

The Manifestation of Ideology in a Literary Translation

Mohammad Ghazanfari
Sabzevar University of Tarbiat Moallem

Abdullah Sarani
University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan

Abstract

This paper investigates ideological aspects of literary translations by specifically focusing on the analysis of the textual features of a literary source text (namely, Sadeq Hedayat's *Buf-e Kur* [*The Blind Owl*], a novel originally published in Persian in 1937) and its corresponding translated target text (namely, *The Blind Owl*, rendered into English by D. P. Costello in 1957). Inspired mainly by Hatim and Mason's (1990, 1991, 1997) theoretical framework for the analysis and assessment of translated works, the researchers have analysed the target text by accounting for the sets of constraints relating to genre, discourse, and text as semiotic systems within which the expression of ideology takes place. In order to indicate the translator's ideological orientations, the study has mainly concentrated on three textual features, namely, "transitivity shifts", "nominalizations", and "modality shifts", together with a handful of lexical choices suggesting "domestication". Venuti's proposal (1995) – that the present status of English as a "dominant" language serves as a motive for translators to adopt a "domesticating" strategy – has also been drawn on.

Keywords: ideological critique, literary translation, translation and ideology, translational shifts, domestication/foreignization, transitivity system

1. Introduction

It is said that "translation is as old as humankind" (Calzada Pérez 2003: 1). Therefore, it is not surprising that it has been recognized as an essential means of disseminating knowledge, spreading scientific achievements, and passing on great literary works across cultures and nations throughout the history of civilization. Therefore, it should not sound surprising that even the advent of some great socio-political movements have been attributed to works of translation. One of the outstanding instances that history has recorded is the translation of the *Thousand and One Nights* from Arabic into French in the eighteenth century by Galland, described as having "inflamed the imagination of Europe, of general readers and poets alike, from Pope to Wordsworth" (Haddawy 1990: xvi).

However, as a social and linguistic activity, translation cannot be considered a neutral undertaking (Hatim & Mason 1997). For example, Fitts, a famous contemporary translator of classical and Latin American literature into English, in his translations of ancient Greek poetry, has translated *Zeus* by *God* – thereby suggesting "an atmosphere of monotheism" in ancient Greek society (Venuti 2000: 69). One may regard such a rendering as a reflection of his own religious beliefs, or, to put it another way, his own ideology. The recent translator of *Alf Layla wa Layla* (*The Thousand and One Nights*) into English reports that previous major translators of the work into English "deleted and added at random, or at will, from the various sources to piece together a text that suited their individual purposes" (Haddawy 1990: xv).

He adds that the French translator of the same literary work went even further and “instead of following the text faithfully,...deleted, added, and altered drastically to produce not a translation, but a French adaptation, or rather a work of his own creation” (*ibid.*: xvi) to suit French tastes.

Lefevere (1992) maintains that all translations, “whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology”. Considering the issue from a linguistic perspective, Fairclough (1989) maintains that language is the primary domain of ideology. Or, to put it in Kress’s words (1985: 29–30), “ideologies find their clearest articulation in language”. Therefore, as a linguistic activity by nature, translation may as well be regarded an *ideological activity*.

I ought to clarify at the outset that in line with Hatim and Mason (1997) and in accordance with Simpson’s understanding of the term (1993: 5), what I intend by *ideology* is “the taken-for-granted assumptions, value systems and sets of beliefs which reside in texts”.

As one of the outstanding examples of ideological attack through translation, one can mention Voltaire’s (1734) frequently-quoted translation of Hamlet’s famous soliloquy – certainly not as a meditation on death, but instead as a bitter attack against religion: “*thus conscience doth make cowards of us all*” was translated into French as “*thus conscience turns a warrior hero into a timid Christian*” by Voltaire (quoted by Fawcett 1998: 108).

As another historical example of literary translation that conveys an ideology different from that of the original text, one can point to Fitzgerald’s translation of Omar Khayyam’s quatrains in the 19th century. Maine (1965), the editor of *Robā’iyāt*, comments that Fitzgerald took such great liberties with the text that it is not Khayyam’s. Venuti (1995: 189) makes a similar point, evaluating Fitzgerald’s work as an outstanding instance of “domesticating” translation. The process of domestication in Fitzgerald’s rendition is so conspicuous that Bunting (1936, cited in Venuti, *ibid.*) maintains that “Fitzgerald translated *a poem that never existed*, yet...made Omar utter such things as he would himself have spoken if he had been born in England” (italics added).

On the basis of the framework of analysis put forward by Hatim and Mason (1990, 1991, 1997), and later developed by Calzada Pérez (2002), this paper presents a selective sample of a more thorough analysis of a literary source text in Persian and its corresponding translation into English (cf. Ghazanfari 2004) in terms of three textual features: *transitivity shifts*, *modality shifts*, and *nominalizations*.

Finally, relying on the data obtained by an analytical comparison of the source text (ST) and the target text (TT), the researchers have attempted to identify the translational strategy applied by the translator in terms of the dichotomy historically associated with Schleiermacher.

2. Theoretical grounding of the study

The basic theoretical foundations of the present research are the theoretical premises put forward by Hatim and Mason (1990, 1991, 1997), on the basis of which Calzada Pérez (2002) developed her own model of analysis. Their theoretical proposals are, in turn, based on the line of thought put forward by critical discourse analysis

(CDA). The other strand of thought upon which this study draws to interpret the data is the methodological dichotomy proposed by Schleiermacher. A brief account of each of these lines of thinking follows.

2.1 *Hatim and Mason's framework for the analysis and assessment of translations*

Hatim and Mason's framework of analysis uses a set of constraints relating to *genre*, *discourse*, and *text*. Their contention is that these are the semiotic systems within which the expression of ideology takes place, and that, in Mason's words (1994: 26), "the investigation of ideology in translation is best handled within such a framework". However, from a linguistic perspective, their proposed framework draws especially on Halliday's (1985) systemic-functional linguistics.

2.2 *Calzada Pérez's theoretical model of analysis*

On the basis of Hatim and Mason's framework of analysis, Calzada Pérez (2002) proposed a model of critical text analysis that has inspired the present study more vividly than Hatim and Mason's, and that delves in particular into the ideological realms of translations. Her critical approach consists of three components: description, explanation, and exploration. At the descriptive level, a host of tangible, textual features such as *transitivity*, *mood*, *modality*, *cohesion*, and *thematization*, can be studied. The explanatory component is related to pragmatic and semiotic features "such as discourse, genre and text-type that are closely connected to ideological spheres" (Calzada Pérez 2002: 208). The exploratory component of Calzada Pérez's model is concerned with the potential impact the new translated texts might have upon the target culture and the receiving literary system.

2.3 *Schleiermacher's methodological dichotomy*

According to Venuti (1998), the many different strategies that have emerged since ancient times may perhaps be divided into two large categories: *domesticating* and *foreignizing* strategies.

From a historical perspective, as a theory and practice of translation, a foreignizing method, according to Venuti (1995), is mostly associated with the philosopher and Protestant theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834). Concerning the various roads open to a translator in the course of translation, he argued:

In my opinion there are only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him. Or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him. (cited in Lefevere 1992: 149)

He emphasized that "I would merely like to add that there cannot be a third method" (*op. cit.*: 150). Although Schleiermacher did not himself make any attempt to find specific labels for the two methods he distinguished, his distinction has so far been redefined many times and used by other writers (Fawcett 1998), the former having come to be known as "foreignization" and the latter as "domestication" in the re-

lated literature. “Seen from the perspective of socio-textual practices,” in Hatim’s words, “domestication means negotiating the discursual, generic and textual designs of the source text in terms of target language norms and conventions”, whereas foreignization “means negotiating these values in terms of source language norms and conventions” (Hatim 1999: 214).

3. Method

3.1 *Materials and procedure*

As mentioned earlier, a Persian novel by Sadeq Hedayat (1937), entitled *Buf-e Kur* [*The Blind Owl*], has been selected as the literary source text (ST) to be compared closely with its corresponding target text (TT) translated into English by Desmond Patrick Costello (1957) to reveal to what extent the translated text diverges from the original work as far as ideological orientations are concerned. Moreover, through a sentence-by-sentence comparison of the two texts, instances of domestication in the TT have been identified as qualitative evidence.

Finally, the study seeks to find convincing answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent did the translation process affect the ideology of the original text, namely, *Buf-e Kur*?
2. Did the status of English as a “dominant” language cause the translator of *Buf-e Kur* to unwittingly apply a *domesticating* strategy in translating the book into English?

4. Framework of analysis

As it was pointed out, the ST and the TT have been analysed in terms of three categories of textual features: transitivity shifts, modality shifts, and nominalizations, as well as lexical choices denoting domestication. A brief account of each of these features follows.

4.1 *Transitivity system in systemic-functional linguistics*

In the systemic-functional grammar, the selections that we make are included in the system of *transitivity*. The term transitivity generally refers to how meaning is represented in the *clause*. It shows how speakers encode in language their mental picture of reality through *processes*, or verbal phrases. The semantic processes expressed by clauses potentially have three components:

- (1) The *process* itself, which will be expressed by the verb phrase in a clause;
- (2) The *participants*, or noun phrases, involved in the process;
- (3) The *circumstances* associated with the process, normally expressed by adverbial and prepositional phrases.

Furthermore, processes can be classified according to whether they represent actions, speech, states of mind or simply states of being. Halliday (as cited in Simpson 1993) classes **material** (or physical), **mental**, and **relational** processes as major processes. There are also minor processes, which include **verbal** and **existential** ones. Examples of each type of the above-mentioned processes follow:

1. Material process: *The mouse ran up the clock.*
2. Mental process: *Mary liked the gift.*
3. Relational process: *Sarah is wise.*
4. Verbal process: *He said that.*
5. Existential process: *There were ten students at the party.*

Material processes are further subdivided into **action** processes, in which the actor is animate (e.g., *The policeman fired*), and **event** processes, in which the actor is inanimate (e.g., *The ceiling collapsed*). Action processes can be further subdivided into **intention** processes, in which the actor performs the act voluntarily (e.g., *John aims at the target*), and **supervention** processes, in which the action simply happens (e.g., *John fell down*).

4.2 Modality shifts

The term *modality* refers broadly to “attitudinal” features of language, reflecting the text producer’s attitude toward the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence. It refers to some of the grammatical means (e.g., modal auxiliaries, *seem*, *appear*, etc.) by which a speaker or writer “qualifies” what would otherwise be an *absolute* statement (see Simpson 1993). Modality indicates the speaker or author’s point of view, as Kies (2009: Modality Shifts, para. 1) has also pointed out, allowing them “to hedge on the assertions made by transitive verbs”. To put it differently, modals introduce an element of *obligation*, *necessity*, *willingness*, *probability*, or the like into the sentence.

4.3 Nominalizations

Nominalization is the condensed reformulation of a verbal process and the various participants involved; in other words, the conversion of an *agent-verb sequence* into a single noun phrase. For example, an agent-verb sequence like: *Someone criticized* may be changed into *There has been criticism*. When we nominalize a process, we can exclude the participants involved in that process. The elimination of human participants would have the effect of *undercutting agency* and minimizing the role of people as active conscious human agents and the elimination of human intentionality (Sykes 1985: 98). To indicate the suppressing of agency in literary texts, Kies (2009: Nominalizations, para. 1) presents the following nominalized example from Orwell’s *1984*:

She described to him, almost as if she had seen or felt it, the stiffening of Katharine’s body as soon as he touched her.... (1984: 110)

“To write that *Katharine stiffened her body*,” Kies (*ibid.*) elaborates, “would make

Katharine conscious and agentive. The nominalized verb *stiffening* robs Katharine of consciousness and agency”.

5. Analysis and results

In this section, a selective sample of instances relating to each of the textual features under investigation, together with a series of lexical choices leading to “domestication”, have been taken from the target text and critically analysed in terms of the ideological shifts that are likely to be brought about as a result of such translational shifts.

5.1 Critical analysis of transitivity shifts

As for the system of transitivity, the researchers have been concerned with the *alterations*, or the *shifts*, that the transitivity system of the ST undergoes in the process of being relayed to the target language, thereby conveying an ideology that may differ from the original. Such alterations of the transitivity system have been grouped on the basis of the type and nature of the shifts, and for the sake of convenience of analysis, under *expansions*, *contractions*, *materializations*, *agency shifts*, *voice shifts*, *nominalizations*, and *modality shifts*. Moreover, transitivity shifts are followed by some examples of lexical choices that reflect the employment of a *domesticating strategy* by the translator. Instances of the Persian source text have been transliterated, and are immediately followed by the researchers’ English translation in square brackets. Then, the target text version is quoted, followed by a comment by the researchers.

5.1.1 Expansions

The category of shifts discussed under this heading includes cases in the source text in which the text producer has avoided any reference to a *process*; however, in relaying the text, the translator has inserted the avoided process(es).

The following selective instances of transitivity in the Persian source text (*Buf-e Kur*) have undergone *expansion* in the English target text (*The Blind Owl*). The processes that have been added to the utterances by the translator appear in italics.

- (1) ST: ...*væ tænha daru-ye an færamushi be tavæssot-e shaerab væ xab-e mæşnu‘i be væsileh-ye æfyun væ mævadd-e moxæddereh æst.* (p. 9)

[...and the only remedy for that is forgetfulness through wine and artificial sleep through opium and narcotics.]

TT: Relief from it is *to be found* only in the oblivion *brought about* by wine and in the artificial sleep *induced* by opium. (p. 7)

While the source text contains a single relational process with a non-human agent, the target text expands the clause by inserting three more material processes in the passive voice, the agent of the first of which is an implied human actor.

- (2) ST: ...æz *sheddæt-e væhshæt 'æmuyæm ba muha-ye sefid æz oṭāq xarej mishævæd...* (p. 56)

[...due to excessive horror, my uncle walks out of the room with white hair...]

TT: ...the horror of all this *had changed* my uncle, by the time he walked out of the room, into a white haired old man. (p. 74)

In this case, a prepositional phrase in the ST has been expanded into a clause with a material event process assigning the non-human agent (*the horror*) an active role.

5.1.2 Contractions

Contraction may be considered the opposite case of expansion, where a construction with a process is contracted into a *no-process* construction, a nominalization, a phrase, etc.

- (1) ST: ...*ræng-e læbæsh mipæræd væ cheshmhayæsh gerd o væhshætædeh mishævæd.* (p. 75)

[...her lips get pale, and her eyes become round and full of horror.]

TT: -bloodless lips, staring, wild eyes-... (p. 100)

The ST contains two clauses with two explicit processes together with an elliptical process, whereas in the TT, the processes have been reduced to nominals, entailing the deletion of agency.

- (2) ST: *cheshmhayi ke mal-e u bud...* (p. 40)

[The eyes that belonged to her...]

TT: ...her eyes. (p. 51)

In the example above, the same trend of omitting the process and reducing the clause to a phrase is in operation. That is, the *agent-process* sequence has been converted into a nominal phrase, diminishing the active role of the agent in the translated version.

5.1.3 Materializations

This type of transitivity shift refers to cases in which various *non-material* processes, e.g. relational, mental, existential, etc., in the source text are converted into *material processes*, denoting the performance of an action.

- (1) ST: ...*bel'æxæreh mæn æz kar o jonbesh oftadæm...* (p. 62)

[...at last, I was unable to do any work or make any movement...]

TT: In the end I *abandoned* all the activities and interests that I had... (p. 82)

While the source text includes a material action process (the agent of the process is animate), of *supervention* type (of the type in which the action simply happens to the agent, without his/her intention; see § 3.1, above), the target text producer has changed the process into a material action process, of *intentional* type, where the agent has been granted the will and the ability to either carry out the action or fail to perform it.

(2) ST: *'æṭr-e sinehāsh māstkonāndeh bud...* (p. 112)

[The fragrance of her bosom was intoxicating ...]

TT: The perfume of her bosom *made* my head *swim*... (p. 151)

Once more, a *relational process* in the source text has undergone *materialization* in the translation, being altered into a material event process (one in which the agent is inanimate; see §3.1, above). As a consequence, the non-human agent has been portrayed as assuming a more active role than in the source text. Moreover, the clause has been expanded so that another sequence of agent-verb ([*made*] *my head swim*) has been added by the translator.

5.1.4 Agency shifts

As Kies (2009: Introduction, para. 5) has pointed out, “AGENCY is one of the most widely used techniques to control a literary theme in a text.... It can be expressed (or suppressed) by a number of syntactic constructions.” To put it another way, changes in syntax can lead to changes in meaning. One way to achieve such changes in the subtleties of meaning through syntax is by means of passive voice constructions. The passive voice holds the potential, Kies (*ibid.*) argues, “for manipulating a hearer/reader: it allows the speaker/writer to hide the agent by neglecting to mention the agentive *by*-phrase.” The following pair of examples, presented by Kies (*op. cit.*: Passives, para. 1), can help clarify the difference in meaning between active and passive voices:

- a. Bill hit John. [active voice, grammatical subject clearly expressing the agent]
- b. John was hit (by Bill). [passive voice, grammatical subject does not express agency; the agent is expressed through a prepositional phrase with *by*, if it is expressed at all]

One more point in relation to *agency* is concerned with the *theme/rheme organization*. According to Halliday (1985: 39), “the Theme [*sic*] can be identified as that element which comes in first position in the clause...So part of the meaning of any clause lies in which element is chosen as its Theme”. He goes on to clarify the point by making a distinction between two semantically related sentences:

There is a difference in meaning between *a halfpenny is the smallest English coin*, where *a halfpenny* is Theme (“I’ll tell you about a halfpenny”), and *the smallest English coin is a halfpenny*, where *the smallest English coin* is Theme (“I’ll tell you about the smallest English coin”).

(1) ST: ...*bæra-ye in næqš moshtæri peida mishod væ...* (p. 13)

[...customers were found for this picture, and...]

TT: *I found customers for these paintings of mine.* (p. 14)

The ST process is of material action type, belonging to the *supervention* subdivision of material processes (see §3.1, above), without denoting any sense of prior human intention, whereas in the TT, the *supervention* process has given way to an *intention* one (*found*), suggesting an active human will on the part of the narrator, which is different from what the original sentence conveys.

(2) ST: ...*mesl-e in mærdha-ye toxmi ke zænha-ye hæshæri væ æhmægra jælb mikonænd...* (p. 99)

[...like the stud males who attract dissolute foolish women...]

TT: ...like the stud-males that *stupid randy women* usually fall for. (p. 132)

The “*goal*” in the original sentence has been transformed into the “*actor*” in the subordinate clause. The result would be a striking change in the entire meaning and ideology of the clause – that is, while in the ST “*the men*” are assigned the active role of “*attracting women*”, in the TT they are pictured as inactive, passive creatures. On the contrary, it is “*stupid randy women*”, in the TT, who assume the active role, rather than being acted upon, as in the ST. All in all, it seems that in this case the shift in agentivity results in a shift in discourse toward the opposite end of the pendulum; that is, the original *male-oriented discourse* has given way to a sort of “*feminist discourse*” in the translated version.

5.1.5 Voice shifts

As it was discussed above, a passive construction enables a speaker or author to hide the agent, especially when he/she fails even to mention the agentive by-phrase. It was also argued that changes in voice can lead to different *theme/rheme organizations* and consequently to shifts in the meaning of the clause. Kies (2009: Passives, para. 1) has more to say about expressing *passivity* in English, although a similar interpretation may be put forward concerning the Persian language as well:

Passives are among the most common grammatical devices to undercut agency in English, allowing the agentive noun phrase to occur out of thematic, sentence initial position, in an optional agentive *by*-phrase at the end of the sentence.

Therefore, by changing an active utterance into a passive, or, on the contrary, by altering a passive into an active construction, one has to change the agent of the utterance, resulting in an utterance with a different *thematic orientation*, which, in its own turn, would convey a different meaning, and a different ideology.

(1) ST: *hæmin ke qæziyeh kæshf mishævæd...* (p. 56)

[As soon as the affair is exposed...]

TT: As soon as *she* learned the truth... (p. 73)

In this case, besides changing the agent, the translator has altered a passive into an active process. In terms of thematization, while in the ST it is “*the affair*” (or “*the truth*”, as suggested by the translator) that is focused upon, or foregrounded, in the TT, this “foregrounding” shifts toward “*she*”.

(2) ST: *næmidanæm in xanehra kodam mæjnun ya kæjsæliqeh...saxteh...* (p. 12)

[I do not know which madman or which ill-disposed fellow has built this house...]

TT: They *must have been built* by some fool or madman heaven knows... (p. 12)

An active material action process, of *intentional* type, in the ST has been translated as a passive one, eliminating at the same time the questioning tone of the original sentence and adding a sense of modality (*must*) to the clause. From a thematic point of view, the two versions differ strikingly. Furthermore, there is an error of reference in the translated version; namely, the “patient” of the clause, a singular noun by origin (*xaneh*), has been transformed into a plural personal pronoun (*they*) in the TT.

5.2 Critical analysis of modality shifts

In the following sample of instances, *modality shifts* have resulted in an ideology different from that in the original text.

ST: *...abi ke u gisovanæshra ba an shostoshu midadeh mibayæsti az yek chesh-meh-ye monḥaṣer be færd-e nashenas...budeh bashæd.* (p. 18)

[...the water with which she washed her hair *must* have come from a unique and unknown spring...]

TT: ...the water with which she washed her hair *came* from some unique, unknown spring ...(p. 21)

The source text, with a modal auxiliary, introduces an element of expectation, or inference, into the sentence, whereas the target text conveys an *absolute* statement, eliminating any sense of possibility, qualification, or hedge from the sentence.

(2) ST: *...ḥala hæm ba jesaræt-e mæxṣuṣi ke momken æst yek zæn-e bi showhær dashteh bashæd nesbæt be mæn ræftar mikærd.* (pp. 79–80)

[...she still treated me with the peculiar boldness that a husbandless woman *might* possess.]

TT: ... She still treated me with that peculiar boldness that you *find* only in widows. (pp. 106–7)

The target version has ignored the element of *modality* in the ST, conveying as a consequence a sense of *absoluteness* in the statement, as if all widows behaved in the same manner.

5.3 Critical analysis of nominalizations

The following samples have undergone *nominalization* in the target text – that is, a clause in the ST with its own process(es) has been contracted and diminished into a *nominal* in the TT.

- (1) ST: *ægær kæsi beguyæd ya benevisæd...* (p. 9)

[If someone *talks* or *writes* (about them)...]

TT: Any *mention* of them in *conversation* or *writing*... (p.7)

The source text contains a verbal process (*talk*) and a material action process, of intentional type (*write*), with an overt agent; in the translated version, however, the two processes have been replaced with three nominalizations devoid of any agentivity.

- (2) ST: *...bæra-ye an ke kæsi næbinæd...* (p. 30)

[...in order for no one to *notice* ...]

TT: ... without *attracting attention!* (p. 37)

An agentive process in the ST has been changed into an *agentless* nominalization. Undercutting agency through a nominalized verb can suggest a lack of intentionality, or passivity on the part of the agent of the clause.

6. Critical analysis of lexical choices resulting in “domestication”

In addition to the transitivity shifts the target text has undergone, as discussed above, there are also instances that can be termed “domestication”, according to the dichotomy proposed by Friedrich Schleiermacher in the 19th century (see §1.3 above). Therefore, as far as lexical choices are concerned, the following sample of instances in the target text – instead of relaying socio-textual and socio-cultural features of the original text – either reflect elements peculiar to the receiving culture or convey the source text in a manner that neutralizes specific socio-cultural elements present in the source text. To quote Schleiermacher, as the translator has tried to leave the readers in peace and move the author toward them, examples such as the ones that follow can be considered instances of “*domestication*” in the translated version of the original text.

- (1) ST: *...migoft: “binæmazæm.”* (p. 59)

[She would say: “I’m exempted from praying.”]

TT: ...she would only say, “It’s the wrong time of the month.” (p. 78)

In this sentence, faced with an expression involving socio-cultural and religious values and beliefs (namely, the fact that a Moslem woman is not allowed to pray during her monthly periods, implying, as a consequence, that she cannot have sexual relationships either), the translator has opted for a rather neutral expression that

simply implies a sense close to the original, thereby denying the clause its socio-cultural and religious values.

- (2) ST: ...*yek ketab-e do‘a bærâyem aværdeh bud ke ruyæsh yek væjæb xak neshæsteh bud.* (p. 81)

[...she brought me a prayer book with *a span of dust* on top of it.]

TT: ...she brought me a prayer book with *half-an-inch of dust* on it. (p. 109)

This specific case is also worth considering due to the *domestication* that has taken place in the process of translating: “*half-an-inch*”, a measurement more associated with the Anglo-American culture, is the suggested equivalent for *yek væjæb* (literally, a span).

- (1) ST: ...*mæn be dæræk*... (p. 30)

[...*hell* with me...]

TT: Not that I *mattered*. (p. 37)

- (2) ST: ...*væ bæ‘d æz an ke mæn ræftæm, be dæræk*... (p. 48)

[...and after I am gone, *hell* with me...]

TT: ...and after I have gone *what do I care what happens?* (p. 61)

The Persian term *be dæræk* conveys a sense of excessive annoyance or anger, describing an unpleasant situation or experience. Neither of the translated versions of the term in pair of examples quoted conveys such a sense whatsoever. The inconsistency of the translator, on the other hand, in the two cases above indicates that he was not certain about the exact equivalent of the term, domesticating it as far as he could to approximate the original text.

- (5) ST: ...*væ ba xodæsh zækr mikærd*...(p. 89)

[...and she was reciting some prayer to herself ...]

TT: She ...was muttering some *formula* to herself. (p. 119)

While the original clause conveys a solemn religious sense, the translation has reduced a significant cult merely to a neutral “formula” in the modern sense of this word, devoid of any religious connotation or sacredness.

7. Quantitative data pertaining to translational shifts in *The Blind Owl*

By comparing Hedayat’s *Buf-e Kur* as the source text and its corresponding English translation, *The Blind Owl*, as the target text, with regard to the textual features and lexical choices made by the translator, one may arrive at the conclusion that the target text does reflect the source text as literally as one might expect it to do. Our quantitative data display a rather large array of translational shifts (a total of 172 cases; see Table 1 below) opted for by the translator in the process of rendering the

source text. In terms of ideological orientations, such shifts can be considered divergences of the target text from the source text.

Table 1. Translational Shifts in *The Blind Owl*.

	Number of shifts	Percentage of shifts
Transitivity shifts:		
Expansions	47	27.32
Contractions	12	6.97
Materializations	6	3.48
Agency shifts	43	25.00
Voice shifts	28	16.27
Total transitivity shifts	136	79.06
Nominalizations	6	3.48
Modality shifts	6	3.48
Lexical choices	24	13.95
Total number of shifts	172	100.00

8. Discussion and conclusions

The quantitative data obtained through the empirical study of the source text and its corresponding translated version provide strong evidence that the original and the target text diverge from each other with respect to both the textual features and lexical choices under investigation, resulting in semantic and ideological discrepancies between the two corresponding texts. Therefore, as far as the first research question is concerned, the obtained data by themselves lead to the more limited conclusion that the translation process *has affected* the ideology of the source text. Nonetheless, we should bear in mind that, in the absence of any agreed-upon criterion in the relevant literature, the exact degree of such an ideological impact cannot be measured and declared quantitatively. All we do know and are certain about is that the target text and the source text do not convey the same ideology. To put it another way, the influence of target-language values and ideological tendencies of the translator are evident throughout the target text.

A number of scholars in the field of translation studies (for example, see Emami 2002, quoting Beard) have commented that Costello's translation of Hedayat's *Buf-e Kur* is a free translation. The data obtained by analysing the texts in the present study also confirm the claim. The translational shifts that the target text has undergone clearly indicate that the divergences of the target text from the source text are striking, resulting in a translation that seems to stand close to the "free" end of a "literal – free" continuum.

One more point which is worth mentioning is the relationship assumed to exist between *domestication* and *free translation*, bearing in mind, of course, that Costello's translation is regarded as a free rendition. Hatim (1999:214) maintains that any discussion of "domestication" versus "foreignization" inevitably raises the "literal" versus "free" translation debate. "It is tempting to equate foreignizing with a more literal mode," Hatim explains, "and domesticating *with a freer mode*. Indeed, this is more or less how it is in most cases" (*italics added*).

Finally, Venuti (1995: 18–19), regarding translation as "a cultural political prac-

tice” by nature, with regard to a domesticating method of translation, points to “the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the target language”. Moreover, according to Venuti (*ibid.*), over the last three centuries, there has been a predominant trend towards domestication in Anglo-American translations; Costello’s rendering of Hedayat’s *Buf-e Kur* seems to be a typical example of this. Thus, do not the great number of translational shifts (nominalizations; transitivity, voice, agency, and modality shifts; as well as certain lexical choices, as displayed in Table 1 above) in *The Blind Owl* suggest that all these *interventions* by the translator are directed towards producing a translation reflecting dominant cultural values, a target text “in which linguistic and cultural differences are domesticated” (Venuti, 1995: 34)? It is, however, very difficult, if not impossible, to prove that this domestication takes place because of the status of English as a “dominant” language. A large number of case studies, where translations into “dominant” and “less dominant” languages are analysed, could potentially at least suggest an answer to this question.

References

- Calzada Pérez, M. C. (2002). “A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory translation studies”. *Target*, 13(2), pp. 203–239.
- Calzada Pérez, M. C. (ed.) (2003). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester and Northampton: St. Jerome Publishers.
- Emami, K. (2002). “Kargah-e tærjomeh (Translation workshop) (19)”. *Motærjem [The Translator]*, 36, pp. 33–40.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
- Fawcett, P. (1998). “Ideology and translation”. In M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 106–111.
- Ghazanfari, M. (2004). *Reflection of Ideological Orientations in Literary Translation and its Implications for Teaching: A critical text analysis approach*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Shiraz University.
- Haddawy, H. (1990). *The Arabian nights*. New York and London: W. W. Norton.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, B., and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B., and Mason, I. (1991). “Coping with ideology in professional translating”. *Interface: Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), pp. 23–32.
- Hatim, B., and Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. (1999). “Implications of research into translator invisibility”. *Target*, 11(2), pp. 201–222.
- Hedayæt, Ş. (1973). *Buf-e Kur [The blind owl]* (14th ed.). Tehran: Amir Kabir.
- Hedayæt, Ş. (2001). *The Blind Owl [Buf-e Kur]* (Offset ed.). (D. P. Costello, transl.). Tehran: Caravan Publishing House. (Original work published 1937).
- Kies, D. (2009). The uses of passivity: Suppressing agency in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Retrieved February 20, 2009, from <http://papyr.com/hypertextbooks/comp2/1984final.htm>
- Kress, G. (1985). “Ideological structures in discourse”. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse analysis: Vol. 4. Discourse Analysis in Society*. London: Academic Press, pp. 27–42.
- Lefevere, A. (ed.) (1992). *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Maine, G. F. (ed.) (1965). *Robā’iyāt of Omar Khayyam*. London and Glasgow: Collins.
- Orwell, G. (1962). *Nineteen eighty-four*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sykes, M. (1985). “Discrimination in discourse”. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 4. Discourse analysis in society*. London: Academic Press, pp. 83–102.

- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1998). "Strategies of translation". In M. Baker (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 240–244.
- Venuti, L. (ed.). (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.