

## Some Notes Towards Degrees of Literariness in Two Persian Translations of Nietzsche's Thus Spoke Zarathustra

Mahboobeh Alizadeh<sup>1</sup> Iraj Montashery<sup>2</sup>

1. Department of English Language Translation, Shahr-e-Qods Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Department of English Language Translation, Shahr-e-Qods Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

2. Department of Humanities, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

### Abstract

In recent years, linguists and stylistics experts have become aware of the significance of lexical arrangement as a means of ascertaining and exploring the organization of concepts in the mind. The researchers argue that analyzing lexical items in terms of their literariness and interrelationships in semantic space makes the lexicon of a language doubly meaningful. However, there are not many studies in literary translations focusing on literariness in terms of lexicon on the translated works of Persian literary translators. More specifically, not a single research has been done on aspects of literariness in Nietzsche's translated works in Iran using the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes until today. Therefore, this research is an attempt to contribute to Persian literary translation by providing insights regarding choice of literary words used by the two Persian translators of Nietzsche's Thus Spoke Zarathustra. This research revealed that Dariyoush Ashouri not only has had a better choice of literary words, but he has managed to approach Nietzsche's poetic language in arrangement of the words. Rahim Gholami has employed the common and available words for translation. Consequently, Ashouri's translation is considered far more literary than Gholami's translation, because of his wide range of literary words.

**Keywords:** Literariness, Lexicon, Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Jakobson, Nietzsche.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

From ancient time up to now, there have been debates about translation. According to Mashhady et al. (2015) translation has been regarded as a multi-faceted phenomenon by many scholars. Translation is "the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language" (Nida & Taber, 1969; Hartmann & Stock, 1972, cited in Bell, 1991).

To many, it is a waste of time to define literature, for everybody knows what literature is. Obviously, it is prose like novels and short stories, poetry, and drama. Ghazala (2014) states "other definition of literature were in terms of creativity, subject matter, symbolism, figurativeness, transcendentalism, essence, aesthetics and estranges and peculiar language that is deviant from ordinary language of daily use" (p. 2). (see Eagleton, 1983, ch. 1; Wales, 1989, p. 279; Wellek, 1982, ch. 1; Williams, 1976/1983; Ghazala, 2012, ch. 1; and others).

Ovský (1970) argued that literary language is "an aesthetically purposeful distortion of standard language" such that literature foregrounds its language, that is, it calls attention to itself through its forms. Many theoreticians (Mukařovský among them) identify foregrounding with deviation as a feature of poetic language. Deviations from the norm do not only create "hindrances" while reading the text, but also signal the author's/ speaker's intensification of the thought and the foregrounding of the expressed idea. Deviant foregrounded language elements may represent various categories of deviation: a) grammatical (morphological/syntactical) b) phonological, c) mixing of register, and d) lexico-semantic. As often as not, several kinds of deviation or all of them occur simultaneously at the syntagmatic or paradigmatic level.

Style, for many critics as Nowotny (1962), is effectively language manipulated in ways that signal it as different from ordinary language. Shklovsky (1917) emphasizes that, what creates a literary text is literary language and what creates this language is a procedure he calls defamiliarization. By defamiliarization, he means that art changes our habits and foreignizes any familiar thing before us.

According to Safavi (2012) Jakobson believed that whatever happens in literature is grounded in language and for the same reason, performance study of language system units in the text must be considered in literature study and any emotional quality must be set aside. Based on this view, in their study, Jakobson and Jakubinsky were after examining types of phonotactics, phonetic repetitions, how to use pause and stress, different word usages and other functions of language units in literary texts, in order to determine how and according to which formal criteria an automata language is turned into literary language. Safavi (2012) notes we are going to skip the automata language and move toward literary language. For this purpose, we can use two processes of selection and combination. He adds Jakobson points out two metaphoric and metonymic processes that the former acts on paradigmatic axis and the latter on syntagmatic axis. Therefore, we can find why Jakobson has been merely looking for the type of "selection" and "combination" of the signs, because he thought this was the only way to find how

the “literary language” is created (Safavi, 2012).

## 2. WHAT IS LITERARINESS?

The notion of literariness was developed in the works of early Russian Formalists. In 1921, Jakobson made the following statement: “The subject of literary science is not literature but literariness, i.e. that which makes a given work a literary work” (Hawthorn, 1998, p. 184). The aim of specifying the notions imaginative literature and literariness has been on the agenda of literary investigations since the end of the twentieth century. Some scholars associate literariness with a special kind of literary discourse. Thus, T. Todorov (1981) discusses literariness in terms of poetics and establishes a link between interpretation and science in the field of literary studies. He sees literariness as the properties of literary discourse.

### 2.1 INDICATORS OF LITERARINESS

The phenomenon of literariness in a literary work is based on textual and contextual linguistic and stylistic features. They manifest themselves in foregrounding, metaphoricity and deviation from the literary norm. These textual features are observed in non-literary texts as well, but in literature, they are characterized by higher frequency and density of use. Literary texts contain features that stand out from ordinary language use or are “foregrounded” (a term from Mukařovský, 1932/1964). There are several indicators of literariness. These indicators, a) literary style of the text, b) defamiliarization, c) deviation from standard norms, d) literary device, and e) lexical, seem proper for identify the literariness of the text. This research was set to literariness by Jakobson’s theory of two axes and limited its scope to the choice of literary words. We could have worked in field of grammar too but we limited the research to the field of words specifically the vocabulary selection field.

## 3. LITERARY LANGUAGE AND LITERARINESS

Yau-hau Tse (2011) states literary language refers to a particular language or language variety used in literature. It also refers to a type of language—a style or mode of expression associated with literary genres such as poetry, narrative fiction or drama. The Formalists were the pioneers who examined the idea of deviance. They equated literary language with deviation, and claimed that it is used in a particular way and set off in contrast with the normal use of language. Ghazala (2014) asserts they did not elaborate what the norm of language use could precisely be. Different terms were used by them to define deviation such as estranging of language, foregrounding, defamiliarization, and automatization vs. de-automatization of ordinary Language (see Carter, 1979; Ghazala, 1987 & 2011; Wales, 1989/2001; Simpson, 2004). Among the obvious shortcomings of the formalists’ perspective of literary language was that they identified it with poetry to the neglect of other types like prose and drama (Ghazala, 2014).

Blake (1983) assumed an understanding of “literariness” when he talked about the difference between poetic imagery and flat language. Carter and Nash (1983) addressed this issue very thoroughly in a paper entitled Language and literariness. They argue that to polarize language as either literary or non-literary leads to the assigning of values to particular kinds of language, valorizing the literary against the non-literary (Carter & Nash, 1983). Hadigheh (2013) expresses an alternative to this, they suggest, is that language should be seen in terms of a gradation or “cline”, which makes it possible to find elements of literariness in languages which would usually be defined as ordinary/non-literary.

## 4. RONALD CARTER’S MODELS OF LITERARINESS

Carter (1999) identifies three models of literariness: two established models which he refers to as an inherency model and a sociocultural model; and a more recent cognitive model.

The inherency model sees literariness as embedding in certain formal properties of language. Literary language is regarded as distinct from more practical uses of language in that language itself is highlighted. Jakobson (1960) perceives this as the poetic function of language, where there is a “focus on the message for its own sake” (p. 356). Yau-hau Tse (2011) believes this property of language may also be termed as self-referential—where language is referring to partly to itself and not simply to entities in the external world that are the object of discussion.

A sociocultural model sees literariness as socially and culturally determined: for example, drawing attention to the fact that conceptions of literature vary historically and culturally. Eagleton (1996) argues that there is nothing distinctive about literary language; any text can be seen as literature if it is defined as such by institutions or if people read it as such. Yau-hau Tse (2011) adds anthropological studies of literary performances in various cultural contexts also tend to take a sociocultural view on literariness. Many studies focus on performance in its traditional literary or theatrical sense, to include public displays of artistic activity that are responded to aesthetically by an audience, such as story-telling, song, dance or drama (Yau-hau Tse, 2011).

The cognitive model relates literary language to mental processes. Tannen’s (1989) suggestion that linguistic repetition derives from a basic human drive to repeat is a kind of cognitive argument. Cook (1994) argues

that literary texts have an effect on the mind, helping us think in new ways and “refreshing and changing our mental representations of the world” (p. 4). According to Yau-hau Tse (2011) such benefits are not, however, confined to established literature. Cook (2000) has similar things to say about everyday creativity or play with language. Similarly, Gibbs (1994) claims that human language and human understanding are often metaphorical, and that literary metaphor carries on and extends everyday metaphorical notions.

Carter and Nash (1990) also define several standards of literariness, such as ‘Medium Dependence’, ‘re-registration’, ‘Interactions of Levels: Semantic Density’, ‘Polysemy’, ‘Displaced Interaction’, and ‘Discourse Patterning’. For example, ‘Interactions of Levels’, which they regard as the most significant standard, means that a variety of levels of text, such as semantic, phonetic and syntactic ones, interact to reinforce meanings in texts and to emphasize the theme of the work (pp. 38-42).

## 5. LITERARY LANGUAGE AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Mashhady et al. (2015, p. 58) state “some scholars believe that translation is an expression of what has been said in SL into TL by preserving semantic and stylistic equivalence” (see Bell, 1991; Hatim & Munday, 2004; Munday, 2001; Larson, 1998; Catford, 1965). Due to the fact that literary translation copes with different modes of expression, it is known as one of the critical areas in translation studies. Landers (2001) defines literary translation in terms of uniqueness and creativity, describing it as “the most demanding type of translation”.

Considering the fact that the difference of language systems imposes a certain effect on features of literary texts in different areas, the translator requires knowledge of the nuances and skill to interpret correctly all the shades of meaning of these texts. Moreover, when translators face a difficulty in translation, they try to find adequate strategies to deal with it. The researcher believed that literature has a lot to say, because as Carter and McRae (1996) point out, literature gives us the opportunity to deal with complexities and subtleties which are not always present in other sort of texts. Through the present study, the researcher wish to find out whether or not Nietzsche’s text would retain its artistic value and poetic language when translated into Persian. To this end, the researcher decided to examine Nietzsche’s “*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*”, and compared it with its Persian equivalents to see whether its literariness are preserved in the translations. The texts are analyzed and compared based on lexicon. The main purpose of this research was; therefore, to identify, compare and analyze the lexicon in the translations based on Jakobson’s theory of axes and see which translation is approaching Nietzsche’s highly literary style.

## 6. FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE AND HIS *THUS SPOKE ZARATHUSTRA*

Daniel Came (2014) asserts that more recently, Brian Leiter, in his landmark *Nietzsche on Morality*, has argued that Nietzsche deserves recognition as a leading philosophical naturalist and to be “a live participant in contemporary debates” in ethics (Leiter & Sinhababu, 2007, p. 2). Ludovici (1909) states the truth is that although “*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*” is considered as Nietzsche’s literary masterpiece, it is by no means his first work the study of which a beginner must undertake. He asserts the author (Nietzsche) himself speaks of this work as being the most profound work ever presented to German public and he speaks about necessities of recognizing this work in any other part of his other writings. Doostdar (cited in Asadi, 2014) claims that Nietzsche’s “*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*” is one of the masterpieces in German literature, in terms of sharpness and mobility of meaning and agility of expression and style flexibility.

## 7. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

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

1. To what extent have the Persian translators been able to approach and preserve the literary aspects of Nietzsche’s book “*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*” in their Persian translations according to Roman Jakobson’s syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis?
2. Why Ashouri’s translation is much more appealing than Gholami’s?

## 8. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Jakobson’s (1956) theory of axes was chosen for this study. However, the part which is related to vocabulary was selected in the research. Jakobson’s syntagmatic axis moves from left to right \_\_across the sentence \_\_so that the linguistic elements are related contiguously. They are all present and they are ordered according to grammatical construction, in Saussurian terms, as *parole*. The paradigmatic axis dips downwards into the absent pool of substitutions, similarities and differences available by virtue of *la langue*, the linguistic system. An utterance thus encodes meaning through selection from the paradigmatic axis and combination on the Syntagmatic one. The two axes thus together allow addressees to understand an utterance by decoding the sentence on the combination axis with unconscious reference to the selection one. Every item of language has a paradigmatic relationship with every other item which can be substituted for it (such as *cat* with *dog*), and a syntagmatic relationship with items which occur within the same construction (for example, in *The cat sat on the mat*, *cat* with *the* and *sat on the mat*).

## 9. DATA ANALYSIS

This research was a descriptive and comparative corpus-based study attempting to analyze source text and target text of the selected corpus within the framework. Based on the model, the sentences showing literary elements are determined in the original text and then they are compared with the two translations to show if the Persian translators have been able to approach and preserve the literary aspects of Nietzsche's "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*".

### 9.1 CHOICE OF LITERARY WORDS

According to Sanchez (2009), "if any kind of translation implies a challenge, in the case of literary translation the challenge is ever greater because the translator has to contend not only with semantic problems but also with the stylistic connotations inseparable from the content which will demand a constant and painful process of decision making". When one chooses a word they do more than name an object, person or situation, they also convey feelings about what are being described. Feeling is an important part of meaning. Every translation is an interpretative act, as well as a creative one. Translators read the original piece and try to work out what it's doing, what's important that's going on. They are constantly making choices about which elements of a text to preserve and foreground, and which to sacrifice.

The choice of word, just as its name implies, is the choice and use of word, which is the first to be affected in translation. Translators must think about the meaning carefully, and find the corresponding expression in target language. The connotation of words always means its emotion, stylistic meaning and figurative meaning, etc. Different cultural backgrounds cause different social attitudes; people in different cultures may have different recognition in one thing. If translators do not take these aspects into account, apply the thoughts and pattern of target language, they are probably to cause misunderstanding. Thus, some words with the same literal meaning may have different association and adjustment in different languages.

In one word, if translator wants to be smooth and fluent in translation, the choice of word is very important. Translators must choose the correct word according to the theme of the text, its style and target readers, to make translation appropriate and concise. Sure, in translation, everything changes. Every word or phrase; every syllable, for that matter, will be different from the original text. This means there will be additions, of course, but it will also draw attention to certain things in the original.

The translators are in a position to explore how they function as participants in clauses as parts of those worlds. The problem arises when most of literary works translated to Persian cannot evoke the same reaction in the target language as it did in its original form in the source language. Safavi (2012) states some units are "selected" in each language level and "combined" with each other to produce a unit from a higher level. These "selections" and "combinations" obey rules called language construction rules. Collections of human creations, and in general, all human creativities are limited to performance of these two "selection" and "combination" processes (Safavi, 2012). We can claim that author of a literary text selects the language signs and puts them in a combination with each other in a way that the resulting chain does not belong to the world of realities around us.

Paradigmatic relation enables the writer to select among the words collection, those words which fit the structure, and the selected words will be put together in a vertical linear direction to create a new written composition. Each word in a structure transfers meanings it does not transmit in another structure. A word is selected based on structure's atmosphere and its semantic content and some words are replaced with the others in order to convey the meaning intended by the author. Finding the original meanings of the words and achieving a coherent structure and proper understanding of semantic relations are the major reasons for importance and impact of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes are like the warps and wefts which have created structure and context of the word in a specific semantic field and they should be compatible in order to be understood.

In the following examples, vocabulary selection by the two translators has been studied. Those parts of texts which appear in underline are the ones researcher wanted to pay particular attention to and focus on. For better understanding of the two translators' styles, paying attention to type of the grammar and arrangement of the words is necessary. In these examples, not only Ashouri has had a better choice of word, but he has managed to approach Nietzsche's poetic language in arrangement of the words and syntax of the sentences.

1. "To my goal I will go on my own way; over those who hesitate and lag behind I shall leap. Thus let my going be their going under." (p. 24)

ترجمه آشوری: غایت خویش را پی خواهیم گرفت و راه خویش در پیش. از فراز دیرنگیان و تن آسایان برخواهم جهید. بدا که فرافتن آنان باشد! (ص 34)

ترجمه غلامی: به هدف خود خواهیم رسید، راه خویش را دنبال خواهیم کرد؛ از تاخیرکنندگان و از کندروان جلو خواهیم افتاد. بگذارید که پیشرفت من موجب نزول آن ها باشد! (ص 48)

2. Once the spirit was God, then he became man, and now he even becomes rabble. Whoever writes in blood and aphorisms does not want to be read but to be learned by heart. (p. 40)

ترجمه آشوری: روزگاری «جان» خدابود و سپس انسان شد و اکنون به غوغا بدل می‌شود. آن که با خون و گزیپن گویه می نویسد، نخواهد که نوشته‌های‌اش را بخوانند، بل می خواهد از برداشته باشند. (ص 52)

ترجمه غلامی: زمانی روح، خدا به شمار می‌آمد، سپس انسان محسوب شد و اکنون حتی به صورت تودیهی از مردم درآمده است. کسی که با خون مطالبی را نوشته و در آن‌ها از ضرب المثل‌هایی بهره برده است نمی‌خواهد که مطالبش خوانده شود بلکه می‌خواهد آن‌ها را مردم از یر کنند. (صص 78-79)

3. Everything about it is false; it bites with stolen teeth, and bites easily. Even its entrails are false. (p. 49)

ترجمه آشوری: همه چیز-اش دروغین است. این جانورگزنده با دندان‌هایی که دزدیده است می‌گزد. اندرون‌اش نیز دروغین است. (ص 61)  
ترجمه غلامی: همه چیز دولت دروغ محض است؛ دولت با دندان‌هایی که از راه دزدی به دست آورده دزدی می‌کند و موجودی گاز گیرنده است. حتی روده‌های شکم دولت نیز دروغین هستند. (حتی تمام وجود دولت دروغین است) (ص 94)

4. Let woman be a plaything, pure and fine, like a gem, irradiated by the virtues of a world that has not yet arrived. (p. 66)

ترجمه آشوری: زن بازیچه‌ای باد پاک و ظریف، همچون گوهری، رخشان از فضیلت‌های جهانی که هنوز در کار نیست. (ص 78)

ترجمه غلامی: بگذارید که زن بازیچه‌ی ظریف و نفیس همچون سنگ‌های قیمتی باشد و درخشش فضیلت‌های دنیایی و در حال تکوین را داشته باشد. (ص 124)

5. And most recently I heard him say this: "God is dead; God died of his pity for man." (p. 90)

ترجمه آشوری: و چندی پیش شنیدم که گفت: «خدا مرده است. رحم خدا به انسان او را کُشت». (ص 103)  
ترجمه غلامی: به تازگی چنین سخنانی را از اهریمن شنیده‌ام: "خدا مرده است. به علت ترحمی که نسبت به بشر دارد مرده است." (ص 161)

6. You are no eagles: hence you have never experienced the happiness that is in the terror of the spirit. And he who is not a bird should not build his nest over abysses. (p. 105)

ترجمه آشوری: عقاب نیستید، از این رو شادکامی هراس‌های جان را نیازموده‌اید. آن که پرنده نیست همان بِه که بر فراز مغاک‌ها آشیان نسازد. (ص 118)

ترجمه غلامی: عقاب نیستید، ازین روی هرگز سعادت هراس فکری را تجربه نکرده‌اید. کسی که پرنده نیست، نباید بر بالای پرتگاه‌ها مسکن گزیبند. (ص 186)

7. Well then, here are my foothills and there the sea: that rolls toward me, shaggy, flattering, the faithful old hundred-headed canine monster that I love. (p. 188)

ترجمه آشوری: باری! این جاست سنگیوز من و آن جاست دریا، که به سوی من می‌غلند؛ این ژولیده موی جاپلوس، این پیر وفادار، این سگسار-هیولای صدسر، که دوست می‌دارم‌اش. (ص 204)

ترجمه غلامی: بسیار خوب، این جا دماغه من و آن جا دریاست. دریا چون هیولایی سگ مانند و دارای صد سر است که پیر و وفادار و مورد علاقه من است و با موهای زبر و در هم و بر هم و تملق‌گویان افتان و خیزان به سوی من می‌غلند. (ص 316)

8. From high mountains cast down your glittering mocking laughter! (p. 240)

ترجمه آشوری: قَهقاه رخشان افسوسگر خوبش را از کوه بلند فروافکن! (ص 258)  
ترجمه غلامی: از بالای کوه‌های بلند، خنده پر از انتقاد و سرزنش خود را که می‌درخشد به سمت پایین پرتاب کن. (ص 392)

9. These should be slaughtered quickly and prepared tastily with sage: I love it that way. (p. 285)

ترجمه آشوری: «این‌ها را باید زود سر بُرید و با سلوی چاشنی زد و پخت: من این‌گونه دوست می‌دارم. (ص 304)  
ترجمه غلامی: این بره‌ها فوراً می‌کشیم و با افزودن چاشنی مریم‌گلی می‌پزیم. آری، این غذایی است که به آن علاقه دارم. (ص 458)

10. Such nourishment, to be sure, may not be suitable for children or for nostalgic old and young little females. Their entrails are persuaded in a different way; I am not their physician and teacher. (p. 311)

ترجمه آشوری: «بی‌گمان، چنین خوراکی نه در خوردن کودکان است نه زنان. پیر و جوان هوسناک. زیرا اندرون‌های ایشان را به راهی دیگر کشانده‌اند. من طیبی و آموزگار آنان نیستم. (ص 334)

ترجمه غلامی: چنین غذایی مطمئناً برای کودکان و هم چنین برای دختران آرزومند، خواه پیر باشند یا جوان مناسب نیست. روده ها و شکم آنان را به نحوه دیگری باید ترغیب و قانع کنید. من یزشک و آموزگار آنان نیستم. (ص 496)

## 10. DISCUSSION

The translator must use his art and skills to reconcile the target reader to the writer; a very difficult job that Ashouri has managed to do. In addition to complexity of philosophical texts, Nietzsche's detailed knowledge of ancient languages has made his prose cryptic. Religiosity and ultra-thoughts in philosophy do not leave him. The ability to substitute one word with others always informs the meaning of the original word. The two modes of arrangement (combination, selection) align with Jakobson's twin axes of language. In combination, linguistic units are related by contiguities, and reside on the syntagmatic axis. In selection, linguistic units are related by similarities, and reside on the associative or paradigmatic axis.

Ashouri, in preface of his "Thus Spoke Zarathustra's" third edition, states that he has edited the translation once again in summer 1976 and has adapted it with the original German text and also, its English translation by Walter Kaufmann, which Ashouri believes it to be the best available English translation of the text, and he has created the necessary reforms both in terms of consistence with the text and fluency and adornment of the Persian prose. There are lots of significant and remarkable points in study of the book "Thus Spoke Zarathustra" translated by Ashouri among which we can mention the margins of translation. In "Thus Spoke Zarathustra", Ashouri has created coinages such as /ایرانسان/, /دژمناک/, /پسین زاد/, etc., and has taken lots of words from ancient writing of Persian literature like /ازکنده/ and /سرفیدن/. Ashouri has brought several coinages in this book. Some of the words

exist in Persian writing but considering today's Persian language, they are used in new meanings; although, in some of these words we cannot certainly say whether they have been built before him or not. Ashouri has both tried to take the text closer to the source time and to promote these words as a translator in order to use Persian words instead of foreign equivalents. The translator must use his art and skills to reconcile the target reader to the writer; a very difficult job that Ashouri has managed to do.

## 11. CONCLUSION

What we explored here is the relationship between literariness and translation. In other words, we look into the problem whether literariness is by itself a criterion of a quality translation. The issue is not selecting the right words. Aesthetics is the whole issue. The main purpose of this research was to find out the literary aspects which were used in the mentioned book, "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*" and then to investigate literary differences in the two translations of the same book if the translators have used the same elements to represent aesthetics in the translated works.

Some scholars (Bassnett-McGuire, Catford, Brislin) suggest that a good piece of translation should be a strict reflection of the style of the original text while some others (Gui, Newmark, Wilss) consider the original text untranslatable unless it is reproduced. Opposing views by different critics suggest that translation is still a challenging issue. It has been acknowledged that every act of reading is a kind of interpretation and decoding of the text. Traditionally, transferring an author's meaning, translators should recognize the text style. When translators analyze the text style, they need examining linguistic and paralinguistic choices such as sentence structure, diction, and tone which are connected with meaning. Indeed, familiarity with these aspects of style makes it feasible for translators to have a better understanding of the text.

As we discussed, translation has been typically seen as an act of creation and reproduction rather than replacement of the SL with some equivalents in the TL. "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*" is a difficult book to translate. With a traditional philosophical text the translator's conscience is driven by accuracy, and when in doubt the translator will be as literal as possible. While it is an undeniably philosophical work, it is also a work of literature. Literature does not have only a sense, it also has a sound. That Nietzsche, like Kierkegaard, the German Romantics, and many of the twentieth-century Existentialists, thought philosophy and literature were ultimately inseparable arts only further complicates the translator's task.

Ashouri and Gholami's translations have many things in common. Gholami did not follow Nietzsche's style and poetic language. Ashouri's style is more appealing, and his style has the added virtue of following the way Nietzsche does it. He made "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*" more readable. The Ashouri's translation strikes the researcher as somewhat more self-consciously literary in its aspirations, and in that way it is perhaps closer to Nietzsche's tone. Moreover, Ashouri's translation shows many of Nietzsche's stylistic strengths. In this research vocabulary selection by the two translators was studied. For better understanding of the two translators' styles, paying attention to type of the grammar and arrangement of the words is necessary. This research revealed that Ashouri not only has had a better choice of literary words, but he has managed to approach Nietzsche's poetic language in arrangement of the words and syntax of the sentences. So, Ashouri's translation with his wide range of literary words is more literary than Gholami's work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and translating: Theory and practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- [2] Blake, N. F. (1983). Philip Larkin's language and style with reference to "Lines on a Young Lady's Photograph Album". *The Journal of English Language and Literature*, 29(1), 341-50.
- [3] Came, D. (2014). *Nietzsche on art and life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Carter, R. (1999). Common language: Corpus, creativity and cognition. *Language and Literature*, 8 (3), 195-216.
- [5] Carter, R. , McRae, J. (1996). *Language, literature & the learner. Creative classroom practice*. London: Longman.
- [6] Carter, A. & Nash, W. (1983). Language and literariness. *Prose Studies*, 62. 123-41.
- [7] \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). *Seeing through language: A guide to styles of English writing*. Basil Blackwell.
- [8] Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and literature: The interplay of form and mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] \_\_\_\_\_. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Eagleton, T. (1983/1996). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [11] Ghazala, H. S. (2011). *Cognitive stylistics and the translator*. London: Sayyab Books.
- [12] \_\_\_\_\_. (2014). Literary translation: A literary stylistics-based perspective. *Linguistics, Culture & Education*. 2014 (I D 5) 1-29.
- [13] Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [14] Hadigheh, S. S. (2013). How to apply critical linguistics in English/Persian literary work's criticism. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5 (4), 90-108.
- [15] Jakobson, R. , Halle, M. (1956). *Fundamentals of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- [16] \_\_\_\_\_. (1960). *Closing statement: linguistics and poetics*. London: Methuen.
- [17] Landers, C. (2001). *Literary translation: A practical guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [18] Leiter, B. & Sinhababu, N. (2007). *Nietzsche and morality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [19] Ludovici, A. M. (1909). *Who is to be master of the world? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis.
- [20] Mashhady, H., Pourgalavi, M. , Fatollahi, M. (2015). newmark's procedures in Persian translation of Golding's Lord of the Flies. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 3 (1), 57-69. Retrieved from <http://www.eltsjournal.org>
- [21] Nietzsche, F. (1978). *Thus spoke Zarathustra: A book for all and none* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Penguin (Non-Classics). (Original work published 1883-1891).
- [22] Nowotny, W. (1962). *The language poets use*. London: Athlone Press.
- [23] Sanchez, M. T. (2009). *The Problems of Literary Translation: a Study of the theory and Practice of Translation from English to Spanish*. Peter Lang. Retrived from [www.books.google.com](http://www.books.google.com). Id=WePQuqUyOSAC
- [24] Shklovski, V. (1917/1998). *Art as Technique. Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [25] Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [26] Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Todorov, T. (1981). *Introduction to poetics*. Trans. R. H. Brighton.
- [28] Tse, Y. A. (2011). Which one is more literary- A speech or a visitor's guide?. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (5), 237-241.
- [29] Wales, K. (1989/2001). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Longman.
- آشوری، داریوش. (1394). "چنین گفت زرتشت". تهران: انتشارات آگاه.
- اسدی، منوچهر. (1393). "چنین گفت زرتشت". اصفهان: انتشارات پرسش.
- صفوی، کورش. (1391). "آشنایی با زبان شناسی در مطالعات ادب فارسی". تهران: انتشارات علمی.
- غلامی، رحیم. (1393). "چنین گفت زرتشت". تهران: انتشارات زرین.