i a au kia tutuki pai aku mahi rangahau.

Ki tōku whānau, taku māmā, ki a Robyn Roa, taku tuakana, ki a Raukura Roa me aku teina, ki a Anne rāua ko Atamira Roa, ngā mihi manahau ki a koutou e tautoko nei i a au ahakoa te aha. Ki taku hoa rangatira, ki a Noel Reid, me aku tamariki ki a Poihakena rāua ko Gitana Reid, ko koutou te whitinga mai o te rā. He kokonga whare e kitea, he kokonga ngākau e kore e kitea, nō reira kei te tau, koinei te pine o te aroha e kore rawa e waikura.

Heoti rā, mokori anō te mihi ki ngā tāngata nā rātou te huarahi i para i mua i a au. Ahakoa kua roa e noho ana i te poho o te Atua, ko ngō mahuetanga tēnei e rangahaua ana e ngō uri

whakaheke. Nō reira, kei te amokura, Pei Te Hurinui Jones, tēnā koe, mōu i whakamāori i ngā kupu whakahirahira a Edward Fitzgerald, me ngā kaupapa nonamata a Omar Khayyám.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Quatrains

Chapter 1

Introduction: Research aims, research questions and research methods

1.1 Introduction

Omar Khayyám, a Persian poet[1] who died in 1131, wrote a small number of quatrains (no more than 1,000 in total) in Farsy which are regarded by some as representing the very summit of Sufism, that is, of the mystical dimension of Islamic thought, and by others as being essentially agnostic and hedonistic in nature. Those who are of the latter view are often strongly influenced by the 'translation' into English of some of these quatrains[2] by Edward Fitzgerald, a British poet and writer whose first edition of the *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* appeared in 1859, at the height of the Victorian era. Although there have been several other translations of Khayyám's quatrains, none has been as popular or, perhaps, as highly regarded as an artistic work as that of Fitzgerald. It has rarely, however, been regarded as a work that is faithful to the intent of the original. This is something of which Fitzgerald himself seems to have been well aware. After all, approximately half of the quatrains in his *Rubáiyát* are made up of images drawn from several different quatrains by Khayyám. It is probably for this reason that he preferred to refer to his own work as a 'rendering' or even a 'transmogrification' rather than a 'translation', the first of these words often being used in the sense of artistic re-presentation, the second involving a complete change in nature or appearance. In deciding to translate into Māori Fitzgerald's rendering into English of some of Khayyám's Farsy quatrains, Pei Jones was faced with a peculiarly complex set of problems (linguistic, literary, cultural and religious). Many of these problems are inevitably present in the case of translations of translations (or translations of transmogrifications). Others are specific to the context in which Pei Jones was operating.

1.2 Rationale for the research

I was brought up speaking both Māori and English in a bilingal family and have a particular interest in the verbal arts (both Māori and English) and in the processes

[1] He was also a philosopher, mathematician and astronomer.
[2] A quatrain is a four line iambic pentameter stanza. The first second and last line have an end rhyme, whereas the third line often does not.

involved in the translation of artistic, creative and spiritual works, particularly where what is involved is the translation of translations. Although translating translations is by no means ideal in many cases, it is nevertheless a widespread practice, particularly in the case of some of the world's most widely read books, such as the Bible. There are several possible reasons for translating translations, the most often being lack of familiarity with the languages in which these works were originally written and/or a preference for the translated text over the original one. The process of translation is almost always fraught with problems, particularly where the text to be translated is a literary or artistic one that is deeply embedded in the source culture and distant in time. Where what is being translated is a text that is itself a translation, these problems are even more complex. Thus, any analysis of the process of translating translations inevitably raises questions about translation itself in their most acute form. It is for this reason that I felt that an exploration of Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* would be both interesting and potentially valuable.

Pei Jones' translation is generally regarded as being faithful to Fitzgerald's version of the *Rubáiyát.* It would appear, therefore, that he decided to treat Fitzgeralds's text, in spite of the reference in its title to the original text, as his source text. This gives rise to a number of questions, questions about what is involved in translating a translation, what it means for a translator to be faithful or unfaithful to a source text, and, above all, whether use of the word 'translation' is ever appropriate in the case of literary, artistic and culturally-embedded texts.

Of course approaches such as discussion forums, advisory panels and parallel texts can be, and are utilised, however, ultimately what happens is that the translated text is often used and treated as a source text. This research is based around a case where a translated text has been treated as a source text and translated accordingly, however the fidelity of the 'new' source text is highly questionable. This research therefore, has the purpose of investigating issues of, and approaches to translating translations with an intention of inciting further discussion around the topic of translating translations and the different aspects and dynamics around such a task.

1.3 The aim of the research and the research questions

The overall aim of this research project is to explore Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* from the perspective, in particular, of *purpose, fidelity* and *approach*, in order to determine whether it throws light on issues relating to the translation of translated texts and, more generally, on the nature of translation itself in the case of literary and artistic texts that are culturally embedded and historically distant.

On the basis of this overall aim, the following focus questions were developed as a guide to the rsearch:

- What does a sample of literature on translation tell us about possible approaches to the translation of literary and artistic works and the translation of translations?

- To what extent is there evidence of these processes in Pei Jones translations?

- What does analysis of the Pei Jones translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* reveal about issues relating to the concept of 'fidelity', as it relates, in particular, to source culture, target culture and poetic style?

- What does analysis of the Pei Jones translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* reveal about the extent that purpose and intent inform types of compromise that have to be made in one area (e.g. target culture) in order to be as faithful as possible in another (e.g. poetic style)?

1.4 Research methododology and overview of the manuscript

The research methodologies employed combine historiography (*Chapter 2*), critical literature review (*Chapter 3*) and textual analysis (*Chapter 4*).

The authors of all three versions of the *Rubáiyát* discussed here are long gone. Fortunately, however, there are many reliable sources of information about their

work, including, in the case of Fitzgerald and Pei Jones, biographies. Reference is made to several of these works in *Chapter 2*, where background to each of the works discussed is provided along with discussion of what is known of the approaches to translation adopted by Fitzgerald and Pei Jones.

Chapter 3 provides a critical review of selected literature on the theory and practice of translation, with a focus on (a) the translation of poetic and artistic works, and (b) issues associated with the translation of translations, including, in particular, issues associated with the concept of 'fidelity'.

Chapter 4 focusses on the analysis of twenty-five (25) of the one hundred and ten (110) quatrains translated by Jones from the perspective of *purpose* and *approach*, *differences between the concept of verse in English and Māori*, and *issues associated with fidelity*.

The final chapter, *Chapter 5*, provides an overview of the findings of the research, recommendations for future research, bnd a discussion of the perceived strengths and limitations of the work as a whole.

Chapter 2

Background to the author and the translators

2.1 Introduction

The series of poetical verses known as ‘rubáiyát’ (quatrains) has transcended time and space, surviving the test of time and overcoming social and linguistic barriers. It has been translated into many languages, and has been read in almost every country in the world (Coumans, 2010, p. 13). New Zealand and the Māori language are no exception. In this chapter, Omar Khayyám, Edward Fitzgerald and Pei Te Hurihuri Jones, are introduced and the contexts in which each of them lived and worked are explored.

2.2 The Omar Khayyam Context

Very little, is known about Omar Khayyám, including the exact dates of his birth and death. According to both Jones and Fitzgerald Omar Khayyám was an astronomer and poet who was born around the latter half of the eleventh century and died in 1123AD (Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 49; Jones, 1975, p. i). Coumans (2010, p. 15), referencing a 1941 study based on astrological data, records the date of his birth as 18th of May 1048AD and that of his death as 4th of December 1131AD. Whatever the exact dates might be, what *is* certain is that Omar Khayyám lived at a time very distant from that of Fitzgerald and Pei Jones and in a cultural setting very different from that of either of them.

Khayyám was born, and died, in Naishapur, Persia (now Nishapur, Iran) where he was sufficiently privileged to be educated in his youth by a tutor of considerable distinction in Islamic teachings, Im’am Mowaffak, who would have been an appropriate mentor for a future adherent of Sufism, a philosophy that requires that those who aspire to the mystical Sufi philosophy must be inducted by such a scholar (Kellscraft Studio, 1999, para. 2).

According to Fitzgerald (1942, pp. 49-51) Hakim Omar Khayyam, as his name is recorded in a testament by Nizam al-Mulk, was a fellow student of Nizan al-Mulk

and Hassan ibn Sabbah, both of whom became renowned scholars and political leaders.

Fitzgerald (1942, pp. 50-51) records a story that Hassan ibn Sabbah proposed a pact, based on the reputation of their tutor, that whoever fortune fell upon (himself, Khayyám or Nizan al-Mulk) would share that good fortune with the others. In the event, Nizan ul Mulk was the first to do so, being raised to the position of administrator of affairs during the sultanate of Sultan Alp Arsl'an.[3] Nizan ul Mulk (now the Vizier), perhaps honouring that old school pact, asked the others what he could grant them. Hassan requested a position in government which was granted at his Vizier's request by the Sultan. Unsatisfied with this, however, Hassan objected, was disgraced, and subsequently became head of the Persian sect of the Ismailians, a group of fanatics who spread terror throughout the Muslim world. It is believed by some that the word 'assassin' is derived from the name of the founder of that sect (Hassan). One victim of the terror spread by Hassan was his old-school friend Nizam ul Mulk, who Hassan killed himself (Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 52). It said that, unlike Nizam ul Mulk, Khayyám asked little of the Vizier, requesting only that he should live "under the shadow" of the Vizier's fortune and spread the wide advantages of science. He was granted a healthy yearly pension in gold from the Naishapur treasury to use as he 'busied' himself in gaining knowledge of every kind, especially in astronomy (Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 53). Khayyám was highly praised by the Sultan for his proficiency in science and was appointed as one of eight scholars charged with reforming the Muslim calendar. This resulted in the Jal'ali era known as "a computation of time", which is said to surpass the Julian calendar[4] and approach the accuracy of the Gregorian one[5] (Gibbon in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 53). He also authored astronomical tables and treatise on algebra. Omar's greatest fame must, however, be attributed to his poetic renown as the author of approximately 500 epigrams known as ruba'i or quatrains (Jones, 1975, p. iii), a selection of which were

[3] Alp Arsl'an was Sultan of Persia from 1072 to 1092 and was succeeded by his son Malik Shah I, whom Nizam ul Mulk also served as Vizier.
[4] Julian Calendar: A reform of the Roman Calendar by Julius Caesar which was surpassed by the more accurate Gregorian Calendar.
[5] Gregorian Calendar: differs to the Julian only by the way the leap day rule is applied. The Gregorian takes into account that the tropical year is a few minutes shorter than 365.24 days and is currently and has been for decades the most widely used calendar internationally.

rendered into English by the poet Edward Fitzgerald and entitled *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*.

Knowledge of Khayyám's background is strictly limited and there have been conflicting deductions concerning his beliefs. Westerners, such as Fitzgerald, have concluded that he was a 'hedonist' with an "Epicurean Audacity of Thought and Speech" that was especially hated by the mystical Sufis, whose "practice he ridiculed" (Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 56). In judging him to have been a "radical free thinker", Jones' (1975, p. i) is likely to have been heavily influenced by Fitzgerald's views and his translation. Jones (1975, p. iii) makes the following observation:

> Although most of his quatrains are purely mystic and pantheistic, many of them bear quite another stamp; they are the breviary of a radical free-thinker, who protests in the most forcible manner both against the narrowness, bigotry and uncompromising austerity of the orthodox ulemā and the eccentricity, hypocrisy and wild ravings of advanced sūfis whom he successfully combats with their own weapons, using the whole mystic terminology simply to ridicule mysticism itself.

In contrast, Nicolas (in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 113), in his French translation of the *Rubáiyát*, observed that he regarded Khayyám as mystic and a Sufi. In the index of his book *Autobiography of a Yogi*, Yogunanda (1971) describes Khayyám as a "Persian mystic" (p. 585) and describes him as being "grossly misunderstood" (p. 346). Graves and Ali-Shah (1968, pp. 2-3) entirely disregard the popularised belief throughout the West of Khayyam's hedonistic beliefs, observing that

> For four generations . . . by an evil paradox, Omar Khayyam's mystical poem has been erroneously accepted throughout the West as a drunkard's rambling profession of the hedonistic creed . . . Khayyam is also credited with the flat denial that life has any ultimate sense or purpose . . . which is precisely the opposite view to that expressed in Khayyam's original.

Witteveen (1997, p. 9) also asserts the mystical nature of the *Rubáiyát*, naming Khayyám (among others) as a Sufi poet and describing his quatrains as a "fruitful source for this expression of Sufism". Similarly, Yogananda (n.d, para. 4) describes Khayyám as an advanced mystic and a spiritual teacher and the *Rubáiyát* as "inspired Sufi scripture".

The stark contrast in views about Khayyám's beliefs deduced from interpretation of the *Rubáiyát* may be a reflection of a particular aspect of Sufism, that is, its acceptance of *all* life's experiences as coming from God.

Sufism, a type of Islamic mysticism, is described by Schimmel (2011, p. 4) as follows:

> . . . love of the Absolute – for the power that separates true mysticism from mere asceticism is love. Divine love makes the seeker capable of bearing, even enjoying, all the pains and afflictions that God showers upon him in order to test him and purify his soul.

Witteveen (1997, p. 3) speaks of mysticism in terms of unity with God, a unity that further recognises the divine in all beings.

Yogananda (n.d) describes Persian poetry as characteristically having layered meanings, one inner, and one outer layer. He describes his realisation of the inner meanings of the *Rubáiyát* as follows:

> One day, as I was deeply concentrated on the pages of Omar Khayyam's Rubaiyat, I suddenly beheld the walls of its outer meanings crumble away. Lo! Vast inner meanings opened like a golden treasure house before my gaze (Yogananda, n.d, para. 2).

There are several very different 'translations' of the *Rubáiyát*, translations that presuppose very different interpretations. Indeed, both the nature of Khayyám's true beliefs and the way in which the the *Rubáiyát* should be interpreted are the subject of ongoing debate and dispute. The verses themselves have been selected

and arranged in different ways in order to support different interpretations, the essential ambiguity of the verses themselves serving to underpin either of the two essentially contradictory interpretations, hedonistic and mystical. The first of these (hedonistic) appears to relate to a possible interpretation of the surface layer of meaning, a layer that may conceal deeper (mystical) meanings available to those with an understanding of Sufist teachings.

In exploring the world of Omar Khayyám and his poetry it is important to bear in mind that "Sufism places emphasis on metaphor as a key to understanding because it conveys or creates meanings that are beyond the visible world. . . . [In] Sufi poetry. . . . intemperance seems to be represented as a virtue; intoxication and erotic longing are metaphors of certain human relationships with the Divine. Intoxication is a metaphor for madness, and madness is a metaphor for the spirit's condition, or transformation, or unfolding into reality, in the presence of the Divine" (Wilde, n.d, paras. 23, 31, 36). Indeed, some of the characteristic images of Khayyám's poetry are recognisable in the following extract from Ali Alizadeh's (2005, para. 8) account of Sufi poetry generally:

> Sufi poetry can be best understood as an heretical and dissident spiritual movement that challenged, and was in many instances suppressed by, mainstream religion. Among the most controversial aspects of the poets' works one may list their perception of the relationship between an individual and the creator as an erotic love-affair between an *asheq* and a *maeshuq* ('Lover' and 'Beloved'); the blatantly anti-Islamic, quasi Christian, depiction of the Union between the Lover and the Beloved in the metaphors of *mey* (Wine) and *jam* (Chalice); and the poets' at times vitriolic critiques of their society's religious institutions and rituals.

2.3 The Edward Fitzgerald Context

Edward Fitzgerald, the seventh of eight children to John Purcell and Mary Frances Fitzgerald Purcell, was born March 31, 1809. Edward Fitzgerald's' father, John Purcell, was the son of a wealthy Irish doctor, and although having wealth and standing of his own, he had decided to take on the name of his wife Mary Frances Fitzgerald as there was greater wealth and standing associated with the Fitzgerald

name. John Purcell and Mary were in fact first cousins and so John had taken the name Fitzgerald upon the passing of his father in law, hence the Fitzgerald name being passed on to the children (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 4). According to Coumans (2010, p. 17), Fitzgerald (Edward) was born in Bredfield, Suffolk. However, the family spent a lot of time in different parts of England and France, having estates in the country and a house in Paris. Fitzgerald lived a life of privilege in these different estates.

In 1818, Fitzgerald was sent to school in Bury St. Edmunds, and later attended Trinity College, Cambridge, where he became acquainted with friends who became renowned in their own right. Among them were the poets William Makepeace Thackeray, and Alfred Tennyson (Coumans, 2010, p. 17). Despite Fitzgerald's well roundedness in literature as well as music and art, Haight ((ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 5) describes him as drifting through his college year, observing: "He [Fitzgerald] was not a serious student. He drifted along for four years, reading casually, writing poems, playing the piano, painting water colors – for the most part, simply idling".

After leaving Cambridge, Fitzgerald accompanied his mother to all of her engagements, while his father remained in the country (Haight, 1985, para. 4). He was known to have hated this lifestyle and later kept to himself for the most part. The rest of his life is described by Haight ((ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 6) as being as aimless as his years at university, his family's affluence and life of privilege allowing for this.

During his time in Woodbridge, Fitzgerald befriended Bernard Barton, a bank clerk twenty five years his senior with a keen interest in literature. Barton was "something of a poet on his own accord" (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 6). Later, when Barton fell ill, Fitzgerald promised to provide for his daughter Lucy. This was later confused for an offer of marriage and Fitzgerald's indecision and sense of duty led to a marriage ceremony on November 4, 1856 (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 7). After a brief and unhappy marriage, the couple "separated amicably" and Fitzgerald provided an ample allowance for her (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 7).

Fitzgerald was known to have had a series of “intense emotional attachments to younger men” (Haight, 1985, para.5), one of whom, William Browne, filled a central core of Fitzgerald’s life for 25 years, Browne’s marriage in 1844 was a severe blow to Fitzgerald. Despite this, Browne and Fitzgerald remained friends up until Browne’s death in 1859, which devastated Fitzgerald sending him into a deep depression: for months he would walk the shore at night, causing him to be the “butt of innuendoes” from sailors (Haight, 1985, para. 8). Posh Fletcher, another of Fitzgerald’s friends, was a tall, young, handsome fisherman whom Fitzgerald had met through the captain of a yacht Fitzgerald purchased in 1863. The bond that Fletcher had with Fitzgerald was lucrative for Fletcher who was provided with a lugger and a partnership as a herring fisherman. However, despite Fitzgerald’s affection, Fletcher’s dishonesty was such as to force a Fitzgerald to part company with him (Haight, 1985, para. 8). The relevance of this is that Fitzgerald’s homosexuality, if, indeed, such was the case would have had few outlets in Victorian England, certainly none that could be readily detected. Hence, perhaps, the appeal of translating verses which appeared to be a celebration of love or could be interpreted as such.

An important acquaintance of Fitzgerald’s was Edward Byles Cowell. Fitzgerald met Cowell in 1844 and was introduced by him to the Persian language, which led to the translation of a fifteenth-century Persian poem by J`ami (Coumans, 2010, p. 17). Following Fitzgerald’s separation from his wife, he began translating the rubáiyát attributed to Omar Khayyam from an old manuscript that Cowell had sourced and given to him. The opportunity to busy himself with epicurean thoughts of wine, love, beauty or even death (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 9) was a welcome distraction. The dedication, time and pains taken in translating the rubáiyát is a task that Fitzgerald (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 8) believed very few people would find possible. Even so, Fitzgerald’s determination to reach new heights of literary scholarship is evidenced in his repeated revisions of his translation.

It may have been awareness of a lack of fidelity to the original source that led Fitzgerald to replace the word ‘translated’ with the vaguer word ‘rendered’ in later

editions (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, p. 8). Even so, Haight suggests that Fitzgerald attained a 'unity' that is lacking in the original, perhaps partly by virtue of the fact that, according to Haight, some of his verses are not to be found in the original: "Only half of them [quatrains] are faithful paraphrases of the Persian; most of the others are composed of images drawn from several quatrains; a few are entirely Fitzgerald's" (Haight (ed) in Fitzgerald, 1942, pp. 8-9).

Fitzgerlald's background and state of mind at the time provides a possible reason for his preference for the more obvious meaning of the quatrains (if, indeed, he was aware of the possibility of deeper meanings). Certainly, it appears that the beauty and artistry that he saw in the rubáiyát inspired him to create verses in English which have been admired and frequently quoted for over one and a half centuries, verses which, after much revision, re-organisation and re-paraphrasing, he came to describe as 'transmorgrifications' rather than translations (in Graves & Ali-Shah, 1968, p. 1). His focus, in creating a literary masterpiece that became much more widely known than the 'source', was on fidelity to the structure and conventions of the target language. Even so, many of the ideas and images were derived from the original Persian.

2.4 The Pei Te Hurinui Jones Context

Pei Te Hurinui Jones was born on the 9th of September 1898 on the eastern coast of the Coromandel Peninsula. His parents were Danile Lewis, a European storekeeper, and Pare Te Kōrae, a woman of Ngāti Maniapoto descent. Jones (Pei) was the youngest of four children to Daniel Lewis and Pare Te Kōrae. In Jones' infancy his father absconded and settled in Australia. Later, Pare Te Kōrae married David Jones and at some point the children took on his surname. Jones, however, was adopted by his mother's grand-uncle, Te Hurinui Te Wano, who initiated him into the lore and traditions of his people (Whaanga, H., & Hedley, R., 2006, para. 2). Biggs (2010, para. 1) speaks of the impact that living with Te Hurinui Te Wano had on Pei, who was a sickly child whose schooling was irregular.

Jones spent his early years in Te Kawa Kawa (now Ongarue) and attended the primary school there. Later, in 1911, when Te Hurinui Te Wano died, Jones was

enrolled at Wesley College with his brother Michael. Despite having little formal schooling, Jones later became a 'prolific writer' in both English and Māori (Biggs, 2010, para. 8). His depth of knowledge of Māori tradition was due to the time spent with his *koroua* (grand-uncle, elder) who would set him to work on rewriting manuscript books containing genealogical tables, tribal traditions, ancient songs and ritual (Jones, 1982, pp. 10-11). Despite the fact that he was sometimes tempted to abandon his granduncle's books and play with his friends, he became very interested in the subject matter and began to seek understanding from his granduncle on obscure passages so that ultimately he became absorbed in the study of ancient ritual, tribal traditions and the esoteric lore of his people – it became a 'passion' with him (Jones, 1982, pp. 10-11).

In 1920 Jones left Taumarunui to work as an interpreter at the Native Department in Wanganui. From 1928 he was tasked with consolidating Māori lands in the King Country (Biggs, 2010, para. 3). He made a deep impression on Apirana Ngata, who expressed his approval of Jones in a letter to Peter Buck. Ngata commented on the fact that younger members of Ngāti Maniapoto who were prepared to break down the conservatism of the elders. He observed (Ngata, 1986, p. 87):

> The torch-bearer will I think be Pei Jones – a good man, with plenty of vision, a first-rate Māori scholar, steeped in West Coast folk lore &c. and a very competent master of English. His translation of the Merchant of Venice would do credit to the best of us. And he has the fire that kindles hearts.

However perceptive Ngata's remarks were, Jones' principal involvement was to be with the King Movement. His knowledge and skill of both languages and his ability to move freely between Māori and Pākeha cultures were devoted to this service where he became an advisor to Te Puea Herangi as well as King Korokī and later his successor Queen Te Ātairangikaahu (Biggs, 2010, para. 4). During this time, Jones also played a major role in negotiations regarding the compensation that Waikato would later receive for the confiscation of their lands. Jones assisted in preparing the Waikato-Maniapoto Claims Settlement Act 1946

and was the King's nominee on the Tainui Māori Trust Board (Biggs, 2010, para. 4).

Jones first stood for Parliament as an independent candidate. However, votes were split between him and Haami Tokotoru Ratana, and Te Taite Te Tomo won the seat. Jones stood unsuccessfully in 1938, 1943, 945 and also in subsequent years as a New Zealand National Party candidate (Biggs, 2010, para. 5).

Jones was widely accepted as a Māori leader. He was a member of many boards and councils. He was awarded an OBE in 1961 and an Honorary Doctorate in Literature from Waikato University in 1968 for his contribution to New Zealand literature (Biggs, 2010, para. 12). He had a passion for recording Tainui genealogies and tradition. He published a number of historical works, such as *Mahinaarangi* (an account of the building of the meeting house Mahinaarangi at Tūrangawaewae Marae and a retelling of the story of Tūrongo and Mahinaarangi), *King Pōtatau* (a biography of the first Māori King) and Puhiwahine (a biography of a Māori poetess). His most valuable contribution to Māori literature, as Biggs (2010, para. 10) observes is, however, the *Ngā Mōteatea* series.

He translated a number of Shakespeare's works into Māori, including *Julius Caesar* (Huria Hiha), *Othello* (Owhiro) and T*he Merchant of Venice Te Tangata Whai Rawa o Weneti*. One of these, *Te Tangata Whai Rawa o Weneti* was recently released as a feature length film, directed by Don Selwyn. Jones (in Shakespeare, 1990, p. 1) outlines his purpose and desire to translate Shakespeare in a note in the typewritten manuscript of *Te Tangata Whai Rawa o Weneti*:

> Ko nga take i whawha ai ahau ki te pene, i mata-ara ai i te po, a i whaka-maia ai ki te whaka-maori i tenei korero paki-maero, koi nei:- Tuatahi: He aroha ki to tatou reo Māori.
> Tuarua: He hikaka no te ngakau kia matakitaki tahi nga mea o tatou kaore ano i whakarere i te reo o nga tupuna ki nga korero whakapaipai o te reo Ingarihi.

As part of the University of Waikato Waka Week celebration in August 2003, Don Selwyn reminisced about Jones and the screen play *Te Tangata Whai Rawa o Weneti*. He recalled a conversation he had with Jones over a round of golf when he was an adolescent.[6]The conversation took the form of an explanation of his reason for translating Shakespeare. Selwyn observed that Jones said that Shakespeare was "such a brilliant linguist in his own language that I thought it'll be wonderful if Māori actually learnt to understand what he said in Māori – and that was his motivation…" (Selwyn, 2003).

Jones was not interested only in the writings of Shakespeare. He also developed an enduring interest in Fitzgerald's *Omar Khayyam* which he translated into Māori. That translation has never equalled in popularity to Jones' translations of Shakeseare's plays and little has been written about it. The initial manuscript of *Ngā Rupaiaha o Omā Kaiama* was produced in 1959 as a parallel text in a collection of one hundred and ten English quatrains by Edward Fitzgerald, inspired by the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. This manuscript was never published. It was, however produced as a self-bound typescript and released by Jones in 1975.

Although Jones has never recorded his reason for translating these particular quatrains, it is likely that he was inspired by their literary merit. He may also have been intrigued by the epicurean take on life that Fitzgerald portrays in the quatrains and, in particular, by his appreciation of the cross-cultural themes that he detected, themes which, as an accomplished bilingual, bicultural writer and literary scholar, he no doubt believed would appeal to a Māori audience.

2.5 Some concluding remarks

The rubáiyát emerged at a particular time and place and in a particular cultural, linguistic, literary and religious context that were largely unknown to English scholars and poets of the Victorian period. Verses that may have emerged out of a primarily spiritual aesthetic were rendered by Fitzgerald, a man of wealth and privilege, into verses that were generally interpreted as hedonistic, verses that may

[6] Despite Jones' scholarly appearance in later years, Biggs (2010, para. 14) observes that he was well rounded athlete in his youth.

have been an outlet for aspects of his life that were marked by concealment and suffering. Pei Jones was not familiar with Farsy and could not therefore access the original verses of Khayyám. Fitzgerald's verses may have appealed to him because they expressed that natural acceptance of life's pleasures, including life's sexual pleasures, that is a characteristic of traditional Māori society, one that pervades *Nga Mōteatea*. All of this raises complex issues for the theory and practice of translation. Notwithstanding these issues, the fact remains that we have, in the work of Fitzgerald, poetry that has a genuine appeal for readers who appreciate the particularities of English verse, and in the work of Pei Jones, poetry that has a particular appeal for readers who appreciate the particularities of the Māori verbal arts.

Chapter 3

A review of selected literature on the theory and practice of translation

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, a selection of literature on the theory and practice of translation will be critically reviewed, the primary focus being on issues associated with the retranslation of existing translations. This is an issue of considerable significance, particularly when it is bore in mind that Derrida (1992, p. 224) has argued that a translation becomes an original, an argument endorsed by Bassnett (1998, p. 25) who makes the following observation concerning the way in which readers often treat translated texts:

> This view is entirely credible if we think of the terms in which most readers approach a translated text. When we read Thomas Mann or Homer, if we have no German or Ancient Greek, what we are reading is the original through translation, i.e. that translation is our original.

The chapter begins by considering definitions of translation (*3.2*), the nature of the translators' task (*3.3*), varying approaches to translation (*3.4*), explores issues with translating literary and poetic works from English into Māori (*3.5*), and then discussing issues relating to the concept of 'fidelity' in translation (*3.6*).

3.2 What is translation?

Bassnett (1997, p. 11) observes that translation always involves an attempt to "cross boundaries and enter into new territory". Although this very general statement is necessarily true, translation is conceived of in different ways in different cultures and is often evidenced by the words used to refer to it. In the Māori context, what is referred to in English as 'translation' is referred to as 'whakamāori' (to make Māori), the māori term for translation is dependent on the language with which the target text is being translated into, this language is then preceded by the prefix 'whaka' (causing or to make), as such to translate into English would be 'whakapākeha' (to make 'pākeha' or English), in any case this

is a word that is indicative of a primarily uni-directional perspective (Roa, 2004, p. 2).

In his definition of translation, Houbert (1998) focuses on *process* and *purpose*. It is "the process whereby a message expressed in a specific source language is linguistically transformed in order to be understood by readers of the target language" (para. 1). For Houbert, what is essential to translation is that the reader should understand the original message, something that presupposes that that message is, in fact, available to the translator. Roa (2004, p. 2), a Māori linguist, echoing the Māori perspective that is evident in the word 'whakamāori' has an entirely different perspective, asserting that translation involves making something into something else – a process of transformation.

Since language is intrinsically 'context-bound' (Macdonald, 2012, para. 3), complex messages expressed in one language at a particular point in time are specific to that language and so crossing boundaries (linguistic, cultural and temporal) involves entering new territory. It involves un-binding the language from its existing context, transforming it, and re-binding it into another context. One such context that is integral to the translation process is the cultural context. Thus, Leonardi (2000, para. 2), in her review of theories of equivalence, observes that the translator is necessarily involved with two cultures simultaneously, something that inevitably impacts on how translation is to be viewed. This emphasis on culture is also found in the work of Karamanian (2002) who focuses on the culture-bound nature of discourse (including proverbs and idiomatic expressions) and the requirement that a translator should have a sound understanding of the cultures s/he is dealing with, describing translation as "a process of cultural de-coding, re-coding and en-coding" (para. 3). From this perspective, successful translation requires cultural and contextual familiarity.

3.3 The translator

Translation is clearly a complex task. It follows, therefore, that the translator must be clear about his or her role. Houbert (1998) describes the core task of a translator as that of 'message conveyor'(para. 1). For Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 223), the translator is primarily a 'mediator' and must, therefore have both

bilingual and bicultural expertise, including understanding of ideological and moral systems and socio-political structures. To this must be added understanding and appreciation of text-type, style and a range of non-linguistic constraints (Snell-Hornby, 1988, p. 111). Thus, Bassnett (1997, pp. 1-2) notes that the impossibility of exact reproduction, the worlds of the original text and the translated text being inevitably different worlds. For her, the task of the translator is "to mediate between . . . two different moments in time and space and to produce a text that exists in a relationship with both".

Referring specifically to the task of a translator of literary texts, Kolawole and Salawu (2008, para. 5) add historical knowledge and understanding to the mix:

> The literary translator participates in the author's creative activity and then recreates structures and signs by adapting the target language text to the source language text as closely as intelligibly allows. He [sic] needs to assess not only the literary quality of the text but also its acceptability to the target reader, and this should be done by having a deep knowledge of the cultural and literary history of both the Source and the Target languages.

Kolawole and Salawu refer here to 'recreation' of structures and signs, a recreation that must be driven by issues associated with intelligibility and acceptability, all of which raises issues associated with the concept of fidelity, a concept discussed below.

What all of this indicates is that the translator must prioritise and also often compromise. In doing so, s/he will need to give careful consideration to purpose, function and audience (see below).

3.4 Approaches to translation

3.4.1 General approaches to translation

Newmark (1988b) makes the following distinction between translation 'methods' and translation 'procedures': "[T]ranslation methods relate to whole texts,

translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language" (p. 81). He also (Newmark, 1988b, pp. 46-47) makes a distinction between what he refers to as 'literal translation', 'faithful translation', 'semantic translation', 'the communicative translation' and 'adaptation':

> ***Literal translation***: grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest target language equivalents and lexical words are translated singly;
> ***Faithful translation***: attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structures;
> ***Semantic translation***: different from a 'faithful' approach only in that it takes into account of the aesthetic value of the source text;
> ***Communicative translation***: attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original so that content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership;
> ***Adaptation***: the freeist form of translation involving the rewriting of a text - often used in the case of plays and poems: themes, characters and plots are preserved but the source language culture is converted into the target language culture and the text is rewritten.

Close examination of each of these translation approaches reveals problems associate with each. The first (*literal translation*) presuppose that it is possible to find structures and vocabulary in the target language that are, in some sense, 'equivalent' to those in the source language. The second (*faithful translation*) presupposes that it is possible to produce, in the target language, something that is close to the contextual meaning of the source text (and, in fact, that it has 'a' contextual meaning rather than several possible ones). The third (*semantic translation*) presupposes that the 'aesthetic value' of a text is something that can be reproduced in the target text. The fourth (*communicative translation*) is based on the assumption that 'the exact contextual meaning' of the source text is recoverable and can somehow be rendered in a target text. Finally, it is highly questionable whether the last (adaptation) involves translation at all. It would appear to involve simply the borrowing of themes, characters and plots.

Newmark (1988a, p. 40) observes that there is a continuum between the semantic and the communicative approach, the closer the approach adopted being to the communicative end of the spectrum, the more faithful it is to the linguistic and cultural expectation of the target audience. This raises the issue of how the notion of 'fidelity' can or should be applied in the case of the other approaches. Presumably, it does not apply at all in the case of 'adaptation'. Presumably, it relates, in the case of a 'faithful translation', to the extent to which the 'precise contextual meaning' of the source text is replicated in the target text. What all of this indicates is that the notion of 'fidelity' is one that is being used in a variety of different ways, each of which is open to a range of possible interpretations.

3.4.2 Approaches to the translation of literary works

Fitzgerald has been accused of grossly breaching the fidelity of translation in the case of the *rubáiyát* (Graves & Ali-Shah, 1968, pp. 2-3; Kinnes, 2012, para. 2) . In fact, what he appears to have created is what Newmark refers to as an 'adaptation', an adaptation that is widely regarded as a work of great literary merit, one that Brodie (n.d, para. 1) describes as being "carefully selected and orchestrated to produce both melodious sound and harmonious conceptual counterpoint". The real issues are whether it should have been entitled *The Rubayat of Omar Khayyam* and whether it should ever have been described as a translation. In the absence of both of these, the question of fidelity would never have arisen. In looking at different versions of particular verses see example below), what we see, irrespective of whether many prefer the initial version, appears to be an ongoing attempt to improve on the metrical structure and imaging, that is, an ongoing attempt to create even greater English poetry. Thus, for example, the alliteration on /s/ is more pervasive in the second version than it is in the first.

Table 3.1: Editions 1-5 of quatrain 1 (Fitzgerald, 1942, pp. 19, 63, 121).

1st edition	**2nd edition**
1 Wake! For the Morning in the Bowl of Night Has flung the Stone that puts the Stars to Flight: And Lo! The Hunter of the East has caught The Sultan's Turret in a Noose of Light.	**1** Wake! For the Sun behind yon Eastern height Has chased the Session of the Stars from Night, And, to the field of Heav'n ascending, strikes The Sultan's Turret with a Shaft of Light.
3rd , 4th & 5th editions	
1 Ake! For the Sun, who scattered into flight The Stars before him from the Field of Night, Drives the Night along with them from Heav'n, and strikes The Sultan's Turret with a Shaft of Light.	

Table 3.2: English quatrain I in Jones' parallel publication (Jones, 1975, p. 1).

I
Wake! For the Sun behind yon eastern height Has chased the Session of the Stars from night; And, to the field of Heav'n ascending, strikes The Sultan's Turret with a shaft of light.

It is interesting to compare Fitzgerald's versions with that of Graves and Ali-Shah[7] (see Table 3.2 below), a version which is generally regarded as being more

[7] Roberts Graves, an English poet, translated the earliest and most authoritative *Rubaiyat* at the request and under the guidance of Omar Ali-Shah (a sufi poet in his own right and classical Persian Scholar) who would have clearly understood the metaphors and meanings of the *rubáiyát* (Graves in Graves and Ali-Shah, 1968, p. 1).

‘faithful’ to the original and one which includes a reference to wine (a common metaphor in Sufi verse for the intoxication engendered by a relationship with God – see *Chapter 2).*

Table. 3.3: Comparative translation of quatrain I by Robert Graves and Omar Ali-Shah (1968, p. 49).

1
While Dawn, Day’s herald straddling the whole sky, Offers the drowsy world a toast ‘To Wine’, The Sun spills early gold on city roofs- Day’s regal Host, replenishing his jug.

The fact that Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* is much better known and widely appreciated then the quatrains written by Omar Khayyám himself may relate, in part, to the fact that it was written in a language more widely read. It may, however, relate as much to the poetic quality of Fitzgerald’s verses. In either case, issues relating to function and purpose need to be addressed.

Newmark (1996, p. 7) discusses the three traditional major text-types: non-literary, literary and poetic, before further categorising six different types. Referring to the last of these, he makes the following observation: “Poetry calls all the resources of language, and, in parallel, these become the factors that the translator has to weigh up and prioritise differently for each poem, depending on its nature and function” (Newmark, 1996, p. 13). Lewes (n.d, p. 483) notes that “the effect of poetry is a compound of music and suggestion”, adding:

> [T]his music and suggestion are intermingled in words . . . [and] words in poetry are not, as in prose, simple representatives of objects and ideas: they are parts of an organic whole – they are tones in the harmony;

> substitute lotherl (sic) parts, and the result is a monstrosity, as if an arm were substituted for a wing.

He (Lewes) raises a question mark over the notion that poetry is untranslatable. Referring to translation as substituting one word for another, however, questioning that the substitute can accurately reproduce the precise shades of music and suggestiveness that the original depends so much on (Lewes, n.d, p. 483). He (Lewes, n.d, p. 485) adds,

> I do not say that a translator cannot produce a fine poem in imitation of an original poem; but I utterly disbelieve in the possibility of his giving us a work which can be to us what the original is to those who read it.

Although we may not dispute Lewes' assertion, the fact remains that attempts to translate poetry have been, and continue to be widespread, raising questions about the purpose and function of these attempts.

In discussing the purpose and function of the translation of a poetry, it is necessary to consider the function and purpose of the original. Is it intended primarily to elicit an emotional response or is it intended to convey a message that is considered to be of fundamental importance? Who is it intended for?

In the case of translations of literary works, Snell-Hornby (1988, p. 114) identifies three dimensions that she considers important:

1. *Intra-textual coherence*: Is the message received by readers of the translated text consistent with that received by readers of the source text?
2. *Functional interaction*: Is the translated text equivalent to the source text in terms of functional meanings?
3. *Publishers' commission*: If the the aim of those who commissioned the text was to recreate and hence perpetuate a work of fiction/art for readers at a given time, in a given language and culture, to what extent has that intention been realised?

Snell-Hornby (1988) believes that the translation of a literary work can rarely be compared in any realistic way with the original because "it loses its communicative function as a work of literature within a continually shifting cultural system" (p. 114). This is particularly evident in the case of Fitzgerald's *Rubaiyat* which is wholly absent of evidence of the social and religious context out of which the original grew.

Ambiguity[8] and concealed significances are characteristic of many literary compositions, including Sufi poetry, characteristics that pose problems of considerable significance for translators since they are so often language-specific. Here, and elsewhere, translators need to compromise. In particular, they need to compromise on issues relating to the specifics of different verbal art forms in different languages, such as, for example, rhythm and metre. In Jones' preface of his translation of the Shakespearean play *The Merchant of Venice*, he states that he decided to undertake the translation because of his love for the Māori language and his desire to introduce the literary brilliance of Shakespeare into the Māori language and culture. A similar rationale would no doubt have applied in the case of his translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubayat of Omar Khayyam*. However, the major differences between English and Māori language and culture meant that his undertaking was a formidable one.

3.5 Issues with translating literary and poetic works from English into Māori

The major issue so far as translation between English and Māori is concerned is the fact that the Māori language is very different from English, as is the nature of the verbal arts. Thus, for example, whereas English is a stress-timed language, Māori is not, and so it is not possible to replicate in Māori the measured accentual syllabic metre[9] of much English verse. Furthermore, whereas English verse is typically spoken, Māori waiata (McLean, 1996, p. 34; Orbell, 1991, pp. 1-2) are often sung or chanted.

[8] Quiroga-Clare (2003) defines ambiguity as something that, "…can be understood in two or more possible senses or ways" (para. 4), noting that it is a feature of all language but may play a particularly important function as "a poetic vehicle" (para. 27).

[9] Measured accentual syllabic metre is based on a regular number of stressed and unstressed syllables in each verse line.

At first glance, the structural differences between Fitzgerald's quatrains and those of Jones are easily discernible. This raises issues that it is important to address, issues that are related to some of the fundamental differences between Māori and English and Māori and English verbal art forms.

The verbal arts are conceived of differently in different cultures. What all cultures appear to have in common, however, is that they involve one or more forms of expression that are regarded as having significance over and above the communication of ideas and that focus on form as well as meaning. Frequently, these forms of expression are associated, in the broadest sense, with what Huizinga (1970, p. 141) a Dutch historian and cultural theorist, referred to as a type of language play:

> *Poiesis*, in fact, is a play-function. It proceeds within the play-ground of the mind, in a world of its own which the mind creates for it. There things have a different physiognomy from the one they wear in 'ordinary life', and are bound by ties other than those of logic and causality.

Within the context of Anglo-Saxon culture, some forms of language play are regarded as being primarily aesthetic in function. In traditional Māori society, the verbal arts were largely educational or had a range of functions relating largely to conflict (or conflict avoidance) and education (relating largely to the passing on of information). However, as the poi dances testify, there was also an aesthetic function, (relating largely to the appreciation and representation of natural phenomena, such as the flight of birds).

One characteristic of much verse in English is a particular type of metrical structure that relies on the natural rhythms of the language, imposing on them certain types of rhythmic structure. Fraser (1970, p. 1) compares the rhythm of language to "waves breaking on the sand and being sucked out again". The rhythmic patterns of language are similarly repetitive and yet each occurrence is minutely different from the others. Attridge (1995, p. 4) defines the rhythm of the English language, a rhythm that is detectable in spontaneous speech and prose, as

being “fundamentally a matter of syllables and stresses", something that is felt as well as heard. The natural rhythm of English involves primary stressed syllables occurring at roughly equal time intervals irrespective of the number of more lightly stressed syllables between them. Attridge suggests that the purpose of this natural rhythm is “to economise on . . . expenditure of energy by imparting a degree of regularity to it" (p. 4).

Metrics, as described by Fraser (1970, p. 2) is concerned with recognising and naming the broad ‘wave’ patterns in the lines of verse. The metre of English verse imposes patterns on the natural rhythm of the language. Thus, Attridge (1995) defines it as “an organising principle which turns the general tendency toward regularity in rhythm into a strictly patterned regularity that can be counted and named" (p. 7). In fact, however, it is not the case that all verse in English relies on the strict regularity of syllable count and main stresses. This is certainly not true of ‘free verse’. Nevertheless, this strict patterning, referred to as ‘accentual syllabic metre’ was very common in English Victorian poetry.

There is a difference between ‘accentual metre’, ‘accentual syllabic metre’ and ‘syllabic metre’ (Crombie, 1987, pp. 11-54). In *accentual metre*, the organising principle is the number of primary word stresses in each verse line. This form of verse structuring, combined with alliteration, is characteristic of Old English poetry that is, of poetry written in English from around the mid-5th to the mid-12th century. In *accentual syllabic* metre, there is an equal number of syllables between main stressed ones (the latter being perceived as being longer in duration). The phenomena of de-stressing and elision play an important role. De-stressing is where syllables that would normally be stressed lose their stress in rapid speech. Elision is where certain syllables are joined with others so that they act together as a single syllable. These phenomena are important because they provide poets composing in accentual syllabic metre with opportunities that would not otherwise be available. In *syllabic metre* there is a regular number of syllables in each verse line and the stress on each of them is roughly the same. This type of metre is characteristic of French poetry but is not possible in English. This is because, unlike English, the difference between stressed and unstressed syllables in French is slight and so primary stresses play no role in the natural rhythm of the

French language. There is, however, another phenomenon, that is, sentence stress (as opposed to word stress), that does play an important role in French verse (and also play a role in English verse). Each clause and/or sentence has a syllable on which intonation changes occur. These changes signal the 'mood' of the clause or sentence, that is, whether it is a statement, question or command/ instruction. Thus, for example, an instruction such as *Sit down!* in English would have a falling intonation. In English *free verse*, where the patterning of stressed and unstressed syllables is much more varied than it is in accentual syllabic metre, the patterning of sentence stress often plays an important role.

Fitzgerald's quatrains (four line stanzas) are written in iambic pentameter, an accentual syllabic verse form in which each line has five feet (i.e. combinations of stressed and unstressed syllables), each foot being made up of one stressed (/) and one unstressed (x) syllable. In most lines the rhyme scheme is aaba, that is, the first, second and fourth lines have end rhyme (indicated in bold print below). In the verse below, elision of two syllables is marked in this way (⁀) and alliteration is indicated by underlining:

x / x / x / x / x /
Awake! for Morning in the Bowl of **Night**

x / x / x / x / x /
Has flung the Stone that puts the Stars to **Flight**

x / x / x x / x /
And Lo! the Hunter of⁀the East has caught

x / x / x / x / x /
The Sultan's Turret in⁀a Noose of **Light**

There are a number of different verbal art forms in Māori, including *ruri, mata, ngeri, haka* and *karakia* (recited verbal art forms), which Ngata (1959, p. xix), in the first volume of the *Ngā Mōteatea* series describes as 'ditties', 'prophetic sayings', 'chants', 'posture dances' and 'ritualistic chants' respectively. Two of

these (*ruri* and *mata*) ditties can be compared with the rubayaát in that they are both short and metaphorically charged. There are also *waiata*, which are typically sung or chanted. Ngata describes *mōteatea* as a type of *waiata,* and Orbell (1991, pp. 1-2) further discusses the different features and charactersitics of waiata. Roa (2008, p. 28) notes that although "[i]t is certainly true that *mōteatea* may be appropriately said to be 'poetic' in that they exhibit a range of characteristics that distinguish them from purely transactional uses of language. . . whether they may also be appropriately referred to as 'poetry', as 'songs', or even as 'song poetry' depends on one's definition of 'poetry' and 'song'". Grey (1853) in the title of his maniscript *Ko Nga Moteatea, me nga Hakirara o nga Maori* (Poems, Traditions, and Chaunts of The Maories) describe Māori poetry as *moteatea* or *hakirara*. Interestingly, Jones (1975, p. 127), in a brief explanatory note, refers to 'Persian poets' as *tohunga tito waiata ō Pāhia*, and to 'Persian poetry' as *waiata o Pāhia* (literally meaning 'expert song composers of Persia' and 'songs of Persia'). It is not generally believed that the Māori translations of Fitzgerald's quatrains had any form of musical melody attached to them and it is beyond the scope of this research to investigate this possibility.

In order to clarify the nature of the investigation of the issue referred to above (see *Chapter 4*), it is important to begin by making two observations about the Māori language. The first is that, unlike English, it is not a stress timed language, that is, more heavily stressed syllables do not occur at roughly equal time distances, and it does not, therefore, lend itself to any form of accentual syllabic metre. Secondly, whereas English syllables can be 'open' or 'closed' (i.e. can end in a vowel or a consonant) and can be strongly or weakly stressed, Māori morae[10] (the equivalent of syllables) are made up of either a consonant and a short vowel or a single short vowel on its own. Syllables may be long or short and stressed or unstressed but the difference between stressed and unstressed syllables is slight. Furthermore, the positioning of stress on words determines their meaning and cannot, therefore, be varied (Harlow, 2001, pp. 13-14).

What is investigated here is the extent to which, if at all, Jones' translation attempts to capture aspects of Fitzgerald's quatrains that have no place in the

[10] The singular is 'mora'.

canon of Māori verbal arts, that is, their metrical structure, and to what extent his translation captures known characteristics of traditional and contemporary Māori waiata. This is something that is fundamental to some conceptualizations of fidelity in translation.

3.6 Issues relating to fidelity: When is translation not translation?

It is sometimes said of a translation: *That's not what that's saying!* As indicated above, Newmark's (1988b, p. 46) description of a faithful translation is one which attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language's grammatical structures. How, then, do we determine what 'the precise contextual meaning' of a text is? The answer to this question, when we are dealing with a text that is distant in time, culture and artistic conventions, is that we cannot be sure, however much research we conduct (as is witnessed by considerable disagreement about how Khayyám intended his quatrains to be interpreted).

In her paper - *When is translation not a translation?*- Bassnett (1998, pp. 27-33), discusses terms that have been applied in cases where translations have appeared to stray from the meaning and intent of the source text. In this context, she uses the word 'pseudotranslation' to refer to a false translation believed to be referred to as a 'translation' by writers in order to introduce innovations into the literary system, and to 'inventing a translation' in cases where there are innovations but these innovations appear not to have been introduced in order to extend or modify the literary system. In discussing FB's[11] 'translation' of *The Kasidah of Haji Abdu El-Yezdi,* which was translated and annotated by F.B (later identified as Frank Baker, an alter-ego of Richard Francis Burton), she initially referred to it as a 'pseudotranslation' but revised that opinion, later referring to it as an 'invention' because she was not convinced that the innovations were for the purpose of introducing novelty into the literary system. In that she compares F.B's translation of *The Kasidah of Haji Abdu El-Yezdi* directly with Fitzgerald's 'translation' of Omar Khayym's *Rubayyát,* the assumption must be that she would also classify the latter as an invention. Even so, it is known that Fitzgerald justified earlier 'free translations' of Caldron's Spanish translations of Aeschylus works in Greek on

[11] F.B. was later identified as Frank Baker, an alter-ego of Richard Francis Burton.

the basis that he was thus able to introduce literary devices that were not present in English. If this is what he intended in the case of the *Rubayyát*, then the term 'pseudotranslation' may be more appropriate. After all, he claimed that "in the absence of a poet who can recreate in his own language the body and soul of a foreign poet, the best translator is one who paraphrases the original work while conserving the author's spirit" (in Graves & Ali-Shah, 1968, p. 10).

Bassnett (2011, p. 40) goes onto discuss instances where writers have referred to their sources as 'starting points' and do not claim that her resulting text is a translation. The problem, so far as Fitzgerald is concerned, is that, not withstanding his later use of the term 'transmogrification' and notwithstanding the fact that some of the quatrains do not occur in the source text, he entitled his work *The Rubayat of Omar Khayyam*, something that clearly suggests that it was a translation. This is particularly problematic in view of the fact that, as Graves and Ali-Shah (1968, pp. 2-3) observe, as a result largely of Fizgerald's work:

> Khayyam is also credited with a flat denial either that life has any ultimate sense or purpose, or that the Creator can be in justice, allowed any of the mercy, wisdom or perfection illogically attributed to him; which is precisely the opposite view to that expressed in Khayyam's original.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Graves and Ali-Shah (1968, p. 2) refer to Fitzgerald as an "easy going amateur orientalist who constructed a mid-Victorian poem of his own from an ill-understood classical Persian text".

The issue of 'fidelity' runs through all of these discussions. In *Translating the Word of God*, Beekman and Callow (1974, p. 34) refer to different types of fidelity: *fidelity to the meaning of the original*, *fidelity to historical references*, *fidelity to didactic references or the teachings that are within the original*, and finally *fidelity to the dynamics of the original or the linguistic form*. There is, in the case of translation/ adaptation of literary works, an additional issue. In literature, imagery can be of fundamental significance in relation to the feelings engendered by a work. It is possible to argue, therefore, that imagistic fidelity is

of the utmost significance. Overall, Beekman and Callow (1974, pp. 33-34) define a 'faithful' translation as follows:

> A translation which transfers the meaning and the dynamics of the original text is to be regarded as a faithful translation. The expression, *transfers the meaning*, means that the translation conveys to the reader or hearer the information that the original conveyed to its readers or hearers. . . . The expression, *the dynamics*, means that (1) the translation makes a natural use of the linguistic structures of the RL [receiving language] with ease and that (2) the recipients of the translation understand the message with ease.

The problem is that poststructuralists such as Derrida (see, for example, *Writing and Difference*, 1978) have made it clear that texts do not have unitary meanings but are open to a range of interpretations. The assumption, therefore, that there is '*a* meaning' (as opposed to possible different meanings at several levels) and that a text carries that meaning (as opposed to being open to a range of possible interpretations, even by those for whom it was initially intended) is no longer plausible. Furthermore, as Bassnett (2011, p. 40) concludes, the issue of fidelity in translation is one that is, in some senses, irresolvable:

> Debates about when a translation stops being a translation and becomes an adaptation have rumbled on for decades, but I have yet to meet anyone who can give me an adequate definition of the difference between the two. The basis of the distinction seems to be the degree to which a text that has been rendered into another language diverges from the source: if it *seems to be recognisable*, then it can be classified as a translation, but if it *starts to move away from that source*, then it has to be deemed an adaptation. The problem is, though, how close do you have to be, and how far away do you have to move before the labels change? [emphasis added]

Chapter 4

Analysis of a selection of Pei Jones' quatrains in terms of 'fidelity' to those of Fitzerald

4.1 Introduction

Pei Jones aimed to translate Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám.* He was not familiar with the language in which Omar Khayyám wrote and there is no evidence to suggest that he was familiar with Sufi poetry. It follows, therefore, that Fitzgerald's text was, for him, the source text and that any issues relating to the fidelity of Jones' translation must be discussed with reference to Fitzgerald's text. The aim here is, through the analysis of a selection of Pei Jones' quatrains to determine how faithful they are to his source text, the issue of fidelity being addressed in a number of different ways. The chapter begins with a brief reintroduction of various concepts of fidelity in translation (*4.2*) and an outline of the analytical approach adopted (4.3) before reporting on the analysis conducted (*4.4*) and discussing the findings (*4.5*).

4.2 Concepts of fidelity in translation

As indicated in *Chapter 3*, Newmark (1988b, p. 46) makes a distinction among each of the following: 'literal translation', 'faithful translation', 'semantic translation', 'communicative translation' and 'adaptation'. The first four of these are outlined below:

> ***Literal translation***: grammatical constructions are converted to the nearest target language equivalents and lexical words are translated singly;
> ***Faithful translation***: attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structures;
> ***Semantic translation***: different from a 'faithful' approach only in that it takes into account of the aesthetic value of the source text;
> ***Communicative translation***: attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original so that content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.

It is difficult to determine in what sense 'faithful translation' differs from 'communicative translation'. In both cases there is an attempt "to produce the precise/ exact contextual meaning of the original". In the first case (faithful translation), the constraints of the target language are accommodated. Presumably doing so results in a text that is "readily acceptable and comprehensible to the target readership" (communicative translation).

Beekman and Callow (1974, p. 33) refer to different types of fidelity: ***fidelity to the meaning of the original***; ***fidelity to historical references***; ***fidelity to didactic references or the teachings that are within the original***; and finally ***fidelity to the dynamics of the original or the linguistic form*.** The last of these would appear to be similar to Newmark's concept of 'literal translation'; the first, to Newmark's concept of 'faithful translation'. The remaining two could be accommodated within Newmark's concepts of 'faithful translation', 'communicative translation', and 'semantic translation'. There is, however, some value in keeping them distinct in analytical terms in that this provides us with the possibility of a more detailed and specific framework within which to operate. Combining the two approaches to fidelity (that of Newmark and that of Beekman and Callow) and attempting to resolve overlaps and contradictions as well as adding some specificity, results in the following fidelity framework:

> **Grammatical fidelity**: grammatical constructions are converted to the nearest target language equivalents if there are grammatical constructions that could be regarded as being equivalent (irrespective of whether these constructions would be likely to be used in a similar context when composing directly in the target language). That is, fidelity to the target audience's grammatical expectations.
>
> **Lexical fidelity:** the communicative value of lexical items (their functional value) is retained by selecting, so far as possible, words that have the same communicative value or a similar one in the target culture;

Informational fidelity: information that is evident in the source text is not excluded and information that is not evident in the source text is not added;

Metrical fidelity: the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of the source text is reproduced in the translation;

Imagistic fidelity: the images that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation;

Rhetorical fidelity: the figures of speech (simile, metaphor, metonymy,[12] synecdoche,[13] puns, personification, etc.) that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation and comparison, contrast and repetition of words and phrases is retained;

Historical fidelity: historical references in the source text are retained (rather than, for example, being omitted or replaced by historical references that are more familiar to the target audience of the translation);

Didactic fidelity: the lessons/teachings that were conveyed by the original text to its intended audience are also conveyed by the translated text to its intended audience.

Functional fidelity: the translated text serves a similar overall function to that of the original text and meets the aesthetic and/or cultural expectations of the intended readership.

It is important to note that some of these types of fidelity may be impossible and/or undesirable in certain cases. This is not only because it is often impossible to determine the way in which the authors of source texts and their original audiences interpreted them. It is because, for example, certain devices (e.g. certain

[12] Metonymy is a figure of speech in which things are called not by their own names but by the names of other things with which they are closely associated. Thus, for example, 'Hollywood' is a metonym for the US cinema industry and 'Washington' is a metonym for the US Government.
[13] Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a term for a part of something is used to refer to the whole of something, or vice-versa (e.g. 'sail' for 'ship').

types of metre) may be impossible to replicate in the target language. Even so, it is useful to bear these possible types of fidelity in mind when attempting to determine the approach taken by a particular translator on a particular occasion. In the case of Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* we know very little of the translator's rationale except that it related to his love of the Māori language and his desire to introduce a Māori audience to a work that he himself appreciated. As suggested in previous chapters, it may also be that he was intrigued by the epicurean take on life that Fitzgerald portrays in the quatrains, by their apparent expression of that natural acceptance of life's pleasures that was characteristic of traditional Māori society (and is to be found in the mōteatea). Understanding which types of fidelity Pei Jones aimed for/ achieved in his translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* should throw further light on the reason why he undertook the translation.

4.3 The quatrains selected for analysis and the analytical approach adopted

Twenty-five of Pei Jones' quatrains were selected for analysis. These were selected because they were accompanied in Pei Jones' manuscript by explanatory notes and it seemed likely that these notes would make a useful contribution to the analytical process. However, although the notes did prove helpful, they did not resolve all of the interpretative problems encountered. For this reason, reference was also made to the translation of these quatrains by Graves and Ali-Shah (1968), translations that they have claimed were much closer to the intent of the original than that of Fitzgerald. However, the quatrain numbering system used differs in each case and so it was not always possible to be absolutely certain that the quatrains included in the Graves and Ali-Shah version to which reference was made were actually translations of the same original quatrains in all cases. As my primary aim was to compare Pei Jones' *Ngā Rupaiaha o Omā Kaiama* with Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* in terms of fidelity (rather than comparing either with the original), this was not the major issue it might otherwise have been. Even so, including quatrains from Graves and Ali-Shah provides an opportunity of determining, to some extent at least, how far Fitzgerald departed from the original even though direct access to the original is not possible without knowledge of the language and culture.

Reference is made to an analytical model developed by Beekman and Callow (1974) who measures the level of fidelity of religious translations with the original in terms of the following features:

Fidelity to the meaning;

Is there distortion or change in the meaning?

- Is there unnecessary gain of information?
- Is there unnecessary loss of information?

Is there distortion or change in historical references?

- Is there unnecessary gain of historical information?
- Is there unnecessary loss of historical information?

Is there distortion or change in the didactic references?

- Is there unnecessary gain of didactic information?
- Is there unnecessary loss of didactic information?

Within fidelity to the meaning, one aspect may take priority over the other. The didactic reference takes priority over the historical, and meaning takes priority over all.

Fidelity to the dynamic;

Is there distortion of change in the linguistic form of the translation?

Is the length of the sentences natural to the new readership?

- Is the connectedness natural?
- Is the use of words and combinations natural?
- Is the syntax natural?
- Is the morphology natural?

Is there meaningful communication?

- Is it readily understood?

- Is it clearly understood?

According to Beekman and Callow if the answer to all of these key questions is 'no' (except for the last question), then the translation is a faithful one. However, as various types of faithfulness are outlined above, it is necessary to align these questions with the types of faithfulness discussed (see below). Doing so reveals that a number of fidelity types are not identified in the analytical framework proposed by Beekman and Callow. Nevertheless, each of these is accommodated in the analysis that follows.

Types of fidelity	Beekman and Callow (1974): categories
Grammatical fidelity: Irrespective of the grammatical form of the source language, the grammatical form of the translated texts is wholly natural in the target language. FIDELITY TO TARET AUDIENCE'S GRAMMAICAL EXPECTATIONS	- Is the length of the sentences natural to the new readership? - Is the connectedness natural? - Is the use of words and combinations natural? - Is the syntax natural?
Lexical fidelity: the communicative value of lexical items (their functional value) is retained by selecting, so far as possible, words that have the same communicative value or a similar one in the target culture.	- Is the morphology natural?
Informational fidelity: information that is evident in the source text is not excluded and information that is not evident in the source text is not added.	- Is there unnecessary gain of information? - Is there unnecessary loss of information? - Is the translated text readily understood? - Is the translated text clearly understood?
Metrical fidelity: the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of the source text is reproduced in the	

translation.	
Imagistic fidelity: the images that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation.	
Rhetorical fidelity: the figures of speech (simile, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, etc.) that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation and comparison, contrast and repetition of words and phrases is retained;.	
Historical fidelity: historical references in the source text are retained (rather than, for example, being omitted or replaced by historical references that are more familiar to the target audience of the translation).	- Is there unnecessary gain of historical information? - Is there unnecessary loss of historical information?
Didactic fidelity: the lessons/teachings that were conveyed by the original text to its intended audience are also conveyed by the translated text to its intended audience.	- Is there unnecessary gain of didactic information? - Is there unnecessary loss of didactic information?
Functional fidelity: the translated text serves a similar overall function to that of the original text and meets their aesthetic and/or cultural expectations of the translated text's intended readership.	

4.4 Analysis by Quatrain

In the following extracts, the English is that used by Pei Jones in his parallel text. I have also included the equivalent quatrains from the Graves and Ali-Shah translation (1968) because there are occasions when reference to them can prove helpful.

In the analysis below, the following coding is applied:

bold print	rhyme
yellow highlighting	alliteration
x	unstressed syllable
/	stressed syllable
⌣	elision of syllables
blue highlighting with linking arrows	attention drawn to translated words and phrases and their 'equivalents'
Green highlight	addition of information
Purple highlight	omission of information

Metrical structuring is signalled directly only in the case of Quatrain II. The four lined structuring is also signalled only in the case of Quatrain II due to formating constrictions. Pei Jones' publication presents each of Fitzgeral's quatrains in the natural four line structure which was more often than not, unachievable by Jones in his translations.

Quatrain II

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
II While Dawn, Day's herald straddling the whole sky, Offers the drowsy world a toast 'To Wine', The Sun spills early gold on city roofs- Day's regal Host, replenishing his jug	**II** **x / x / x / x / x /** Before the phantom of False morning **died,** x / x / x / x / x / Methought a Voice within the Tavern **cried,** x / x / x / x / x / "When all the Temple is prepared within, x / x / x / x / x Why **lags** the drowsy worshipper out**side**?"	**II** I mua i te hemonga ō te wairua ō te ata Pōhēhē, I mahara iho au nō roto i te Whare-inu-wāina te karanga, "I te mea anō kua whakapaia a roto i te Temepara, He aha anō te Tangata- whakapono i hīnā-moe ai i waho?"

Quatrain II: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	Although this quatrain is, in general, marked by lexical fidelity, the sense of slow and delayed movement conveyed by 'lags' in Fitzgerald's text has no equivalent in the Pei Jones translation. The attempt Jones makes to convey the sense of 'methought', that is, by the use of inverted commas, is not wholly successful.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	As indicated above, Pei Jones has not attempted to convey the sense of 'lags' in his translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – in general	A literal translation of 'voice' would be 'reo'. However, the use of 'karanga' for a combination of 'voice' amd 'cried' seems wholly appropriate because it conveys a sense closer to that of 'cried'.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The contrast between 'temple' and 'tavern' is maintained.
Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	Although it is generally believed that Fitzgrald's translation does not convey the religious connotations of the original, his 5th version of Quartrain II refers to 'worshippers' and to a 'temple' and suggests that worldly concerns (the tavern) have made people slow to respond ('lag') to the requirements of morning worship. The implication would appear to be that people need to redirect their attention to religious observation. This is largey conveyed in Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	One of the main functions of Fitzgerald's text was a poetic/ aesthetic one. However, this would seem to be absent from Jones' translation. It does not attempt to replicate the poetic features of Fitzgerald's text and it lacks some features of Māori verbal arts, that is, it makes no appeal to genealogy,

		landscape, and cultural norms and expectations generally. It has, furthermore, no real narrative appeal. However, it is, in some respects, similar to a *whakatauki* in that there appears to be an underlying didactic function.

Quatrain IV

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
IV Now that our worlds finds riches within reach, Live hearts awake and hanker for wide plains Where every bough is blanched by Moses-hand And every breeze perfumed by Jesus-breath.	**IV** Now the New Year reviving old **desires**, The thoughtful Soul to Solitude **retires**, Where the WHITE HAND OF MOSES on the Bough Puts out, and Jesus from the ground **suspires**.	**IV** Na ko te Tau Hōu kei te whakahoki mai i ngā hiahia tawhito, Ko te Wairua whaiwhakaaro ia ka peka ki te Waahi Raorao, Kei reira nei te RINGA MĀ O MOHI kei runga i te Peka rākau E toro ana ki waho, me Ihu kei te whenua e whakaora ana.

Quatrain IV: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	Although this quatrain is, in general, marked by lexical fidelity, the words 'Waahi Raorao' do not entirely convey the sense of 'Solitude', a sense that is conveyed by, for example, 'mehameha' (although, in traditional Māori culture, with vast distances between communities, 'Waahi Raorao' my have had connotations of loneliness).
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	As indicated above, Pei Jones has not fully conveyed the sense of 'solitude'.

Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – in general	Fitzgerald's text suggests a retreat into internal 'solitude', whereas Jones' translation locates this solitude in a physical landscape. However, bearing in mind later references to a 'bough' ('Peka rākau') and 'ground' ('whenua'), this may not be entirely inappropriate.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The metaphor of the WHITE HAND OF MOSES is maintained.
Historical fidelity	YES	References to Moses and Jesus are maintained.
Didactic fidelty	YES	The sense of benefitting from awareness of the presence of the prophets (Moses and Jesus) in the physical world that is conveyed in Fitzgerald's text is maintained in Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of Quatriain II

Quatrain V

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
V Rarest of lads, rising to greet the dawn; Favour my bowl of crystal, pour red wine! This moment filched from the grey corpse of night We long may sigh for, never reposess	**V** Iram indeed is gone with all his **Rose**, And Jamshyd's Sev'n-ring'd cup where no one **Knows**; But still a Ruby gushes from the Vine, And many a Garden by the water **blows**.	**V** Otīa ko Īrama kua riro me te katoa ō āna nei Rouihi, Me te Kapu whitu-riingi a Tamahihi kāore he mea i mōhio ki whea; Ēngari ra mau tonu te pupū mai a te Rūpi i te Wāina, He maha hoki ngā Maara kei Uta e ngangahu.ake ana.
Notes Iram is often represented in Sufi poetry as a magnificent garden city in the desert of Aden. It is described as being invisible (though God now and then reveals a glimpse of it to the passing traveller) (Jones, 1975, p. 111).		

In Sufi poetry, the rose and the garden are symbols of divine perfection.

Quatrain V: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	'By the water' is translated as 'uta'. The functional value of this may be questioned. 'Uta' means '- literally - shore'. If the use of 'by the water' was intended by Fitzgerald to convey a particular image, then 'taha wai' would be more appropriate. A previous draft of Jones' translations shows that he had originally used 'taha wai' but decided to change to 'uta'.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	However, as indicated above, depending on the intended functional value of 'by the water', the translation of 'uta' may be a breach of informational fidelity.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – in general	The translation of 'by the water' as 'uta' means that a specific image conveyed by Fitzgerald has not been reproduced.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	Since all of the words which have metaphoric significance are translated literally (e.g. Rose = Rouhi; Ruby = Rūpi), their metaphoric value remains for those who are in a position to recover it.
Historical fidelity	YES	The names of places and people are maintained (rather than being replaced by names and places that are likely to be more familiar to a Māori audience).
Didactic fidelty	YES	Because all of the words and images that have metaphoric/ spiritual significance in Sufi poetry are translated literally, the spiritual significance of the text remains available for those able to interpret it.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of Quatriain II

Quatrain VI

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
VI A glorious morning, neither hot nor dank, With cheeks of roses newly bathed in dew; The nightingale, in Pahlevi, prescribes For every swallower cheek: 'Wine, wine and wine!'	**VI** And David's lips are lockt; but in **divine** High-piping Pehlevi, with Wine! Wine! **Wine**! Red Wine! .....the Nightingale cries to the Rose That sallow cheek of hers to incarna**dine**.	**VI** Kō ngā ngutu hoki ō Rāwiri kua kopi; ēngari nō te rangi mai Te reo Pai-rawa, e mea ana mai, "He Wāina! He Wāina! He Wāina! He Wāina whero!" ... te tangi a te Manu ki te Rouihi Ko tōna pāpā-ringa i kōmātia ra inā rā i whero ai.
Notes Pehlevi/Pahlevi was an Iranian languae used in Persia during the rein of the Sassanids. The word 'Pehley' may be derived from this and may, therefore, represent the first voice that is heard in the morning – the call to prayer – which is perceived as a sweet voice (see 'nightingale' and 'rose').		

Quatrain VI: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	Jones has chosen to omit the reference to Pehlevi in favour of fulfilling a communicative function in translating 'High-piping Pehlevi' as 'Te reo Pai-rawa' (sweet voice). Jones' translation of 'High-piping Pehlevi' conveys the sense of the original while lacking lexical and historical fidelity. 'Nightingale' (which has specific associations with sweetness of voice) is translated by the generic 'manu' (bird), with the sense of sweetness being conveyed in 'Te reo Pai-rawa'.

Informational fidelity	YES – in general	The sense of sweetness associated with the morning call to prayer (which may have been intended in the combined references to 'Pehlevi', 'nightingale' and 'rose') is present in Jones' translation but the fuction of the sweet voice (which may have been implicit in the use of 'Pehlevi') is absent.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	In spite of omission of reference to 'Pehlevi', the image created by the sense of vocal sweetness is retained.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	Word repetition has been reproduced 'Wine, Wine, Wine' = 'He Waina, He Waina, He Waina'.
Historical fidelity	NO	Graves and Ali-Shah's translation maintains the reference to Pehlevi (spelt Pahlevi), as does Fitzgerald's. Its absence from Jones' translation means that there is a loss of historical fidelity at this point.
Didactic fidelty	YES	In spite of the fact that the reference to 'Pehlevi' has been omitted, it is possible for those familiar with Sufi poetry to recover the didactic sense of the quartain from the references to wine (Waina), bird (Manu), rose (rouihi) and divine (nō te rangi mai) - all of which have metaphoric significane in Sufi poetry.
Functional fidelity	NO – in general	As discussed in the analysis of quatrain II, Jones' translation does not attempt to replicate the poetic features of Fitzgerald's text and is absent of certain characteristic features of Māori verbal arts.

Quatrain IX

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
IX Rest in the rose's shade, though winds have burst A world of blossom; petals fall to dust- Jamsheds and Khuros by the hundred thousand Lie tumbled by a similar stroke of time.	**IX** Morning a thousand roses brings, you **say**; Yes, but where leaves the Rose of yester**day**? And this first summer month that brings the Rose Shall take Jamshyd and Kaikobad a**way**.	**IX** Kei te Ata he mano Rouihi e puta mai, e kī ana hoki koe; Ae rā, ēngari kei 'hea ngā rau o te Rouihi ō nanahi? Otīa mā tēnei marama tuatahi ō te Raumati harimai nei i te Rouihi E hari rawa atu a Tamahihi rāua ko Kaikōpata.
Notes Jamshid is described as 'Yima, the bright' believed to be a child of the sky, which explains the radiance that burns about him (Sacred-Texts, n.d, para. 12). **Kaikobad** was the founder of the Second dynasty and is said to have reigned for 120 years. Although Jamshid and Kaikobad were great legendary Persian kings (Jones, 1975, pp. 113-114), their greatness did not save them from death and so they are often cited as symbols of the impermanence of all that is human (Autumnbreeze3000, 2011). Tamahihi and Kaikōpata are transliterations.		

Quatrain IX: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	It is relevant to note that Jones' use of 'hoki' (in addition; as well) may have been an attempt to explicitly link the first line to the next.
Informational fidelity	YES	Jones uses transliteration (Tamahihi; Kaikōpata) rather than attempting to replace these names by the names of figures appearing in Māori geneaongies that are associated with similar feats.

Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The main image (that of a multiplicity of roses blooming in the mornig light) is retained in Jones' translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES – where possible	The contrast of 'bring' and 'take away' has been reproduced in the translation ('harimai' and 'hari rawa atu'). However, the word-play on 'leaves' is not possible in Māori. Despite this particular loss of rhetorical fidelity, all other rhetorical devices (e.g. the symbolic value of roses in Sufi poetry; the contrast between life and death implied in the disappearance of yesterday's roses; the fact that the mighty must pass on) remain available.
Historical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain IV.
Didactic fidelty	YES	See analysis of quatrain IV.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain X

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
X One ample draught outdoes the fame of Kawus, Kobad the Glorious or Imperial Tus. Friend, never bow your neck even to Rustum Nor proffer thanks even to Hatim Tai.	**X** Well, let it take them! What have we to **do** With Kaikobad the Great, or Kaikho**sr'u** Let Rustum cry "To Battle"; as he likes, Or Hatim Tai "To Supper" ... heed not **you**.	**X** Kaati ra, tukua kia haria te katoa; He aha kei a tātou nei I te Nui Kaikōpata rāua ko Kai'horoa? Tukua a Rūtama kia karanga ana" Ki te Pakanga!" Ko tānā tērā Maana rānei ko Hātima Tai ka mea "Ki te Hākari!" ... kaua rā koe hei aro atu.
Notes See note concerning Kaikobad in Quatrai IX above		

Rustum – a Persian warrior who slew his son unwittingly. Hatim Tai was a famous pre-Islmic Arabian poet who was known for his generosity (Jones, 1975, pp. 114, 116)

Quatrain X: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	The communicative value of lexical items is retained. Thus, for example, the names (which have symbolic meaning) are transliterated.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no addition or omission of information in Jones' translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	The occurance of alliteration in Jones' translation, despite the alignment to the source text, is considered purely coincidental due to a lack of alternative word choice.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images that are suggested by, battle', and 'supper' in the source text are also suggested by the Pei Jones translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The main rhetorical device used in this quatrain is metaphor. Thus, for example, references to a great person (Kaikobad, Kaikhosr'u), to warfare and to food are likely, within the context of Sufi poetry, to represent diversions from worship. These references are retained in Jones' translation and their likely metaphoric significance would therefore be available to readers familiar with Sufi poetry.
Historical fidelity	YES	Historical/ pseudo-historical (possibly mythological) references (Kaikobad and Kaikhosr'u; Rustum's battle; Hatim Tai's generosity) are retained in Jones' translation.
Didactic fidelty	YES	Within the context of Sufi poetry, this quatrain can be interpreted as a call to turn away from ('heed not') earthly pleasures and preoccupations. This reading is also possible in the case of Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain XI

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
XI Should your days portion be one wheaten loaf, A haunch of mutton and a gourd of wine Set for us two alone on the wide plain, No Sultan's bounty could evoke such joy.	**XI** With me along the strip of Herbage Str**own** And just divided the desert from **sown**, Where name of Slave and Sultan is forgot... And peace to Mahmud on his Golden Th**rone**!	**XI** Whai mai i ahau ki te rauwaka ō te Maara i ruia I rohea atu ai te Raorao i te Maara whakapuke, Te waahi tērā i ngaro ai te ingoa Pononga me te ingoa Ariki I tau ai hoki te rangimārie ki a Mahamutu i runga i tona Torona kōura!

Quatrain XI: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	There is a slight distortion in Jones' translation of 'sown' as 'whakapuke' (literally – rise up) rather than 'ruia'. In selecting 'whakapuke', Jones may have been attempting to capture the sense of growth that follows the sowing of seed and may also have been atemptng to avoid exact repetition (as Fitzgerald used both 'strown' and 'sown'). In selecting 'Ariki' (literally – paramount chief) as a translation of 'Sultan', Jones has selected the nearest equivalent that would be meaningful to Māori readers.
Informational fidelity	YES – for the most part	The use of 'whakapuke' in Jones' translation slightly distorts the information that is conveyed in Fitzgerald's version, as does the use of 'Ariki' rather than, for example, a transliteration of 'Sultan'.

Metrical fidelity	NO	As in the case of the analysis of quatrain X, the occurance of alliteration in Jones' translation, despite the alignment to the source text, is considered purely coincidental.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – for the most part	The main images conveyed by the Fitzerald version are: a strip of grass between barren land and cultivated land (possibly a metaphor for the division between life and afer-life); a ruler seated on a golden throne. Both of these images are also invoked by Jones' translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The contrast of 'Slave' and 'Sultan' has been reproduced ('Pononga' and 'Ariki').
Historical fidelity	YES	Historical references are retained, with the exception of the replacement of 'Sultan' by 'Ariki'.
Didactic fidelty	YES	The didactic significance of all of the quatrains considered here (including this one) is largely inferential and relies on the transfer of assumptions about the nature of Sufi poetry. For those familiar with Sufi poetry, there is no aspect of Jones' translation of this quatriain that would block or hinder such an interpretation – which, in this case, would be likely to take something like the following form: *In the space between life and the after-life* (the grassy strip between desert and cultivation), *do not be distracted from spiritual things* (the peace of Mahmud on his golden throne) *by earthly concerns* (man-made beauty, battles; food).
Functional fidelity	?	Although this quatrain lacks the poetic and aesthetic features that are evident in Fitzgerald's text, it nevertheless closely resembles a *whakatauki* in terms of its probable indirect didactic messge.

Quatrain XII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
XII A gourd of red wine and a sheaf of poems- A bare subsistence, half a loaf, not more- Supplied us two alone in the free desert: What Sultan could we envy on his throne?	**XII** Here with a little Bread beneath the **Bough**, A flask of wine, a Book of Verse ... and **Thou** Beside me singing in the wilderness ... Oh, wilderness were paradise **enow**!	**XII** Ki konei au me te Taro iti noa nei i raro i te Peka-rākau, He Oko Wāina, he Pukapuka Waiata ... me Koe tahi E waiata ana i taku taha i te Raorao… Kei meinga hoki ra te Raorao ko Whenuakura ināianei!

Notes
Bread is regarded as sacred in Islam and is treated reverentially. Through the pronouncement of Bismallah during the bread-making process, the bread is imbued with spiritual power or baraka, which is shared by those who eat the bread. The transformation of the raw wheat to finished bread is used as an analogy for Sufi spiritual development (Wikipedia, 2012, para. 1).

Wine or intoxication is a symbol for spiritual knowledge in Sufi poetry, where the intoxication of the body and mind change the state of outer and inner awareness (Wilde, n.d, para. 37).

Intoxication and erotic longing are metaphors of certain human relationships with the Divine (Wilde, n.d, para. 31).

Quatrain XII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	A misinterpretation has occured in translating 'enow' as 'ināianei'. 'Ināianei' is the communicative equivalent of 'now'. It is assumed that 'enow' (archaic form of 'enough') was misread on Jones' part. A point needs to be made on the choices that Jones' makes in relation to the translation of certain lexical items in this quatrain.

		'Bread' has been translated as 'Taro'. A more obvious translation choice would be 'paraoa'. However, 'Taro' is used in the Bible and the Lord's Prayer with reference to 'Bread' and so Jones' translation may have been an attempt to capture the spititual significance of the quatriains. Another word choice of interest is 'Waiata'. In his explanatory notes, Jones' refers to these quatrains as 'waiata' and so this seems to be an appropriate translation. Although 'raorao' was previously used for 'solitude' by Jones, within the context of this quatrain it is used as a translation of 'wilderness'. Literally, 'raorao' refers to undulating low-lying country. The region from which Jones originated is a 'raorao' and is associated with wilderness-like qualities.
Informational fidelity	YES – for the most part	One exception is the translation of 'enow' as 'ināianei'. Another is the translation of 'bread' as 'taro' (possibly for the reason signalled above).
Metrical fidelity	NO	There is no attempt at preserving the metre and rhyme scheme of Fitzgerald's version, and the alliteration observed in Jones' translation is of no significance as it is almost certainly coincidental.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	Jones' translation reproduces the images that are engendered in Fitzgerald's version (i.e. two people beneath a tree in a wilderness, resting, drinking and signing).
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The metaphoric significance of bread would appear to have been captured in the translation as 'Taro'. All other potential metaphors are available to readers of Jones' translation because the words used which may have metaphoric significane are retained.
Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	See analysis of quatrain V.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain XV

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
XV The Rose cried: 'I am generous of largesse And laughter. Laughingly my petals blow Across the world; the ribbons of my purse Snap and its load of coin flies everywhere.	**XV** Look to the blowing Rose about us..."**Lo**, Laughing," she says, into the world I **blow**: At once the silken tassel of my Purse Tear, and its Treasure on the Garden **throw**.	**XV** Titiro ki te Rouihi e ngangahu ake nei, "Tērā hoki au Te Kata nei," e kī ana ia, "Ki te ao i ahau e ngangahu atu nei: Inā tonu te pūtiki hiraka o taku Pūtea Kua tīhaea ake, a ko ōna Taonga Whiua ake ki te Maara."
Notes Words generally considered to have symbolic significane in Sufi poetry (i.e. rose; garden) recur here. There may be symbolic significance in the tearing of the purse (the leaves of the rose) and the scattering of worldly goods (seed) - that is, setting aside worldly goods gives rise to the growth of spirituality (roses).		

Quatrain XV: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	While the lexical value of items in this quatrain, in general, has been retained, 'tassle' has been translated as 'pūtiki'. 'Pūtiki' means 'knot'. However, it can also mean 'tie together' or 'knot together'. In this context, 'tassle' is being represented in the translation as that which has the purpose of holding together.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no distortion of information.

Metrical fidelity	NO – not really	Jones may have attempted to reproduce the alliteration seen in Fitzgerald's version. The occurence of alliteration in quatriains by Jones appears to be coincidental. However, in this case 'Look' has been translated as 'Titiro', 'Lo' as 'Tērā hoki au', and 'Laughing' as 'Te Kata nei'. Possible alternative words for 'Look' in this context include, 'mātai' and 'mātakina' (although 'Titiro' is the most obvious). 'Lo' is usually translated as 'ānana' and 'Laughing' could easily be translated as 'Ka kata nei' or 'E kata ana'. The alliteration in the last line does, however, appear to be coincidental.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	Jones' translation retains the imagistic potential of the Fitzgerald version.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The repetition of 'blow', 'ngangahu' is maintained.
Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	See analysis of quatrain V.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain XVIII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
XVIII This ruined caravanserai, called Earth- Stable of Day-with-Night, a piebald steed; Former pavilion of a hundred Jamsheds; A hundred Bahrams' one- time hall of state;	**XVIII** Think in this batter'd Caravanse**rai**, Whose Portals are alternate night and **day**, How Sultan after Sultan with his Pomp Abode his destin'd Hour, and went his **way**.	**XVIII** Maharatia ano i ana a roto i tēnei Karawēne, Ko ōna Matapihi he Pō he Ao, Ka pahemo he Ariki ka puta mai ano he Ariki me ōna Nuinga I whakatau iho mō tōna Hāora i tohuria ai, ka haere ai i tōna ara.

Quatrain XVIII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	The use of 'Maharatia ano i ana...' is an archaic way of saying 'bear in mind' or 'for future consideration' and is thought to fulfil the same function as 'tonu' (Maharatia tonu) which would emphasise the verb 'think', 'maharatia'. Despite the addition of 'i ana' and the omission of 'batter'd, the general communicative value of lexical items is retained.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	'Anō i ana' has been added to the translation and 'batter'd' has been omitted.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones does not attempt to replicate the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of the source text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	Jones' translation reproduces the images that appear in Fitzgerald's version.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The repetition of 'Sultan' as 'Ariki' is retained, as well as the contrast of 'Night and day', 'he Pō, he Ao'.
Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	The didactic function (drawing attention to the fleeting nature of life and the irrelevance of status in the fate of death) is retained. The contrasting concepts of 'night' and 'day', the repetition of 'Sultan after Sultan' and the message (the 'destin'd hour' approaches), is clearly conveyed in Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	IN PART	'Ka pahemo he Ariki, ka puta mai ano he Ariki...' closely resembles the *whakatauki* 'Mate atu he toa, ara mai ra he toa'. In this respect, Jones appears to have attempted to meet a cultural expectation of the intended readership.

Quatrain XIX

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
XIX A palace gorged in by gigantic Bahram- The vixen whelps there and the lion nods. Bahram, who hunted none but onagers, Lies tumbled in a pitfall called the grave.	**XIX** They say the Lion and the Lizard **keep** The Courts where Jamahud gloried and drank **deep**; And Bahram, that great Hunter ... the wild Ass Stamps o'er his Head, but cannot break his **Sleep**.	**XIX** E kī ana rātou ko te Raiona me te Tuatara kei te tiaki I ngā Marae i whai kororia ai a Tamahihi a i inu ai a mākona noa; Ko Poharama hoki, te Toa rongonui ... nā te Kāihe Mohoao Takahia iho a runga i tōna mātenga, ēngari kia oho ake i tana Moe, kore ake.
Notes The didactic significance here appears to be conveyed by the fact that the great courtly houses of the past, and their occupants, are no longer, their ruins being occupied by wild creatures. Thus, even the greatest are doomed to depart this life without the treasures they accumulated in it.		

Quatrain XIX: Analysis

There are no issues with the translation of this quatrain. Fidelity judgement and comments are identical to those of the analysis of quatrain X.

Quatrain XXVII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
XXVII Some ponder long on doctrine and belief, Some teeter between certitude and doubt. Suddenly out of hiding leaps the Guide With: 'Fools, the Way is neither that nor this.'	**XXVII** Alike for those who for TO-DAY pre**pare**, And those that after some TO-MORROW **stare**, A Muezzin from the Tower of Darkness cries, "Fools; your Reward is neither Here nor **There**!"	**XXVII** Pērā tahi rātou e whakatikatika nei i TĒNEI RĀ, Me ērā e aronui nei te titiro atu mo Apōpō, Ko te Kai-Tūtei i runga i te Whata o te Pōuriuri i karanga, "Koutou Pōauau ma! Ko te Utu mō koutou kāore i Konei kāore hoki i Reira!"

Quatrain XXVII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	The translation of 'Kai-Tūtei' for 'Muezzin' may not have conveyed the spiritual significance that is attached to 'Muezzin'. 'Kai-Tūtei' is considered a spy or scout (which fulfils a sentry type of function). While this may be useful in conveying the general image of a watcher, it is not historically accurate.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	The spiritual significance of a Muezzin is lost in Jones' translation - see analysis of lexical fidelity.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	Contrast is reproduced in Jones' translation.

		'TO-DAY' translated as 'TĒNEI RĀ', 'TO-MORROW' translated as 'Apōpō', 'Here' as 'Konei' and 'There' as 'Reira.
Historical fidelity	NO	See analysis of lexical fidelity.
Didactic fidelty	YES	Despite the compromise of historical fidelity, the literal nature of the translation allows for any underlying didactic function to be available to those who are in a position to retrieve it.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis for quatrain II.

Quatrain XXXIV

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
XXXIV Earth's Perigee to Saturn's Apogee- I have unveiled all astral mysteries: Breaking the barriers of deceit and fraud, Leaping all obstacles but Fate's design.	**XXXIV** Up from Earth's Centre through the Seventh **Gate** I rose, and on the Throne of Saturn **Sate**, And many Knots unravel'd by the Road; But not the Master-knot of Human **Fate**.	**XXXIV** Nā waenganui ake o Papatūānuku puta rawa i te Kūaha Tuawhitu Ahau i piki ake ai, a noho rawa ki te Torona o Haitana, He maha hoki ngā Pūtiki i wetekia e au i ahau i te Huanui; Ēngari kīhai i taea te Tino-pūtiki o te Mate me te Ora mō te Tangata.

Quatrain XXXIV: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	The communicative value of all lexical items has been retained in Jones' translation. However, attention is drawn

		to the items 'Knots' (translated as 'Pūtiki') and 'Fate' (translated as 'Mate me te Ora'). 'Pūtiki' has been used in quatrain XV as the lexical equivalent of 'Tassle' (see lexical fidelity analysis of quatrain XV). However, the lexical value is more accurately aligned to 'knot'. 'Fate' (translated as 'Mate me te Ora') is lexically faithful in that 'Mate me te Ora' conveys the sense of 'Fate' in this context. Even so, attention was drawn to this because the equivalent lexical item in this translation is quite reliant on the context surrounding it. In different contexts, 'Fate' could very well be represented by a different word.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no distortion of information.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Historical fidelity	YES	It is believed that, 'Saturn' has been transliterated to avoid a distortion due to a difference in historical and cultural beliefs, thus, Jones' has opted not to use the existing Māori word for 'Saturn'.
Didactic fidelty	YES	See analysis for quatrain X.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis for quatrain II.

Quatrain LVII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LVII I shall possess myself of a great goblet With pipes of wine for its replenishment, Annulling former ties to Faith and Reason By marriage with this daughter of the Vine.	**LVII** You know, my Friends, how bravely in my **House** For a new Marriage I did make **Carouse**; Divorced old barren Reason from my Bed, And took the Daughter of the Vine to **Spouse**.	**LVII** Kei te mohio koutou, kei aku Hoa, mōku i whakamāia ra i roto i tōku Whare I te Mārenatanga hōu ko ahau tērā i Haurangi ra; Wehea atu e au a Whakaaro-tika i tōku Mōenga, Tangohia ana mai ko te Tamāhine a Te Wāina hei tahu tūturu.

Quatrain LVII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	However, the senses of 'old' and 'barren' are not represented in Jones' translation.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	As indicated above, 'old' and 'barren' have been omitted in the translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text. The occurence of alliteration observed in line one, while frequent, is not significant.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images are retained in Jones' translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	Contrast of 'Marriage' and 'Divorce' is maintained.

Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	Since all the words and images are translated literally, the didactic function that may be conveyed by Fitzgerald's version remains available in Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis for quatrain II.

Quatrain LXI

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
LXI Banish your crowding griefs with wine, disperse Your memories of the two-and-seventy sects And praise wine's alchemy that still can banish With one red draught more than a thousand spites.	**LXI** The Grape that can with Logic absolute The Two-and-Seventy jarring Sects confute; The sovereign Alchemist that in a trice Life's leaden metal into Gold transmute;	**LXI** Mā te Karepe i tōna Mātauranga motuhake Ngā Hāhi tautohe e Whitu-tekau-mā-Rua e whakahē; Ko ia hoki te tino Kai-whakaranu e taea e ia, āno he kimonga iho Te whakarewa ngā matā peehi i te Ora kia puta ana mai he papa kōura;
Notes The symbolic significance within Sufi poetry of wine (representing spiritual knowledge) should be borne in mind when reading these quatrains.		

Quatrain LXI: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	Jones' uses in his translation a word ('Tino') that does not quite convey the significance of 'sovereign'. 'Tino' is roughly equivalent to 'expert' or 'master'. Thus, any connotations and/ or underlying significances of sovereignty that Fitzgerald intended to convey are

		absent from Jones' translation.
Informational fidelity	YES	As indicated above, there is a possible loss of information in the translation of 'sovereignty'.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images are retained in Jones' translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Historical fidelity	YES	Where they occur, the historical references (e.g. God as alchemist in Islamic belief system) are retained.
Didactic fidelty	YES	Despite the possible lack of lexical fidelity in the translation of 'sovereign', in general Jones has translated the words of Fitzgerald's quatrain literally and, in doing so, has ensured that any didactic significance conveyed by the original (metaphorically) is also available to Māori readers who are in a position to access it.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain LXII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LXII Though Judgement Day should prove a grand ordeal Handled, they say, by a short-tempered Judge, Yet never fear: good has the final word- Nothing of Evil can proceed from Good.	**LXII** The mighty Mahmud, Allah breathing **Lord**, That all the misbelieving and black **Horde** Of Fears and Sorrows that infest the Soul Scatters before him with his whirlwind **Sword**.	**LXII** Ko Mahamutu rongonui, he Ariki e whakahua tonu i te ingoa ō Io, Kia meinga ai ngā kore-whakapono me te Tipi o te Hunga mahi kino I ngā whakawehinga i ngā Whaka-pouri ngākau e Whakawairua nei Kia marara katoa atu i tōna aroaro i tana Hoari whiu-kaha.

Quatrain LXII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	Some of the details are not clearly conveyed. 'Mighty' has been translated as 'rongonui' (renowned), which falls short of the concept of a 'strong warrior'. A more appropriate communicative equivalent would be 'ringa-kaha'. This would also make a clear link to the last line with 'whiu-kaha'. Although Jones' has chosen to transliterate other character and place names for the purpose of preserving some cultural significance, he had made an exception for 'Allah' using what he may have seen as a cultural equivalent

		to the target culture (Io). 'Horde' has been expressed throughout by the use of 'Tini' and 'Hunga'. While 'Hunga' (group, company) alone can possibly represent 'horde', the sense of a multitude of people is represented by 'tini' (many). Of note, the sense of 'all' in the second line is not fully represented (as it seems Jones has an explicit style of translating these quatrains). However, it is partially conveyed in 'ngā' (plural to 'the'). What is more appropriate is '**te katoa o** ngā kore-whakapono'. 'Infest' and 'Soul' have been conveyed through the use of 'whakawairua'. This lacks lexical fidelity. 'Whakawairua' is – literally - 'to be represented by an insubstantial image' which does not convey the sense of a 'soul' being 'infested'. A previous draft of Jones' translation shows 'infest the soul' as 'e kai nei i te wairua', which does retain the communicative and functional value of Fitzgerald's version.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	As indicated in the analysis of lexical fidelity, possible distortion has occured with the items discussed above.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – in general	Where imagistic features are observed in Fitzgerald's version, these are retained in Jones' translation for the most part. However: The imagestic value of 'whakawairua' may also be questioned as per the discussion on lexical fidelity.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Historical fidelity	YES	A transliteration has been used for 'Mahmud' ('Mahamutu'), and references to him and to the 'black horde' are retained in the translation.
Didactic fidelty	YES – in general	Due to the lexical, informational, imagestic, historical and rhetorical fidelity, the didactic significance is available in the translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis for quatrain II.

Quatrain LXXIII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LXXIII This cault, underneath which we live bemused Is, so to speak, God's magic shadow-show: With sun for lam, the world as a wide screen For countless lie- rehearsing silhouettes	**LXXIII** We are no other than a moving **row** Of cisionary Shapes that come and **go** Round with this Sun-illumin'd Lantern held In midnight by the Master of the **Show**;	**LXXIII** E hara kē ake tātou i ngā mea i whakararangitia nei He ataata kau ngā Ahua e haere mai ana e haere atu ana Kei te huri mā waho i te Rāma tōna mārama kei to te Rā Nō te Weherua i whakatūria ai e te Rangatira o te Mahi;

Quatrain LXXIII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	Jones' translates 'show' as 'mahi', which maintains the communicative value. Although 'show' is usually translated as 'whakaaturanga', here Jones' has maintained an aspect of didactic function, where 'mahi' (meaning work) refers to the 'work of God', where 'God' is the 'master of the show'.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no addition or omission of information in Jones' translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text. The occurence of alliteration in the translation is coincidental.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images that appear in the source text are reproduced in the translation.

Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The figures of speech that appear in the source text (e.g. the world as a lantern; life on earth as an illuminated show) are reproduced in the translation. Contrast (come' as 'haere mai' and 'go' as 'haere atu') is maintained.
Historical fidelity	YES	Reference to the lantern shows, which were common in the Victorian era, is retained.
Didactic fidelty	YES	Both quatrains convey the sense of an all-powerful God controlling the universe (and, therefore, of the ultimate irrelevance of earthly things).
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

Quatrain LXXV

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
LXXV Poor ball, struck by Fate's heavy polo-mallet, Running whichever way it drives you, numbed Of sense, though He who set you on your course, He knows, He knows, He knows.	**LXXV** The Ball no question makes of Ayes and **Nose**, But Right or Left as strikes the Player **goes**; And He that toss'd you down into the Field, He knows about it all ... He knows ... He **knows!**	**LXXV** Ko te Paoro kāore e ui he aha nei tāna Ae, Kāo rānei, Ēngari ki Katau ki Maui te patua i tā te Kai-patu i mea ai; A ko Ia nāna nei koe i whiu atu ki te Marae, E mohio ana ia ki te katoa ... E mōhio ana Ia ... E mōhio ana Ia!

Quatrain LXXV: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is mostly natural. However, the translation of 'strikes' as

		the passive ‘patua’ seems a little clumsy in the target language (where the most natural rendering would be ‘patu’). The resulting repetition (‘patu’ with ‘kai-patu’) that this would create may well have been something that Jones’ wished to avoid.
Lexical fidelity	YES	Jones chose to translate ‘Field’ as ‘Marae’. The explanatory notes that Jones’ provides in his publication explain that this quatrain alludes to the game of polo, a game favoured by the Persians at that time. This connotation is completely excluded in the use of ‘Marae’. Furthermore, ‘Marae’ was used in quatrain XIX for ‘Court’ (see quatrain XIX analysis). A more appropriate word would have been ‘Whira’. This conveys more clearly the concept of a Field, and would therefore be more appropriate in relation to the connotation of a field game.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	The word choice for conveying ‘field’ has possibly compromised the reference to the game of polo - see lexical analysis above.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald’s text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES – for the most part	In general, the images are maintained. However, the use of ‘Marae’ for ‘Field’ as discussed in lexical analysis slightly distorts the overall image.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES – for the most part	The pun observed in the first line of Fitzgerald’s version is impossible to reproduce in the target language. Therefore Jones’ has translated it as ‘Ae’ (Yes) and ‘Kao’ (No). Repetition is also maintained in the last line (‘He knows...He knows!’, ‘E mōhio ana Ia...E mōhio ana Ia!’).
Historical fidelity	YES – for the most part	In general, where historical references occur they have been transferred to the target text. However, the connotations of a game of polo are lost in the translation.
Didactic fidelty	YES – for the most part	The sense of human beings as players in a game controlled by an all-powerful being is communicated in Jones’ translation although the lack of reference to a field means that there is some potential loss in this area.

Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis for quatrain II.

Quatrain LXXVI

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LXXVI What we shall be is written, and we are so. Heedless of Good or Evil, pen, write on! By the first day all futures were decided; Which gives our griefs and pains irrelevancy.	**LXXVI** The Moving Finger writes; and, having **writ**, Moves on; nor all your piety nor **Wit** Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line, Nor all your Tears Wash out a Word of **it**.	**LXXVI** Ko te Ringa Haere kua tuhi; a i a ia kua tuhi, Ka haere tonu atu; ahakoā te katoa ō Inoi to Mātauranga rānei Hei poapoa i a ia kia hoki whakamuri ka hahae ake i waenganui o te rārangi, Ō Roimata rānei hei horoi atu i tētehi kupu ō taua tuhituhinga.

Quatrain LXXVI: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	The communicative value of each lexical item is retained.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no addition or omission of information in Jones' translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images that appear in the source text (e.g. the writing finger) are reproduced in the translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The metaphoric significane of this quatrain (time moving on and past events remaining frozen in the past) is retained in Jones' translation.

Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	The didactic teaching ('what's done is done', the path is laid out for us, and there's nothing we can do about it') is retained in Jones' translation and easily understood by the target audience.
Functional fidelity	IN PART	Jones' translation of this quatrain closely resembles a *whakatauki* in its didactic function. In contrast to previous quatrains, and true to the Māori verbal art form of *Whakatauki*, there is no need for further narrative to grasp the didactic message. However, the main function of Fitzgerald's text, that is, the poetic/ aesthetic function is not maintained in the translation.

Quatrain LXXXI

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
LXXXI When first the Sky's wild horses won their saddles, When Jupiter first blazed, the Pleiads too, My fate was published from God's Judgement seat. How can I err? I act as it is written.	**LXXXI** I tell you this ... When, started from the **Goal**, Over the flaming shoulders of the **Foal** Of Heav'n Parwin and Mushtari they flung, In my predestin'd Plot of Dust and **Soul**	**LXXXI** E kōrero atu ana ahau ki a koe i tēnei ... I te tīmatanga mai i te Pou tapu, Whiti rawa ma runga i ngā pakihiwi wera o te Kūao Ō te Rangi; Nā Pāwinia raua ko Mahutari nā rāua i whiu, Te Puehu me Te Wairua ki roto i tōku Urupā kua tohuria mai i te Ōroko-tīmatanga.

Quatrain LXXXI: Analysis

There are no issues with the translation of this quatrain. Fidelity judgement and comments are identical to those of the analysis of quatrain X and quatrain XIX.

Quatrain LXXXII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LXXXII But while the Eternal One created me, He word by word spelt out my lesson, love, And seized my heart and from a fragment cut, Keys to the storehouse of Reality.	**LXXXII** The Vine had struck a fibre; which a**bout** If clings my Being ... let the Dervish **flout**; Of my Base metal may be filed a Key, That shall unlock the Door he howls with**out**.	**LXXXII** Ko te Wāina kua tupu tōna take; koirā ia nei Te awhitanga a tōku Hinengaro ... tukua te Tangata Mohoao kia whakahāwea; Mō taku Maitai ka warungia nei hei Kii, E meinga ai kia tuhera te Tatau e aureretia mai nei e ia i waho.

Quatrain LXXXII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is generally natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	This translation is as it stands marked by lexical fidelity. However, the use of 'awhitanga' for 'clings' is not wholly successful. An alternative word choice would be 'piringa' which would associate more naturally with 'hinengaro'.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no distortion of information in Jones' translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Despite the coincidental occurance of alliteration in Jones' translation, he has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images (e.g. a vine clinging) are reproduced in the translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The metaphoric significance of vine, key and transmutation are retained in

		Jones' translation.
Historical fidelity	YES	The reference here is to the belief in transmutation of base metal (symbolising human beings) into gold (simbolizing spirituality).
Didactic fidelty	YES	The didactic significance evident in the Fitzgerland's version is also evident in Jones' version.
Functional fidelity	NO	One of the main functions of Fitzgerald's text was a poetic/ aesthetic one. However, this would seem to be absent from Jones' translation. It does not attempt to replicate the poetic features of Fitzgeral's text and it lacks some features of Māori verbal arts, that is, it makes no appeal to genealogy, landscape, and cultural norms and expectations generally. It has, furthermore, no real narrative appeal.

Quatrain LXXXIII

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
LXXXIII Mysteries broached with joy in tavern talk Have far more substance than a mumbled prayer To you, my Last and First, my soul's Creator Empowered either to sear or succour me.	**LXXXIII** And this I know; whether the one True **Light**, Kindle to Love, or Wrath-consume me **quite**, One Flash of It within the Tavern caught Better than in the Temple lost out**right**.	**LXXXIII** A ko tenei i mātauria e au; ahakoa kotahi te Māramatanga Tika, I Tākirihia ki te Aroha ahakoā ma te Riri ahau e kai a pau atu, Kotahi wherikotanga ōna i roto i te Whare inu Waina i mau mai Pai ake i tō roto i te Temepara i ngaro noa nei.

Quatrain LXXXIII: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	The communicative value of lexical items is retained.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no distortion of information in the translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images (e.g. tavern, temple) are maintained in the translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The contrast between 'temple' and 'tavern' is maintained.
Historical fidelity	YES	The historical references (to temples and taverns) are maintained in Jones' translation.
Didactic fidelty	YES	Similar to the didactic fidelity comments for quatrain II, the contrasting reference to a 'temple' and a 'tavern' suggests a similar didactic function. Due to the literal nature of the translation, this quatrain is didactically faithful.
Functional fidelity	NO	See functional fidelity comments for quatrain II.

Quatrain LXXXIX

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)	Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)
LXXXIX Ramazan's moon, I hear, rides high again. Soon none may give new rein to hot desire; Yet before Shaban ends, I shall have drunk Sweet wine enough to float me through that Fast.	**LXXXIX** As under cover of departing **Day** Slunk hunger-stricken Ramazan a**way**, Once more within the Potter's house alone I stood, surrounded by the shapes of C**lay**.	**LXXXIX** Nō roto i te maru-ahiahi he Tōnga nō te Rā I whakangaro atu ai a Ramatana me tōna mate kai, Tū mokemoke ana te whare ō te Tangata mahi oko, Ko au tahi e tū ana, i waenga o ngā Mea i hangaia ki te Uku.

Quatrain LXXXIX: Anaysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES	Where equivalent lexical items occur, communicative value is retained, including that of 'shapes'. Jones has translated 'shapes' as 'mea', although 'mea' simply means 'thing', it is implied that 'mea' refers to those 'things' which are made of clay. Therefore the imagistic component of 'things' of clay coming in different shapes and sizes is retained.
Informational fidelity	NO	'Slunk' has no equivalent in Jones' translation. There is a clear distortion furher on, where Jones has conveyed the idea of "standing alone in the Potter's house" as "The Potter's house stands alone".
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.

Imagistic fideilty	?	For the most part the images are maintained in the translation. However, the distortion of information in line 3 leads to imagistic distortion.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The metaphorical significance of clay (human beings), and a potter (God) is retained in Jones' translation.
Historical fidelity	YES	Through transliteration, the historical references are maintained in Jones' translation.
Didactic fidelty	YES	The didactic function (trusing to God to shape humanity) is maintained in the translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See functional fidelity comments for quatrain II.

Quatrain XCIV

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
XCIV I saw at least two thousand pots, last night In Potters Row, not all of which were mute, And one cried loudly: 'Friends, where is the Potter, Where is the salesman, where is the customer?	**XCIV** Thus with the Dead as with the Living, What? And Why? so ready, but the wherefore **not**, One on a sudden peevishly exclaim'd, "Which is the Potter, pray, and which the **Pot**?	**XCIV** Ka rite tahi ai tā ēnei mea Mate ki tā te hunga Ora, He aha? A mō te aha? tau-rite tonu, ēngari ko te whakautu mai, inanā kei te ngaro tonu, Kātahi tētehi ka karanga noa ake, "Ko tēwhea ai te Tangata mahi Oko, utua mai ra, ko tēwhea hoki te Oko?"

Quatrain XCIV: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	***Fidelity judgment***	***Comment***
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.

Lexical fidelity	YES	The lexical value of items is retained.
Informational fidelity	YES	There is no distortion in the translation.
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text
Imagistic fideilty	YES	The images are retained in Jones' translation.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	The repetition of 'which' is retained as well as the occurance of rhetorical questions.
Historical fidelity	n/a	
Didactic fidelty	YES	Since all the words and images are translated literally, the didactic function that may exist in Fitzgerald's version (i.e. one's unwillingness to see himself as of lesser ability than God) remains available in Jones' translation.
Functional fidelity	NO	See functional fidelity commtransents for quatrain II.

Quatrain CIX

Graves and Ali-Shah's translation of the Persian	**Fitzgerald's translation of the Persian (5th version)**	**Jones' Translation of Fitzgerald (5th version)**
CIX	**CIX**	**CIX**
Since no voice here can promise you tomorrow, Content yourself, my mortal Moon, with Bowls Emptied by moonlight-one fine night the Moon May search the world for us, but find us gone!	But see! The rising Moon of Heav'n **again** Looks for us, Sweet-heart, through the quivering **Plane**; How oft hereafter rising will she look Among those leaves … for one of us in **vain**!	Tītiro anō i ana; Ko te Marama kua āranga ki te Rangi E rapu ana i a tāua, e te Tau-aroha, i roto i ngā kārohirohi o te Papa-whenua; E whia rā aranga ōna a muri ake nei ki te rapu I waenganui o ngā rau rākau … mo tētehi o tāua kia kitea a kore ake hoki!

Quatrain CIX: Analysis

Type of Fidelity	*Fidelity judgment*	*Comment*
Grammatical fidelity	YES	The grammatical form of the text as translated by Jones is wholly natural.
Lexical fidelity	YES – in general	There is no word/ particle in Jones' translation that conveys the sense of possession (i.e. the moon belonging to Heaven) that is present in the Fitzgerald version. As with quatrain XVIII, Jones has again used the phrase 'anō i ana', the same intention and function applies here, where 'anō i ana' is used to emphasise the verb 'see', 'titiro'.
Informational fidelity	YES – in general	There is a slight omission of information in the first line (see lexical fidelity above).
Metrical fidelity	NO	Jones has made no attempt to reproduce the metre and rhyme scheme (including alliteration) of Fitzgerald's text.
Imagistic fideilty	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Rhetorical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Historical fidelity	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Didactic fidelty	YES	See analysis of quatrain X.
Functional fidelity	NO	See analysis of quatrain II.

4.5 Findings

It was argued at the beginning of this chapter that the issue of fidelity in translation is not a straightforward one. Nine types of fidelity were outlined and defined (*grammatical, lexical, informational, metrical, imagistic, rhetorical, historical, didactic* and *functional*) and it was noted that it might not always be possible, or desirable for a translated text to achieve all nine. Often, choices among different types of fidelity need to be made. Thus, for example, a translated text in which all of the historical references included in the source text are maintained (historical fidelity) might have little relevance to readers who have no knowledge of the historical circumstances to which the author of the source text was referring. In such a case, a translator might, in seeking to achieve, for

example, didactic fidelity, decide to replace some or all of the historical references in the source text by historical references that are familiar to the intended audience of the translated text and, in that way, communicate to the intended audience a message (e.g. that no amount of worldly wealth can secure happiness) that might otherwise remain unavailable. Equally, to seek to achieve metrical fidelity may be to aim for an impossible ideal in some cases. It is, for example, simply not possible to replicate the stress-timed metre that is a characteristic of much English verse (including Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*) in translations into languages, such as te reo Māori, that are not stress-timed[14]. For these reasons, it is interesting to examine translations, particularly translations of literary texts, in terms of a range of types of fidelity.

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, it would appear that the text of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám Rubiyam* was, for Jones, the source text for his own translation although it (Fitzgerald's version) has often been regarded as being very different in some important respects from the quatrains written in Farsi by Omar Khayyám. This is borne out by the fact that Jones' translation is generally *lexically*, *informationally* and *historically* faithful to Fitzgerald's text even where there are clear differences between that text and the translation by Graves and Ali-Shah, a translation that is widely regarded as being closer to Khayyám's quatrains.

Twenty-five of Pei Jones' quatrains were compared, in terms of the nine types of fidelity outlined above, with the equivalent quatrains in Fitzgerald's text. Overall, the translation was found to exhibit, in large measure, the following types of fidelity: *grammatical, lexical, informational, imagistic, rhetorical* and *historical* but to lack *metrical* and *functional* fidelity. While the presence of lexical, informational and historical fidelity ensure that the *potential* for didactic significance present in the source text is also present in the translated text (*didactic fidelity*), that potential may not be realized in practice as the majority of Māori readers are unlikely to be familiar with these historical references or, indeed, with general conventions of Sufi poetry (which involve a tension between

[14] Jones does, however, make some attempt to replicate the alliteration that is a characteristic of Fitzgerald's text. Thus, where it is possible to select a word that is useful from an alliterative point of view rather than another alternative, he does so (as is the case with quatrain XV).

surface and deeper meanings). This raises an issue that is relevant also to Fitzgerald's text. It has often been claimed that Fitzgerald's quatrains lack the spiritual significance associated with Sufi poetry, representing the world in a largely hedonistic way. However, because Fitzgerald retained many of the historical and mythological references that were present in the original and, in addition, retained many symbolically charged references (e.g. roses, wine, gardens), it could be argued that the spiritual and didactic significance of the original Sufi poetry was *potentially* available to Victorian readers (and is, in fact, available to readers generally) just as they were/are to Māori readers of Pei Jones' translation. If, therefore, readers of the English and Māori versions fail to detect that didactic/ spiritual potential, it may not be because the translations lack didactic fidelity but because readers of the translations (and, possibly, also the translators themselves) lack the type of knowledge and understanding that is required in order to appreciate the potential didactic significance. In other words, if a translated text has lexical, informational and historical fidelity, it must necessarily have the same didactic *potential* as the original. Even so, if a translator wishes to *emphasise* the didactic potential of a text, he or she may need to sacrifice some aspects of lexical, informational and/or historical fidelity in order to do so since the readers of the translated text may respond more readily to the potential didactic significance of historical and/or mythological references with which they are familiar.

In terms of *grammatical* fidelity, the grammatical structures used in the Pei Jones' translation are, in all cases, wholly natural to *te reo Māo*ri and so the translated text, like the source text, is likely to be wholly acceptable in this respect to the target audience.

In terms of *lexis*, the words appearing in the Pei Jones' translation have, in most cases, the same communicative value, or a similar one, to those appearing in the source text. On occasions when this proved difficult, or impossible to achieve, Jones employed a range of strategies. Since there is no equivalent of 'nightingale' (a bird known for the beauty and sweetness of his song) in the world familiar to Māori, he opted for a generic word, in this case ('manu'/ bird). However, he conveyed the sense of sweetness by referring to the voice as 'Pai-rawa', thus

ensuring that a critical aspect of the sense of the original was not lost. Similarly, since there is no equivalent in Māori culture of 'Sultan', Jones opted to translate this word as 'Ariki', thus maintaining the sense of a powerful ruler conveyed in the source text. On at least one occasion, however - in Jones' translation of 'solitude' as 'raorao' (undulating, low-lying land - the sense of the original appears not to be fully communicated). Furthermore, Jones' decision to translate 'bread' as 'taro' (as in the Bible) appears to have been motivated more by a desire to capture what he may have interpreted as a spiritual reference in the source text than by a desire for lexical fidelity. On this occasion, lexical fidelity may have been sacrificed in order to retain his perception of the potential for didactic fidelity.

Achieving *informational* fidelity appears to have been a primary motivator for Pei Jones. Thus, for example, where the source text makes reference to historical or mythological figures, these are transliterated rather than being replaced by figures more likely to be familiar to a Māori audience. Thus, for example, *Jamshyd, Kaikobad, Rustum* and *Hatim Tai* are translated as *Tamahihi, Kaikōpata, Rūtama* and *Hātima Tai*. However, while the use of transliteration allows for *historcal* and *informational* fidelity, it may result, for Māori audiences, in a loss of *didactic* fidelity. Thus, for example, readers of *Quatrain X* are urged to pay no heed to Rustum's call to battle and Hatim's call to supper. Those familiar with Sufi poetry, and with the stories of Rustum and Hatim, are likely to interpret this as a call to turn away from worldly things and towards spiritual things (the *didactic* significance of the quatrain). However, that reading is likey to be available only to a minority of Māori readers. If one of the reasons why Jones translated Fitzgerald's text was to make its potential didactic significance avilable to a majority of Māori readers, it might have been better for him to have replaced historical/ mythological references that were unlikely to resonate with Māori audiences with historical/ mythological references with which they were more likely to be familiar. In the event, it appears that the decision was made to prioritize lexical over didactic fidelity. This does not mean that the didactic potenial of the quatrains is no loner available. It does, however, mean that it is unlikely to be generally available to a Māori audience.

A final and important issue is that of *functional fidelity*, that is, the extent to which the translated text serves a similar function to that of the original text and, in the case of a literary/aesthetic work, meets the aesthetic and/or cultural expectations of the target audience. The issue of functional fidelity is, in many ways, the most complex because it may involve things that cannot be reproduced in a translation. Thus, for example, in assessing the extent to which Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's text has functional fidelity, the issue of metre needs to be considered. As indicated earlier, metrical fidelity is not possible in the case of a translation from English into Māori and so one important aspect of the aesthetic appeal of Fitzgerald's text is inevitably absent. This being the case, it is important to consider whether Pei Jones' translation compensates for this by drawing upon aspects of Māori verbal arts with which his readers are likely to be familiar. In attempting to address this issue, it is relevant to bear in mind the fact that Fitzgerald's quatrains do appear to have something in common with *whakatauki* in that they are brief, densely symbolic and frequently appear to have didactic significance. As indicated in the analysis above, similarities to *whakatauki* are particularly clear in the case of quatrains II, XI, XVIII and LXXVI. In each of these quatrains, the potential didactic significance is evident as a result of the lexical content. Māori readers will be familiar with the spiritual significance of words such as 'Tangata-whakapono (worshipper); 'Hāora i tohuria' (destin'd Hour) and 'Inoi' (piety). This suggests that the didactic function may have been one that had particular significance for Jones in spite of the fact that he chose not to replace some historical/ mythological references that are likely to be unfailiar to many Māori readers by references that would have been familiar to them.

It may be that some similarities between Fitzgerald's quatrains and *whakatauki*, particularly in relation to their potential didactic significance, was one of the reasons for Jones' decision to embark on the translation. On the other hand, as suggested in previous chapters, it may be that Jones was intrigued by the apparently epicurean take on life that Fitzgerald portrays in the quatrains, that is, by the fact that, on one level, they can be read as an expression of that natural acceptance of life's pleasures that was characteristic of traditional Māori society (and is to be found in the *mōteatea*). The fact is, however, that much of the potential didactic significance of the quatrains will be unavailable to all but a very

few Māori readers. Furthermore, the epicurean aspect of the quatrains is expressed in a way that is very different from the more earthy appeal of Māori compositions.

In spite of the fact that they have something in common with *whakatauki* (brevity and potential didactic significance) and something in common with *mōteatea* (the surface appearance of an epicurean approach to life), Jones' quatrains are generally lacking in terms of *functional fidelity*. There are, for example, none of the references to genealogy, to familiar places and to culturally significant events that characterize Māori verbal arts. There is none of the wordplay, the drama, the spectacle, the story telling and the feats of prowess and human weakness that Māori audiences have come to expect from Māori verbal arts. It may be for this reason (that is, its overall lack of functional fidelity) that Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* has never been as popular as his translations of Shakespearean plays which, above all, provide Māori audiences with many of those things they have come to expect from the verbal arts. The translation of an artistic work may be faithful to the original in almost all respects but may nevertheless lack appeal to its intended audience because it fails to meet their aesthetic and cultural expectations.

Chapter 5

Conclusions, strengths and limitations

5.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by revisiting the overall aim of the research and the research questions underpinning it. It provides an overview of each chapter, focusing, in particular, on how the research questions were addressed and what the main findings were. The chapter ends with an outline of the perceived strengths and limitations of the research project as a whole.

5.2 Revisiting the overall aim of the research and the research questions

The overall aim of this research project has been to explore Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* from the perspective of *purpose*, *fidelity* and *approach*. This was done in order to determine whether such an exploration could throw light on issues relating to the translation of translated texts and, more generally, on the nature of translation itself as it relates, in particular, to literary and artistic texts that are culturally embedded and historically distant.

The research questions underpinning the research project were:

- *What does a sample of literature on translation tell us about possible approaches to the translation of literary and artistic works and the translation of translations?*

- *To what extent is there evidence of these processes in the Pei Jones' translations?*

- *What does an analysis of the Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám reveal about issues relating to the concept of 'fidelity' as it relates, in particular, to source culture, target culture and poetic style?*

- *What does an analysis of the Pei Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám reveal about the extent to which purpose and intent inform the types of compromise that have to be made in one area (e.g. poetic style) in order to be as faithful as possible in another (e.g. target culture)?*

5.3 Overview of each chapter

Chapter 1 set the scene by providing a brief background to the text – which is highly artistic, heavily culturally embedded, and historically distant - and to the author/ translators. It introduces the research aims, research questions and research methods, highlighting, in particular, the fact that the research is intended not only to throw some light on a particular instance of the translation of an already translated text but also to contribute to the theory of translation more generally.

In *Chapter 2*, some background information about the original author (Omar Khayyám) and the two translators (Edward Fitzgerald and Pei Jones) is provided. Khayyám is described as a Persian scholar, an astronomer and philosopher of the eleventh century who was also a Sufi poet, that is, a poet whose writings were considered to be an expression of the mystical dimension of Islamic thought. In contrast, Fitzgerald is described as a man of wealth and privilege who, possibly as an outlet for aspects of his life that were marked by concealment and suffering, may have interpreted the rubáiyát as an expression of hedonism. Finally, Jones is described as a highly regarded scholar and leader, someone who may have been drawn to Fitzerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* because, on a surface level at least, it would appear to be a celebration of that natural acceptance of life's pleasures that characterises traditional Māori society. This chapter outlines the cultural, linguistic, literary and religious context out of which the rubáiyát emerged and explores the different contexts in which Khayyám, Fitzgerald and Jones were operating, attempting, in each case, to extrapolate from that some indication of the purpose, function and intent that informed each of the works.

Chapter 3 seeks to address the first research question by examining selected literature on the theory and practice of translation. It explores, the practice of

translating translations, arguing that this is sometimes undertaken in order to make the original accessible (Bassnett, 1998), it could be argued that a translation that is being re-translated has effectively *become* the original (Derrida, 1985). The overall conclusion reached was that, in going through the process of translating and/or retranslating texts, particularly literary and artistic texts, the translator must make a range of compromises in relation to purpose, function and/or audience and that these compromises will ultimately determine the nature of the relationship between the source and target texts and the ways in which readers relate to the target texts.

Chapter 3 also explores a number of problems relating to Newmark's (1991) discussion of approaches to translation, noting, in particular, the problematic nature of some of the presuppositions involved. Thus, for example, the description of what is referred to as 'the literal approach to translation' presupposes that it is possible to find structures and vocabulary in the target language that are, in some sense, 'equivalent' to those in the source language; what is referred to as 'the faithful approach' presupposes that it is possible to produce in the target language something that is close to the contextual meaning of the source text; what is referred to as 'the semantic approach' presupposes that the 'aesthetic value' of a text is something that can be reproduced in the target text; and, finally, what is referred to as 'the communicative approach' assumes that the 'exact contextual meaning' of the source text is recoverable and can be rendered in the target text. Furthermore, the notion of 'adaptation' in translation is questioned and it is argued that the simple borrowing of themes, characters and plots results not in an 'adapted translation', one that lacks certain types of fidelity, but in a wholly new creation, one that nevertheless has some features in common with the original.

All of this, it is argued, raises some critical issues concerning the concept of fidelity in translation. In what respects might a translated text be judged to lack fidelity to the original? In connection with this question, it is noted that Jones' text is a translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* and that, therefore, the source text is, in this case, Fitzgerald's text rather than Khayyám's text. Any judgment concerning the fidelity of Jones' text must therefore be made with reference to that of Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald's text is often regarded as being

unfaithful to Khayám's rubáiyát in that it is seen as being essentially hedonistic rather than spiritual in orientation. If Jones' text is faithful to Fitzgerald's, one would therefore expect it to be equally hedonistic in orientation. Two problems were identified here. The first relates to ambiguity. Ambiguity often plays a central role in artistic works. In particular, it is an acknowledged characteristic of Sufi poetry, in which there is a tension between the surface meaning and the symbolic/ spiritual significance of objects such as wine, roses, gardens and lovers. It follows, therefore, that those who believe that Fitzgerald's translation is hedonistic in orientation may do so simply because they do not have the knowledge required to unlock the symbolism inherent in the objects to which reference is made. The second problem identified is the fact that fidelity in translation is a complex concept, one that includes many different dimensions. The faithfulness of a translation cannot therefore be judged in simple binary terms (faithful/ unfaithful). Furthermore, it was noted that certain types of fidelity may be either impossible or, in certain cases, undesirable. These issues are revisited in *Chapter 4* where the concept of fidelity in translation is re-examined.

Chapter 4 began by questioning the validity of various approaches to the concept of fidelity in translation and presenting a framework including nine types of fidelity (*grammatical, lexical, informational, metrical, imagistic, rhetorical, historical, didactic* and *functiona*l), each of which was defined. It was noted, however, that there are inevitably occasions when it is neither possible nor desirable to aim for all of these types of fidelity in translation and that certain types of fidelity may be sacrificed in order to achieve other types. An examination of Jones' translation of Fitzerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* in terms of each of the types of fidelity outlined led to the following conclusions.

Jones' text has *grammatical fidelity,* that is, its grammatical form is wholly natural within the context of the target language and so it meets the grammatical expectations of the target audience (in the same way as Fitzgerald's text meets the grammatical expectations of its very different target audience).

In terms of *lexis*, the communicative value of the translated words is, in most cases, equivalent to that of the source text although there are a few occasions

where *lexical fidelity* is compromised. Thus, for example, although there is an obvious difference between 'bread' and 'taro', the translation of 'bread' as 'taro' by Jones is reminiscent of the Maori Bible and may have been intended to be interpreted as having spiritual connotations.

Informational, *historical* and *imagistic fidelity* appear to have been priorities for Jones: historical references and mythical figures are transliterated and images are, in general, retained. However, to have replaced references that are likely to be unfamiliar to the majority of Māori readers by more familiar references that are similarly charged (e.g. that act as reminders of the fleeting nature of worldly goods) would have been more likely to reveal to them the didactic potential of the translated text. However, as Jones was translating Fitzgerald's text rather than that of Khayyám, and as he may not, in any case, have been familiar with the symbolic significance of certain references in Khayyám's text, he may have preferred not to make changes that would have predisposed his readers to a particular interpretation. It may, in fact, be the case that he was more interested in conveying a more surface/ literal reading of the quatrains, one that could be read as being essentially epicurean, possibly because such a reading highlights some of the similarities between the quatrains and certain aspects of *mōteatea*.

Overall, the analysis of Jones' translation revealed it to be largely *lexically*, *informationally*, *imagistically*, *rhetorically* and *historically* faithful to Fitzgerald's text but to lack *metrical* and *functional* fidelity. The issue of *didactic fidelity* was, however, found to be a more complex one. Thus, while Jones' translation has the *potential* for didactic fidelity (precisely because it is largely *lexically*, *informationally* and *historically faithful*), this potential may not be realized in practice in that the majority of Māori readers are unlikely to be in a position to appreciate the symbolic (spiritual) significance of many of the references (e.g. references to lovers, gardens, roses, wine) within the context of Sufi poetry. Since the same is likely to be true of Victorian readers of Fitzgerald's text, the widely held belief that it is unfaithful to the original in respect of its lack of a spiritual dimension may be unjustified. In other words, if a translated text has *lexical*, *informational* and *historical* fidelity, it must necessarily have the same didactic potential as the original. If readers of the English and Māori texts fail to detect any

didactic/ spiritual potential, this may not be because the translations lack didactic fidelity but because readers of the translations lack the knowledge and understanding that is required in order to appreciate the potential didactic significance.

Overall, an examination of translations and translations of translations in the light of the multi-faceted concept of fidelity outlined in this chapter appears to have the potential not only to uncover some interesting aspects of the translation itself, and to provide useful clues to the rationale for it and the types of compromise that were made by the translator, but also to throw some light on issues relating to the ways in which translated texts are, or are likely to be, received/ interpreted by readers at different times, with different cultural expectations and with differing levels of appreciation of the literary expectations of other communities.

5.4 Strengths and limitations of the research

A critical aspect of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* is its metrical structure. This is something that is impossible to replicate in Māori. However, Māori verbal art forms have melodic qualities that are very different in kind but equally artistically appealing to Māori audiences. One limitation of this research project is its failure to explore the musical aspects of Jones' translation in any depth. This was largely due to the limited time available in which to conduct the research. It would, however, be a useful avenue to explore in the future, particularly as it is impossible to reach any definitive conclusions about the *functional fidelity* of the text without reference to the extent to which it is likely to meet those aesthetic expectations of a Māori readership that relate to its musical qualities.

Another limitation of the research relates to the fact that neither Fitzgerald's text nor that of Jones is compared directly with that of Khayyám. This is because of the researcher's inability to read the original Farsi text. Ideally, any continuation of this type of research should be conducted in collaboration with someone who is familiar with the language in which Khayyám wrote and the cultural expectations of his potential readers.

In spite of its limitations, I believe that this research project does make a contribution to translation scholarship by:

- highlighting some of the problems associated with the ways in which the concept of fidelity is dealt with in the literature on translation;
- proposing a multi-faceted approach to fidelity in translation that provides a model that can be applied to the analysis of the translation of many different kinds of text, including literary texts;
- using the 'fidelity model' to analyse Jones' translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* in a way that indicates the types of fidelity that appear to be present, and the compromises that appear to have been made;
- demonstrating that where there is, in an overall sense, *lexical*, *informational* and *historical fidelity*, there is also *the potential* for *didactic fidelity*, a potential that is, however, likely to be realized only by a minority of readers;
- demonstrating that translators who wish to make certain meanings (e.g. the deeper spiritual meanings that permeate Sufi poetry) available to as many of their target readers as possible may need to sacrifice some aspects of *lexical* and *historical fidelity* in order to do so.

References

Alizadeh, A. (2005). Confused about Sufi poetry? Retrieved May 5, 2013, from http://www.innersense.com.au/salonim/articles/sufi.html

Attridge, D. (1995). *Poetic Rhythm: an introduction.* Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Autumnbreeze3000 (Producer). (2011, 25 April 2013). The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam: Rubai 8 (and look a thousand blossoms). Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PUeP1dwtSmc

Bassnett, S. (1997). Intricate Pathways: observations on translation and literature. In S. Bassnett (Ed.), *Translating Literature*. Cambridge: D.S Brewer.

Bassnett, S. (1998). When is a translation not a translation. In S. Bassnett, & A. Lefevere. (Ed.), *Constructing Cultures.* Great Britain: Cromwell Press.

Bassnett, S. (2011). *Reflections on Translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Beekman, J., & Callow, John. (1974). *Translating the word of God: with Scripture and Topical Indexes*. United States of America: Zondervan Publishing House.

Biggs, B. (2010). Jones, Pei Te Hurinui 1898-1976. Retrieved January 17, 2012, from http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/4j11/jones-pei-te-hurinui

Brodie, R. (n.d). A Style Analysis of The Rubaiyat. Retrieved 14 January, 2013, from http://www.therubaiyat.com/analysis/styleindex.htm

Coumans, J. (2010). Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam : An Updated Bibliography. Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/waikato/docDetail.action?docID=10493633

Crombie, W. (1987). *Free Verse and Prose Style: an operational definition and description.* USA: Croom Helm.

Derrida, J. (1992). Jacques Derrida from Des Tours de Babel (J. F. Graham, Trans.). In R. Schulte, & J.Biguenet (Ed.), *Theories of Translation: an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fitzgerald, E. (1942). *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam rendered into English quatrains by Edward Fitzgerald the five authorized versions*. New York: Walter J Black.

Fraser, G. S. (1970). *Metre, Rhyme, and Free Verse.* Great Britain: Cox and Wyman Ltd.

Graves, R., & Ali-Shah, O. (1968). *Rubaiyyat of Omar Khayaam; a new translation with critical commentaries* (3rd ed.). London: Cassell.

Graves, R. A.-s., O. (1968). *The Rubaiyyat of Omar Khayaam: a new translation with critical commentaries.* London: Cassell and Company Ltd.

Grey, G. (1853). *Ko Nga Moteatea: me nga hakirara o nga Maori*. Wellington: Robert Stokes.

Haight, G. (1985, Sunday, 12 May). The Rubaiyat of Edward Fitzgerald., *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.imsc.res.in/~sitabhra/khayyam/fitzbio2.html

Harlow, R. (2001). *A māori reference grammar.* Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Ltd.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.

Houbert, F. (1998). Translation as a communication process. *Translation Journal, 2*(3). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal//05theory.htm

Huizinga, J. (1970). *Homo Ludens: a study of the play element in culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Jones, P. T. H. (1975). *Ngā Rūpaiaha a Oma Kaiama*. New Zealand: Jones.

Jones, P. T. H. (1982). Te Hurinui. In W. Ihimaera, & D. S. Long (Ed.), *Into the world of light: An anthology of Maori writing*. Auckland: Heinemann.

Karamanian, A. (2002). Translation and Culture. *Translation Journal, 6*(1). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal/19culture2.htm

Kellscraft Studio. (1999). Omar Khayyam: the astronomer poet of Persia. Retrieved 24 April, 2013, from http://www.kellscraft.com/rubaiyatkhayyambio.html

Kinnes, T. (2012). Rubaiyat Commentary. Retrieved 12 December, 2012, from http://oaks.nvg.org/rua.html

Kolawole, S., & Salawu, A. (2008). The Literary Translator and the Concept of Fidelity. *Translation Journal, 12*(4). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal/46lit.htm

Leonardi, V. (2000). Equivalence in Translation: between myth and reality. *Translation Journal, 4*(4). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal/14equiv.htm

Lewes, G. H. (n.d). *The Life and Works of Goethe: with sketches of his age and contemporaries*. London: Dent and Co.

Macdonald, p. (2012). Who's Listening/Reading? *Translation Journal*, *16*(4). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal/62listen.htm

McLean, M. (1996). *Māori Music*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988a). *Approaches to translation*. UK: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. (1988b). *A Textbook of Translation*. UK: Prentice Hall International.

Newmark, P. (1996). Introductory Survey. In R. Owens (Ed.), *The Translator's Handbook*. London: ASL113.

Ngata, A. (1959). *Ngā Mōteatea: he maramara rere nō ngā waka maha / he mea kohikohi nā Sir Apirana Ngata = The Songs: scattered pieces from many canoe areas / collected by Sir Apirana Ngata.* (Vol. 1). Wellington: Polynesian Society.

Ngata, A. (1986). *Na to hoa aroha: from your dear friend, the correspondence between Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck* (Vol. 1). Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Orbell, M. (1991). *Waiata: Maori songs in history*. Auckland: Reed.

Quiroga-Clare, C. (2003). Language Ambiguity: A curse and a blessing. *Translation Journal*, *17*(1). Retrieved from http://translationjournal.net/journal//23ambiguity.htm

Roa, R. (2008). *Formulaic Discourse Patterning in Mōteatea.* Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics and Māori Doctoral Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Roa, T. (2004). Traittore;Traduttore: Cultural integrity and translation involving Māori and other indigenous languages. *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, *5*(1).

Sacred-Texts. (n.d). Chapter III: Yama, the first Man, and King of the Dead Retrieved 24 February, 2013, from http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/iml/iml08.htm

Schimmel, A. (2011). *Mystical dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Selwyn, D. C. (Writer). (2003). Don Selwyn Presentation [VHS]. New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Shakespeare, W. (1990). *Te tangata whai rawa o Weneti = The merchant of Venice: he mea tuhi na Wiremu Haakipia: he mea whakamaori na Pei Te Hurinui* (P. T. H. Jones, Trans.). Auckland: Huia.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies An Integrated Approach.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

Whaanga, H., Hedley, R. (2006). Pei te Hurinui Jones (1898–1976): Ngāti Maniapoto leader, adviser, interpreter, land officer, scholar, writer, translator, genealogist, husband, father, grandfather Retrieved June 15, 2012, from http://www.heherengakorero.co.nz/peiJones/bibliography.html

Wikipedia. (2012). Langar: Sufism. Retrieved 24 April, 2013, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Langar_(Sufism)

Wilde, D. (n.d). On Sufism and poetry. Retrieved May 8, 2013, from http://www.unc.edu/depts/sufilit/Wilde.htm

Witteveen, H. J. (1997). *Universal Sufism*. Australia: Element Books Limited.

Yogananda, P. (1971). *Autobiography of a Yogi*. Los Angeles: Self-Realization Fellowship.

Yogananda, P. (n.d). Inspirational Article: introduction, the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam explained. Retrieved August 24, 2012, from http://www.crystalclarity.com/content.php?page=pyarticle37