Translation as Rewriting: Cultural Theoretical Appraisal of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* in the Ewe language of West Africa

**Abstract:** The cultural turn in translation theory brought attention to the idea that translation is not a purely linguistic phenomenon but one that is also constrained by culture. The cultural turn considers translation as a rewriting of an original text. In this paper, I attempt to find reflections of the cultural turn in a translation into an African language. As such, the paper reads William Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* in the Ewe language of West Africa, *Shakespeare je Makbet*, as rewriting. Walter Blege is the translator and the Bureau of Ghana Languages is the publisher of the target text meant for Ewe language audience in Ghana. The target text is for learning and acquiring the Ewe language especially in the area of developing reading comprehension skills. Following Andre Lefevere and Jeremy Munday, this paper suggests that *Shakespeare je Makbet* is a rewritten text as it follows some cultural constraints in its translation. The study provides insight into the motivations for some of the translator/rewriter’s choices. Given the less attention paid to the Ewe language and many other African languages, the paper proposes translation as a socio-psychological tool for revitalizing interest in the learning and acquisition of African and other lesser-known languages.
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Initial translation theories, such as the theories in the Equivalence paradigm, have focused on purely linguistics aspects. Anthony Pym defines a paradigm as “a set of principles that underlie several theories (in the general sense outlined by [philosopher of science Thomas] Kuhn)” (3). Stemming from Structuralism, theories in the Equivalence paradigm suggest possibilities where Source Language and Target Language expressions can have the same value especially in the areas of form, function or reference. They argue that there is natural equivalence between languages and what a translator does is to discover this equivalence. Oettinger, for instance posits that “Interlingual translation [is] the replacement of elements of one language, the domain of translation, by equivalent elements of another language” (Oettinger 110). For others like
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Catford, all the translation materials are to replace a translation unit. “Translation may be defined as follows: the replacement of textual material in one language (Source Language, SL) by equivalent material in another language (Target Language, TL). (Catford 20). Eugene Albert Nida and Charles Russell Taber argue that translation is a reproduction rather than replacement. “Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message” (Nida and Taber 12). Embedded in all these explanations is the notion that there exists a kind of equivalence among expressions in all natural languages. Some translation practitioners and linguists have agreed, however, that lexical meanings are not necessarily equivalent across different languages. Theo Hermans (9) for instance rejects the notion of “translation as reproducing the original, the whole original and nothing but original”. While the early theories in the equivalence paradigm attempted to find the equivalents of source texts (STs) in target texts (TTs), theories in the purpose paradigm suggest that the purpose of a translation is the most crucial factor in how to engage in a particular translation (Munday 81).

However, linguistic aspects such as meaning in translation have posed problems: what type of meaning is intended? Later, the possible types of meaning are considered essential and are put under the cultural aspects of translation. This new perspective suggests that context, history, and convention must guide translation activities (Bassnett & Lefevere in Munday 125-135). This shift is referred to as the ‘cultural turn’ in translation: the shift from “translation as text to translation as culture and politics” (Munday 192). Drawing from Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak and Bruno Latour, this perspective argues that translation usually is a resistance against assimilation by source cultures. As such, translators create new texts, which are hybrids. For cultural translation theorists, equivalence is untenable as there are no clearly separate linguistic and cultural spaces in the contemporary world, so that we find equivalence in culture A for expressions in culture B. Although this paradigm emerged outside of translation studies, translation scholars like Anthony Pym propose the possibility of engaging translation from this perspective. As such, he suggested that translation should consider the translator’s point of view so that translation will focus on people instead of focusing on texts. This perspective no longer thought of translation as a linguistic activity carried out in isolation, but as the product of a wider cultural context. In other words, this approach differs from the traditional linguistic approach by which the word, phrase, sentence, and text are the main translational units. With this new perspective, culture is the main translational unit. This approach treats translation as a micrographic cultural shift and focuses on the shift from the source text to the translated text, from the author to the translator and from the source culture to the receptor culture. Translation then becomes a strategy that connects two cultures that, perhaps,
have an unequal power relationship and thus mirroring and sometimes subverting perceptions about the two cultures (Gentzler 59).

The work of early Christian missionaries in translating the Bible into indigenous languages is mainly what defined the formal beginning of translation in Ghana. Motivated by the success of this project, linguists later worked to produce orthographies, dictionaries, and primers for indigenous languages. Noticeable among these early missionary translators were Johann Christaler Gottlieb, who with the help of two local colleagues (names unknown) translated the Bible into Twi. Johannes Zimmermann translated the Bible into Gâ in addition to writing a grammar book for the language; and Carl C. Rheindorf and Christian Obobi, who read, wrote, and preached in both Gâ, the local language, and the missionaries’ languages (Ameko). According to Ameko, there were Muslim scholars at the court of the Asantehene (ruler of Asante) who translated, into Arabic, the historical occurrences and laws of the Asante nation. These translations of Akan records (mainly oral) into Arabic were destroyed in the destruction of Kumasi, the capital city of the Asante nation, by the British army on a number of occasions during the Anglo-Asante wars. These were probably the first formal translators in the territory of present day Ghana (Ameko).

After the attainment of independence, Ghana established an institution to develop her languages: the Bureau of Ghana Languages (BGL). This institution also became responsible for translating classical works into Ghanaian languages for study in schools. In an interview, a prominent literary scholar and poet, Professor Kofi Anyidoho, once attested to the efficacy of this method, like many others of his generation, when he said that he read such works as Tolstoy’s stories and the Arabian tales in Ewe (Akomolafe). These translations are now almost extinct.

Andre Lefevere, the main proponent of ‘translation as rewriting’, suggests that there are factors that control the “acceptance, reception and rejection of a literary text. These factors are power, ideology, institution and manipulation” (Munday 193). The control of literature by these constraints, among others, is what Lefevere refers to as rewriting (Munday 193). Rewriting is the production of a text based on another text with the intention of adapting that other text to a certain ideology or to a certain poetics and, usually, to both (Hermans 137). Lefevere sees translation as the most obvious form and potentially the most influential form of rewriting, as “it is able to project the image of an author and/or a (series of) work in another culture, (Lefèvre Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation 9). Lefevere cites as an example Fitzgerald’s translation of Omar Khayyam’s Rubaiyat, where he took liberties with the original, in order to make it follow the western conventions of his time. According to Lefevere, this fundamental process of rewriting is evident in translation.
In Lefevere’s view, professionals within the system and the patrons outside it direct the function of translation in a literary system. While the professionals (e.g. academics, critics, reviewers, translators) partially control the poetics, the patrons (e.g. institutions, powerful individuals) partially control the ideology (Munday 127-136). *Rewriting* manifested in the early years of postcolonial Ghana. In keeping with his Pan-African ideology, the founding president of Ghana started a full-scale translation initiative. Through the Bureau of Ghana Languages, the initiative was organised and conducted by the state itself and translated western literature into nine Ghanaian languages: Akan, Dangme, Dagbani, Dagaare, Ewe, Gâ, Gonja, Kasem, and Nzema. *Rewriting*, translation is done through adherence to or defilement of constraints. In what follows, we discuss some of these constraints.

**Constraints on Rewriting**

Four major constraints influence rewriting namely, ideology, patronage, poetics and universe of discourse (Lefevere *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation* 9-13). However, Lefevere posits that constraints are conditioning factors and not absolutes. Translators may choose to go with or against them, that is, to stay within the perimeters marked by the constraints, or to challenge those constraints by trying to move beyond them. Ideology is “a set of discourses which wrestle over interests which are in some way relevant to the maintenance or interrogation of power structures central to a whole form of social and historical life” (Eagleton 116 in Lefevere 59). Lefevere maintains that the most important consideration in the translation process is ideology and that ideology and poetics determine the solutions to problems encountered during the translation process.

The tendency of most societies to maintain an ideology makes them resist any attempt that contradicts that society’s ideology. For instance, a society that frowns on the explicit exposure of the public to sex and taboo terms may compel a translator of D.H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterleys Lover* to rewrite the novel by substituting taboo words with euphemisms. Lefevere points out that, patrons, that is, the people or institutions that authorize or publish translations, also impose ideologies on the individual translator. When this happens, the foremost reason for which an author writes a book may be lost in the translation of the work and patrons’ ideologies take precedence.

Lefevere (*Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation*, 15) refers to patronage as people or institutions “that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature”. Translators have limited independence with respect to what and how they translate. Patrons include institutions (e.g. educational establishments, national academies), groups (e.g. political elite,
publishers) and powerful individuals (e.g. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah in early postcolonial Ghana). Patronage ensures that the literary system conforms to societal ideology. For instance, institutionalised religions in history detested the translations of scriptural texts such as the Bible into vernacular. It is also encouraged to read the Quran in its original Arabic language. In these cases, translations are perceived to potentially become blasphemous and subverting God’s word.

There are three main components of patronage: the ideological component, the economic component and the status component. The ideological component acts as a constraint on subject matter and presentation styles. The economic component is concerned with the remuneration of writers and translators/rewriters. The status component concerns prestige and recognition. Patronage is classified as differentiated or undifferentiated. It is undifferentiated when a single person or institution dispenses all three components, as under totalitarian regimes where focus is directed at maintaining a status quo. Patronage is differentiated when economic success is relatively independent of ideological factors, and does not necessarily bring status with it.

Poetics is generally, what literature should be (Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation* 15-20). Poetics consists of two components: 1. inventory and 2. the function of literature in the social system. The functional aspect of poetics regulate subject matter and ensures that they are relevant to the society. The functional component of poetics is closely connected to the dominant ideology. The institutions which enforce dominant ideologies, for instance, determine the kind of works that can be considered classical and eventually form the canon at a point in time. These works can be recommended for study at universities, among others. They may keep their status so long as they are “reinterpreted or rewritten” in line with the prevailing ideology (Munday 196). While some works attain this status shortly after publication, others take a long time to reach this position. Poetics go beyond languages and societies and determines ideology. An example is the adoption of British English poetics by Anglophone African countries, a legacy of colonialism. The inventory component of poetics is not immediately subjected to direct influence from the institutions and may tend to be more conservative. The conservative influence is evident in how genres lead a shadowy existence as “theoretical possibilities” even when they are not actively used (Lefevere 34-35). A poetics change over time so that the prevailing poetics is different from that which existed at the beginning of a literary system.

Universe of Discourse is described as objects, customs and beliefs that are thought unacceptable in a certain culture. Every society has unique cultures, customs and beliefs. For instance, a thing that is considered a jest differs in various languages, so that, a word-for-word translation is perhaps impossible. In such a case, translation involves a combination of choices. During rewriting,
translators’ attitudes toward the Universe of Discourse is heavily influenced by the status of the source culture of the text, the status of the target culture, including the kinds of acceptable texts, acceptable diction, the intended audience and the “cultural scripts”, which audiences are familiar with or readily accept (Lefevere 87). The status of the source text can also be an important consideration. A text that is highly respected in its own culture may not have the same status in another culture. In addition, a culture with a low status will prefer translations from a culture or cultures it considers superior to itself.

The Target Text

*Shakespeare je Makbet*, that is, Walter Blege’s translation of William Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* from English into Ewe, is the target text (TT) in this study. It is the only known translation of Shakespeare’s work from English into Ewe. *Macbeth* then is the source text (ST). The translation is targeted at the Ewe people in Ghana, mainly students, since the translation is done mainly for the purpose of teaching and learning the Ewe language especially in the area of developing reading comprehension skills.

Ewe is a member of the Gbe sub-group of the Kwa branch of the Niger-Congo language family. The language is spoken in the Volta Region in the south-eastern part of Ghana and other parts of the country. It has about 2,250,000 native speakers, and a national population of 3,112,000 speakers in Ghana (Ethnologue). It also has speakers in other parts of Africa including Togo, Benin and marginally in the Badagry area of south-western Nigeria. There are several dialects of Ewe in Ghana; so the Bremen Mission, circa 19th century, developed a standard. This standard is the written variety and although it is based on the southern Ghana dialects of the language, it is not identical with any of the dialects (Agbozo 18). This standard variety is used in the target text. The Ewe culture then is the receptor culture of this translation.

Ideology in the TT

There are evidences of institutional and individual ideologies in the TT. The government through the BGL imposes the institutional ideology. The individual ideology is that of the translator/rewriter. The BGL is, among other things, to research into and promote Ghanaian cultures (http://www.ghanaculture.gov.gh/index1.php?linkid=331&page=2&sectionid=602). The translator/rewriter is then under a constraint to produce a translation with the parameters that the BGL set. In other words, the translator/rewriter is compelled to produce a translation that is enriched with Ewe cultural nuances and avoid introducing into the TT foreign
ethno-cultural ideas, or if any at all, reduce their prominence by, perhaps, using metonyms. Example (1) is an instance:

(1) (Act 2, Scene 1):
ST: Thus to mine eyes. Now o’er the one half-world
   Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse
   The curtained sleep, Witchcraft celebrates
   Pale Hecate’s offerings, and withered murder,

TT: Adze-to-wo le woje za kɔnu-wo wɔ-m kple Hekate-hɛ la,
   Witchcraft-owner-PL BE their night ritual-PL do-PROG with Hecate-knife the,
   Witches are doing their night rituals with the Hecate’s knife

In this instance, “Pale Hecate’s offerings” translates as “Hekate-hɛ la” which back-translates as “the Hecate’s knife”. According to Boedeker, Hecate is a goddess in Greek religion and mythology. She is the goddess associated with the dead, the moon, crossroads, torches, dogs, and sacrifices, among other concepts; and mostly portrayed holding two torches, a key, or knife. Hecate is not a known god in Ewe cosmogony or mythology. It does not have an equivalent concept or expression in the Ewe culture that can very well carry the meaning and notion of Hecates like the Greek equivalent. A solution to this lack of equivalence will be the use of several phrases or sentences to express the functions of Hecates. Furthermore, introducing Hecate into the Ewe culture may be considered as cultural adulteration. The translator then uses one feature of Hecate: knife, to represent the concept to which audience could associate since they know what a knife is.

The individual ideology of the translator/rewriter also reflects in the TT. Walter Blege, the translator/rewriter of the target text, is a Christian and a member of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, the heir to the Bremen Mission in Ghana. Kofi Agawu reported that Blege is also a well-regarded musicologist, and composed a full-length opera titled Kristo (Christ), among others. The opera, Kristo, is a narrative of the introduction of Christianity into Ewe territory and the sagas that came with it. He also was the founding council president of the church’s university college: the Evangelical Presbyterian University College in Ho, Ghana. The translator/rewriter’s Christian orientation/ideology perhaps influence the choices he makes, especially concerning religious concepts. For instance, he translates ‘hell’ as ‘tsiɛje’ rather than ‘dzomavɔme’:

(2) (Act 2, Scene 1)
ST: I go, and it is done. The bell invites me.
   Hear it not, Duncan, for it is a knell
   That summons thee to heaven or to hell.
TT: He-le y-w-o-m be na-va dziŋ loo, alo tsiŋje.
And-BE call-3SG-PROG to ASP-come heaven NULL, or afterlife
And calls you to heaven or to the afterlife

In the Ewe cosmology, ‘tsiŋje’ is a metaphysical abode: the unknown village, across the river (an equivalent of Acheron in Greek mythology). This is where the dead, mostly those who lived good lives, live as ancestors and to be re-born as ‘amedzdɔdzɔwo’, ‘the reincarnated’. A bad person’s soul wanders in the form of a ghost (restless, haunting, and destroying) until certain rites are performed to ‘cleanse’ (like purgatory in Catholic theology) him/her before s/he can enter ‘tsiŋje’.1 This does not depict a place of suffering like ‘hell’; rather it is a place of rest from earthly struggles. This ‘afterlife’ is an equivalent of the Christian ‘heaven’. The Ewe word for ‘hell’ is ‘dzɔmavɔme (dzo:‘fire’-ma:’PRIVATE’-vɔ:‘finish’-me:’in’) which means a place of ‘eternal fire’. The lexical choice here is, perhaps influenced by a certain ideology. Christian ideology is likely to invoke the assumption that any person that belongs to a different religion is ‘unsaved’ and goes to ‘hell’ after death and that it is only the Christian who goes to heaven or a place of comfortable rest after death. In other words, the ‘afterlife’ of a non-Christian is, perhaps, nothing close to the Christian heaven and since heaven and hell are the only binary variables of the afterlife, hell is the only option for the non-Christian.

**Patronage & Universe of Discourse of the TT**

The translator/rewriter of the TT is an employee of the BGL. Moreover, as the BGL is a well-known institution and supported by the government, translating for it will perhaps contribute to the ethos of the translator/rewriter among educated Ewe people, and, perhaps, elevate his socio-economic status. The translator will be constrained in service of the power initiated by BGL and by extension, the government. He also stands the risk of losing all privileges if he diverts from the patron’s influences. The type of patronage evident here is the undifferentiated where the government, through the BGL, takes control of ideology, economy, and status. This translator, for instance, was later among the founders of the Ghana Education Trust Fund. Although there is no evidence that, this translation was the reason for his appointment by the government into the founding committee; the study assumes that it, perhaps, has some influence in addition to his credentials as a renowned scholar in education and music.
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Patronage of the TT also includes its use in the classrooms. For instance, two of the general goals of the teaching syllabus for Ghanaian Languages and Culture in Junior High Schools (elementary schools) are 1. to “appreciate the historical and cultural heritage of [students’] linguistic community”, and 2. to “acquire the socio-cultural values in the literature of their language” (Ghana Education Service ii). In addition, a rationale for teaching this subject is to motivate “children to love and be proud of their own culture which is rich in cultural and moral values especially contained in proverbs, folktales, euphemisms, etc.” (ibid.). During assessment, “Knowledge and Understanding” take up “40%” of the total grade for this subject. Out of this “30%” is allocated to “reading” and “10%” to “listening” (Ghana Education Service ix). Reading texts such as the TT are therefore essential to students’ education.

Regarding universe of discourse, a source text is chosen for a certain reason and the guidelines for the translation are drawn to lead to the achievement of the purpose for the translation. The translator/rewriter works towards meeting the set criteria. Ghana is a former British colony and member of the Commonwealth of Nations. British culture perhaps holds a high status among Ghanaians due to the colonial experience, and this could make some Ghanaians see their own cultures in comparison to British culture. This reflects in naming, for instance. Until recently, some Ghanaians prefer English names to indigenous names, and some translate their indigenous names into English as they grow and become independent of parental control. The same reflects in the choice of the ST. A text in another culture other than British could have been chosen. Germans, for instance, had influences on Ewe language and culture. The current Ewe orthography and the first ever description of the Ewe language was done by German missionary linguists. The choice of a British classic over a German one, for example, is evident of the perceived high status of British culture and Ghana’s colonial history as a former British colony likely influenced the choice.

Poetics in the TT

There were literature texts in the Ewe language such as the Adiku’s novel *Bumekpɔ* ‘Think Through It’, and Wiegraebe’s *Eveghalexelxle* ‘Ewe Reader’ during the early postcolonial period in Ghana. The status of Shakespeare’s work as a classic or canonical text perhaps influenced the choice. The status of Shakespeare as one of the best writers in history also constrain the choice. This constraint reflects in the title of the TT, which includes the name of the author. The name of the author comes before the title of the work. No known work in literature has ‘Macbeth’ as its title, so the author’s name could have been omitted from the title. By its positioning, the author’s name is emphasized to immediately give prestige to the work:
Currently, however, most teachers of the Ewe language use Ewe texts, that are not translations, in the classroom. Examples of these include: (1) novel: Akafia’s *Ku Le Xome* ‘Death is in the Room’; (2) Poetry: Seshie’s *Akpalu je Hawo* ‘Akpalu’s Songs’; and (3) Drama: Bidi Setsoafia’s *Tɔgbui Kpeglo II* ‘Chief/King Kpeglo II’, among other texts. This is a change of poetics.

One aspect of poetics concerns the inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, symbols, prototypical characters, and situations. Literary systems have their own inventory that they consider essential to the enrichment of the system. In translation/rewriting, some of these devices are incorporated either purposefully or not. In the Ewe literary system, one of such devices that serve this purpose of linguistic enrichment is the proverb. A proverb is “a phrase, saying, sentence, statement, or expression of the folk which contains above all wisdom, truth, morals, experience, lessons, and advice concerning life and which has been handed down from generation to generation” (Mieder 24). A proverb demands a careful linguistic unmasking before understanding the import of the expression. Chinua Achebe in *Things Fall Apart*, stated that proverbs are the oil with which words are eaten. This underscores the essential role of proverbs in the linguistic/cultural adornment of a literary system. In Ewe culture, a proverb is an elevated form of language and being able to incorporate proverbs into one’s utterance is a sign of competence in the language. In this kind of literary system, a translator/rewriter translates some expressions from the ST into the TT as proverbs. It is evident in the TT for this study, that the translator/rewriter does this kind of manipulation. The following is an example:

(4) (Act 3, Scene 4)
ST: Sweet remembrancer!
   Now, *good digestion wait on appetite,*
   And health on both!
TT: …detsi vivi-e     he-a      zikpui
   …soup sweet-FOC pull-PROG seat
   …delicious soup pulls seat (to itself)

Here, an existing Ewe proverb is used as the translation of the English expression that is not necessarily a proverb in the source culture. Had the English expression been a proverb, we may assume that the translator/rewriter tries to maintain the complex linguistic nuance of the ST. The choice of
a proverb as the translation of a non-proverbial expression is, perhaps, an attempt to enrich the TT with such linguistic choices that are considered high language in the receptor culture. The fact that the TT is mainly for teaching the Ewe language to students who might otherwise be incompetent in the language lends credence to this postulation. As stated earlier, one of the general aims for teaching Ghanaian Language and Culture is to “acquire the socio-cultural values in the literature of [the] language” (Ghana Education Service ii). The translator/rewriter helps in achieving this goal.

Towards Developing African Languages Through Translation

Recent studies suggest that most students in various countries in Africa found it burdensome, and to some extent futile, to acquire African languages. For instance, Gamuchirai Tsitsi Ndamba’s study in Zimbabwe found in some schools in the Masvingo district that the majority of respondents favoured English as a medium of instruction right from the infant grades so that they can better acquire the English language. According to the respondents, English is a gateway to success in school and subsequent employment opportunities. Elsewhere (Agbozo 73-78), I found similar results in Ghana and Herbert Igboanusi found same in Nigeria.

A similar situation is prevalent in the area of creative writing. Most of the major novels, drama, and collections of poetry in contemporary Africa are written in the Indo-European languages, with English dominating the statistics. In the Ewe language for instance, the last major known creative work was published in the early 1990s. The major creative writing awards on the continent: the Golden Baobab Prize, the Cain Prize and the Etisalat Prize, consider only works written in English. The only known African language award is the Mbatu-Cornell Kiswahili Prize for African Literature which Cornell University administers. There is also the dearth of translations of Indo-European classics into African languages unlike the case in the early postcolonial period.

In the midst of these, translation is a potential socio-psychological method of revitalizing African and other lesser-known languages. “Translation [is] a kind of dialogue or conversation among languages [and it] is another challenge to the orthodoxy” (Ngũgĩ 5) of Indo-European languages’ hegemony. The positive attitudes that people have towards the Indo-European languages could be manipulated by persuading people to shift this positive attitude to works that are translated from those languages. Social psychologists (e.g. Eagly & Chaiken) believe that persuasion can influence people to modify their beliefs,
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values, and or attitudes. What we must do in the 21st century and beyond is to translate major works from the Indo-European languages into African languages. In addition, we must translate the winning stories, novels, and poems in the creative writing contests on the continent into African languages. The curiosity that will develop among readers to find out how these works turn out in their own languages will make them read these translations. Such translations could be manipulated/rewritten so that rich linguistic nuances in the African languages are incorporated. As the readers read these translations, they get to learn their own language. Jalada Africa sets an example of this proposition when it translated Ngũgĩ’s short story “The Upright Revolution: Or Why Humans Walk Upright” into 30 African languages in 2016.

Conclusion

As exemplified in this paper, translation includes cultural and ideological transportations and that translations are produced under various constraints, as they are constituents of complex literary systems. Translation then is realised as rewriting and undertaken within the framework of the target language, culture, and ideology in the service of power. The theory brought a new perspective to translation studies. Translation is not static. An activity is subject to transformations. This makes translation keep up with the Global Turn and equip translation studies to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world (Darian-Smith & McCarty). The translation of Macbeth from English into Ewe, as shown in this study, provides a ground for upholding Lefevere’s assertion that translation is a form of rewriting. However, it remains to be seen whether it is only rewriting that the translator of this work does, since he also finds equivalences of the ST in the TT. Translation could also be adopted as a method of developing African languages especially in an era where interest in these languages is dwindling.

WORKS CITED

Agbozo, Gabriel Edzordzi. Language Choice in Ghanaian Classrooms: Linguistics Realities and Perceptions. MPhil. Thesis in English Linguistics and Language

---

3 https://jaladaafrica.org/2016/03/22/jalada-translation-issue-01-ngugi-wa-thiongo/
Acquisition, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway, 2015.


