Socio-ideological Manipulations in Literary Translation: A Case Study of Two Translated Versions of *The Panchatantra* in English and Persian

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies

by

Ahmad Ayar Afshord

Supervisor

Professor Panchanan Mohanty

Center for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies

School of Humanities

University of Hyderabad

P.O. Gachibowli, Hyderabad-500046

Telangana, India

January, 2017

DECLARATION

I, Ahmad Ayar Afshord, Reg. No. 14HAPT10, hereby declare that this Ph.D. thesis entitled **Socio-ideological Manipulations in Literary Translation: A Case Study of Two Translated Versions of The *Panchatantra* in English and Persian** is carried and out submitted by me for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies under the supervision of Professor Panchanan Mohanty, Center of Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, University of Hyderabad. I also declare that neither any part nor the whole of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or diploma to any other University or Institution.

Ahmad Ayar Afshord

Acknowledgments

It is very true that all academic works consist of most important people who are sincerely supportive and without their support and encouragement the work is hardly possible. Research is an individual's work, but developments mostly take place in discussions with others and the most influential person is the one who supervise the research. I express my deepest gratitude and hearty gratefulness to Professor Panchanan Mohanty for his supervision time and patience. He was always available and enthusiastic for very discussion on my topic which shaped my work.

I am also grateful to the members of my doctoral committee Prof. Shivarama Padikkal and Prof. R. Sarraju for support. I am also grateful to Dr. B. Salmani for always being there to help with materials and insights.

I, also, want to thank my family members who have backed me not only during the study, but in all critical periods of my life.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **Socio-ideological Manipulations in Literary Translation: A Case Study of Two Translated Versions of** *The Panchatantra* **in English and Persian** submitted by Mr. Ahmad Ayar Afshord bearing registration number 14HAPT10 in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies, is a bonafide work carried out by him under my supervision and guidance.

This thesis is free from plagiarism and has not been submitted previously in part or in full to this or any other University or Institution for award of any degree or diploma. Parts of this thesis have been presented in the following conference:

1. International Conference of South Asian Languages and Literatures (ICOSAL-12), 7-9 January 2016, by Centre for Endangered Languages and Mother Tongue Studies School of Humanities, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad 500046, India.

Further, the student has passed the following courses towards fulfillment of the coursework requirement for Ph.D.

Course Code	Name	Credits	Pass/Fail
1. TS-801	Research methodology	4	passed

Supervisor   Head of Department   Dean of School

Abbreviations

SL: Source Language

ST: Source Text

TL: Target Language

TT: Target Text

TS: Translation Studies

DA: Discourse Analysis

CDA: Critical Discourse Analysis

SC: Source Culture

TC: Target Culture

IPA Transcription of Persian Letters

Persian	IPA
ا	æ
ب	b
پ	p
ت	t
ث	s
ج	dʒ
چ	tʃ
ح	h
خ	x
د	d
ذ	z
ر	r
ز	z
ژ	ʒ
س	s
ش	ʃ
ص	s
ض	z
ط	t
ظ	z
ع	'
غ	gh
ف	f
ق	g
ک	k
گ	g
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
و	oʊ, oː, w
ه	e, a, ah
ی	i, eː

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

1. Chapter one: Introduction

1.1. Background

Translation generally is a means of transferring thoughts of a society expressed in one language into an appropriate linguistic form of another society which involves cultural and linguistic decoding, recording and encoding. Today, it is not simply decoding and recoding of linguistic elements. The various factors have emerged in Translation Studies such as culture, power, globalization, gender, post-colonialism, hermeneutics and ideology in particular.

Cultures are in closer contact increasingly with one another through translation that regulates ideology which again is an important part of any culture. Moreover, due to the development of technology, the small cultures of the world have started to reassert and people around the world have come known to other nations and cultures. In other words, the world has started an international paradigm in which there are no clear boundaries and distinctions.

Consequently, the phrase *'Going Global'* is no longer catchy and has become a part of our daily life. Every day people involve in a globalizing event and play their part in it. For instance, they drink coffee which is most probably from Africa; the car they drive is from the United States; the gas for their vehicles is imported from Iraq; laptops are manufactured in China, and highly sophisticated home appliances are made in Japan or Germany which all play their role to homogenize the cultural diversity.

In this regard, Maalouf (1999:152) argues: "I am convinced that globalization is a threat to cultural diversity, especially to the diversity of languages and lifestyle; and that this threat is even infinitely greater than in the past" (qt. from Calzada-Pérez 2003:1).

Therefore, due to the globalization and along with the import of goods, the ideas and cultural values of a nation undoubtedly find a way to enter the other nation's literary polysystem through translation. The new ideas could influence or subvert a nation's identity through translation since the literary system is the base of a nation's cultural, ideological, religious identity. Literature is largely dependent on culture and a nation's identity depends on its literary system which has evolved through years of experience, belief, and cognitive activities. In fact, the influence of globalization has become inevitable on literary polysystem of nations in which translation plays an outstanding role.

Ideology and its manipulative power have been influencing the translation for years at all levels and control the process of literary translation. Lefevere (1992:14) state: "if you want to influence masses, a simple translation is always best", but the masses avoid alteration at the time of peace and stability. That is why the ideological translation can be regarded as a threat to the identity of a nation. Referring to Lefevere's view, by means of translation, it is possible to influence a nation's ideological dogma, especially when the world is engaged in an ideological conflict.

To cope with such problems in translation, there is a cultural filter which supervises the entry of other's cultural elements and ideological views into its literary polysystem. Furthermore, it concerns the process of translation including cultural and ideological aspects of a text and the sociopolitical situation in which a text is produced and comprehended.

The ideological manipulation in translation is not a new issue and more instances of it are found in the past than in today's world. Ideology is a cultural product but culture could alter ideology and be altered by it. It means culture and ideology are in a

reciprocal relation. Moreover, ideological orientations influence the cultural items like food, dress, personal names as well as the literary system and translation in particular.

It is obvious that there are cultural and linguistic differences between ST and TT and every individual has a unique way of interpreting any given text due to his cultural and ideological background. So, a single text cannot be objectively determined to have one true or a few true interpretations. In fact, an interpretation could be regarded as true that is along with the dominant ideological system and the translator (as an interpreter in first place) has to be faithful to the ideology of patron (as a member of the ideological system) and to interpret (translate) ST in a way that could fit the poetics and serve the ideology of the receiving system.

The issue of faithfulness to ideology must be regarded by the translator since he wishes to reach the target audiences for different reasons such as approving economic status and promoting social status. In fact, the translator is covertly forced to be faithful to the dominant ideological system since the translator is economically dependent on patron and faithfulness in translation has to do more with how to translate.

Any text is translated due to a number of purposes (skopos theory) and all translations are purposeful. So, in order to achieve proposes, the intention of the original author could be violated and the translator would have much freedom to rewrite the intended meaning and message. Since translation is always a matter of rewriting and manipulation, Lefevere (1992: vii) maintain: "Translation is rewriting and rewriting is manipulation."

Therefore, the literary work is manipulated through translation in order to enter the literary polysystem of receiving society. The literary polysystem without the cultural

filter is a ground for foreign literature to achieve the first position and to push the native literature to margins. The translated works, then, are able to alter, add, delete and manipulate the native literature. This act could be regarded as a power of the translation and CDA is applied into practice in text analysis in order to clarify the power of translation and power relations in any language use as well.

Folktales are anonymous stories which deeply rooted in a nation's folklore. These folktales reflect a nation's superstitions, medicinal practices, cultural games, songs, dance rituals, old tales, verses, fables, myths, legends and epics which deal with emotions such as joy, grief, fear, jealousy, wonder, and triumph. One of the worldwide famous ancient fables is Panchatantra. It is the Indian ancient fable which has been written in verse and prose (the Panchatantra and some related issues has been discussed in chapter two).

The people of any nation have been retelling the stories for years but they alter them consciously or not in transferring from one language and culture to another. That is why the stories of the *Panchatantra* has been reappeared in the West especially in Aesop's fables. The original work has been written in Sanskrit but there are different views on how the book has come to existence. It is believed that, on one hand, it has been collected in the 3rd century BCE by a Brahman who is anonymous. On the other hand, it has been written by Vishnu Sharma, an old teacher. The *Panchatantra* is repeatedly translated into different languages and has gone by different names in various cultures. It is completely well-known among the other literary masterpieces of the world.

The works of world-renowned writers have been traveling through the world and have been entering the literary polysystem of nations through translation which

significantly increases the literary and artistic knowledge of authors, elites, and readers and gives new insights extending their sight and thought.

Dyson (2009:300) puts:

> "Reading translated literature expands our mental horizons. It is absolutely vital for education in the arts and the humanities, and also for our general and scientific knowledge. Throughout history, translated literature has been a spur to fresh intellectual and creative activity."

Translation introduced new literary techniques, styles and replaced the modern literature with the old one and new literary patterns with traditional ones. It has brought novel thoughts, ideas, cultural experiences, and sociopolitical dimensions into literature. Moreover, it has created new intellectual horizons and encouraged new audiences to read new literary works. It turned the simple recoding and decoding into a universal phenomenon and different dimensions such as culture and ideology reconsidered systematically in the field.

In the 50s and 60s, translators began to evaluate the techniques of translation in order to affect target audience through translation. They began to consider how to manipulate the texts to achieve this goal. It was a turning point in translation which subsequently led to the emergence of a new school in the field as *'Manipulation School'*. This school is introduced systematically by Lefevere (1992) which aimed at determining the role of ideology as a power factor in literary polysystem claiming that power is paramount even implicit and explicit or formal and informal.

Since the 1960s scholars of Translation Studies have interested in power and power relations in translation which has made the role of ideology significant regarding its

manipulative power which forces translator to manipulate text based on patron's idea. This is the issue that literary translation mostly suffers.

An academic focus on ideology and power has been started from the 1980s with the essay *'The Manipulation of Literature'* by Hermans (1985) and the work of other scholars including Toury, Lambert, van den Broeck, Lefevere, Bassnett and Tymoczko among the others. They tried to show that translation is a primary literary tool which larger institutions, educational system, and art had to manipulate in order to achieve the desired goal in receiving culture. The focus is shifted from equivalence to ideology mostly because of its manipulative power. The manipulation thoughts by these scholars in 1985 evolved into *'cultural turn'* in Translation Studies.

This cultural turn led to an agreement that translation cannot be regarded as a simple and straightforward transfer of linguistic elements but it is a negotiation between two cultures as well. In this regard, the translation is not a personal choice and random act but is an ideological act especially when the translation is commissioned.

Furthermore, a translator, in order to make a translation fit to receiving culture, must be familiar with the issues such as text function, literary norms, skopos of translation, cultural and ideological implications, various discourse types as well as linguistic proficiency. It is because any act of translation is under the influence and constant implicit or explicit alteration which is exerted by the patron such as a publisher, an institution, and a political party. So, the function of translation is to serve the benefits of the patron.

A number of factors influence the production of translation such as media, reader, society, market, culture, institutions, ideology, and patron. The present study has focused on the ideology and its manipulative power and has endeavored to clarify

ideological manipulation within translation process. In other words, how ideology interferes, controls and restructures the message of the foreign text. Moreover, the study has challenged to claim that 1) ideology as a variable has been internalized by the patrons from the beginning of translation and 2) translator has to be submissive to the dominant ideological system within literary polysystem.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Societies have their own literary norms and ideological qualifications by which they control literary polysystem. Regarding writing as a social activity, various factors play a role in the formation of a text such as society, culture, ideology, history, and context. A fact is that these factors are the base of any literary product and the author makes meaning by linking his work to these factors. Regarding these factors, the meaning transferring between two languages is a great task on the part of the translator and even more challenging when ideologies are involved.

The major problem of the present study is that ideology imposes manipulation to a foreign text which leads to violation of message and meaning. In one hand, it forces translator to apply additions, omissions, and alterations which result in a violation of meaning, intention, and loss of message which the foreign author has tried to convey. The author conveys his ideology, thoughts, cultural background and beliefs through his work. On the other hand, ideology allows a literary work to enter literary polysystem of a society, promotes the statutes of the translator, makes the practice of power authentic through translation and contributes a translation winning the first position of literary polysystem only if translation to be along with dominant ideology of receiving society.

1.3.   Significance of the Study

Literature develops in contact with other literature and this contact is through translation. As an example, a number of books which publish annually and enter into literary polysystem are through translations. It is because the native literature could not meet the social expectations and demands various literary works from different cultures to make literary polysystem rich but it is possible through ideological manipulations. So, attention should be paid to the issue of ideology in translation and especially when a literary translation in concerned due to different literature carries different social, cultural and ideological implications.

The present study is focused on ideological acting in translation such as additions, deletions, and violation of meaning. In the case of the *Panchatantra,* it is obvious that the book has been manipulated by different ideologies or cultures since it has gone into different cultures and still has its own significance among the nations which the work is translated. The most significance of the present study is investigating ideological manipulation in the translation of folktales and the *Panchatantra* in particular. This composition of folktale scattered and entered into world literature through Persian translation. The book carries different ideological and cultural views in different cultures and languages.

Since a literary work commissioned to be translated, it is an ideological acting and in the case of the *Panchatantra,* it shows that all dominant ideological system violates message and manipulation has a long history in literary polysystem. The other significance of the present study is applying *'Critical Discourse Analysis'* which is a newly developed analytical method in analyzing language use and as far as the researcher knows, this method has not been applied to analyze the novels and folktales.

1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

Since translation as a means of intercultural communication undergoes the ideological manipulation, the ideological knowledge is quite important on the part of the translator in order to understand the intended meaning and message of the original author. Under this circumstance, the translator alters the translation to make fit to the receiving culture. The basic ideological acts in the past have been adding chapters to the translated version as it is obvious in almost all translations of the *Panchatantra.*

The purpose of the present study is to clarify the role of ideology and the ideological manipulations which a translator must be familiar. The translator must know how different ideologies manifest in different languages, how ideology re-shapes internal structure of the language and its role in translation. The study has intended to describe and explain the ideological manipulation such as additions, deletions, and omissions in the translation process and to investigate how translator deals with different ideologies.

The present study has tried to claim that the analysis of two translations of the same work could take place regardless to the original because the original itself is a translation of a translation and the main objective of the research is to find the ideological manipulations in two translated works rather than evaluating the accuracy of linguistic equivalents.

1.5. The Research Questions

Language is a means by which human being conduct the social life reflecting thoughts and ideas and it links communication with culture and ideology in a complex way. Since people expressing facts, ideas and events in their own languages, they do a kind of translation (intralingual translation). It does not happen in a vacuum, people shows

their cultural and ideological background through language use in which linguistic elements are the physical manifestation of cultural and ideological directionality.

The research questions are closely related to researcher's cognitive and experimental experiences such as insights, intuitions, and visions. Intuition often plays a part in developing the research questions which are based on the causal observation of language, and interpretation of findings which often involves intuitive impressions about the impact of particular lexical and grammatical choices and different strategies in translation. Therefore, any language use is ideological and the issue is bolder when it comes to translation since it is an appropriate site for manipulation which is conducted by translators and patrons.

Hence, present research endeavored to answer the following questions:

- Whether a literary work ideologically colored or not, if so, to what extent ideology manipulates the meaning and message of the source text in the translation process?

- Since the issue of patronage in translation has fundamental importance acts as a mediator among a foreign text, a translator, and TT audiences, should translator be faithful to the ethics of translation or to the patron and his ideology?

- If the translator is obliged to translate a foreign work in the favor of ideological system of the receiving society, then to what extent the translator's ideology would be influential in the translation process?

1.6. Hypotheses

Any research is conducted based on one or more hypothesis. In research methodology, it is believed that association between two variables is random but in the case of the

present study, it is not true. The present study is based on the analysis of language and language is not random because one speaks, writes and interprets based on his background for some certain purposes which make language use ideological. In addition, the interpretation of a text is based on the predisposition of the researcher and his social, cultural and ideological background in making hypothesis. Regarding the objectives of the present study, following assumptions are investigated:

a. Translation of a literary work could enter a literary polysystem, only if it could meet dimensions and qualifications of the dominant ideological system and in this regard, inevitably, undergoes various manipulations and interferences.

b. All translations are ideological and cannot be innocent since, in the process of translation, patron and translator consciously and unconsciously manipulate the text to fit for the receiving society and to serve the benefits of the dominant ideological system.

1.7. Limitations and Delimitations

It is accepted that every study has its limitations and delimitations and the present study is not the exception. To mention the limitation of the present study, it is worth noting that CDA is a new technique in discourse analysis and as far as the researcher found no research has applied CDA in the analysis of literature and folktales because few scholars have theorized the subject. The most important limitation of the present study is *'subjectivity'* which has led to many discussion between me (researcher) and my supervisor. The most common definition of subjectivity could be that it is one's self-identity including ideology, thoughts, feelings, and beliefs. So, the problems of present research have been raised due to researcher's view which directs everything from selecting the topic, formulating hypotheses, selecting methodologies and interpreting data.

The researcher is benefited from subjectivity in conducting the research and analyzing and interpreting the corpus. Tymoczko (2007:146) maintains "just because research is empirical in nature, it does not mean that it is objective"; and Fairclough (1989:142) stated: "the interpretations of a text are generated through the combination of what is in the text and what knowledge and beliefs the interpreter holds."

As mentioned earlier, the subject is novel and has been come to academic concern since 1990 and extended through translation. Delimitation of the present study is mentioned below:

- The subject in question could be investigated based on issues such as psychological, social, gender and postcolonial approaches in translation and political science as well.

1.8. Definition of the Key Terms

1.8.1. Translation

There are various definitions of the term *'translation'* regarding the different perspectives. Translation is a form of meaning transfer within a system, in which all consequences in the process of translating is under the control of dominant ideological systems. For some ideological reasons, it appears as a form of rewriting. Lefevere (1992:9) believes:

> "Translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting that is influential in projecting and disseminating the image of the original writer and their works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin."

And for Alvez & Vidal (1996:4):

"Translation is not the production of one text equivalent to another text, but rather a complex process of rewriting that runs parallel both to the overall view of language and of the Other' people have throughout history; and to the influences and the balance of power that exist between one culture and another."

1.8.2. Culture

The term '*culture*' refers to manifestations of human intellectual achievement. In general, what could be experienced by a human being is a culture including the customs, traditions, beliefs, language, art, music and norms. In other words, culture is a *'way of life'* which is shared by members of a society i.e. it is a distinctive way of life of people in a society. Karamanian (2002:1) elaborates more on the term *'culture'* and classifies culture into three interrelated categories:

a. "The personal, whereby we as individuals think and function as such

b. The collective, whereby we function in a social context

c. The expressive, whereby society expresses itself "

1.8.3. Ideology

There are major difficulties with the definition of the term *'ideology'* due to the lay people believe that ideology is closely linked to power. Williams (1983:153) believes the scope and various definitions problematize the study of ideology in any discipline. The term *'ideology'*, for the first time, is used in 1796 by Count Destutt de Tracy as a reference to *'science of ideas'*. From the 19th century onwards the term *'ideology'* came to acquire a negative Marxian sense of illusion or false consciousness and this negative sense has had a significant impact on the way it was studied. Ideology is defined as "the Marxist tradition of false consciousness"; Althusser's (1984)

"ideological interpellation of a subject through the state's ideological apparatuses"; Seliger's (1976) "concept of a political belief system"; Foucault's (1980) "effect of ideological discipline on the human body"; and van Dijk's (1996) "organized evaluative beliefs".

Lefevere (1992:48) define "ideology as the conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time and through which readers and translators approach the text, but for Calzada-Perez (2003:4) ideology is connected to domination and power. It is ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class by distortion or dissimulation."

Fairclough (1995:49) believes:

> "Knowledge implies facts to be known, facts coded in propositions which are straightforwardly and transparently related to them. But 'ideology' involves the representation of 'the world' from the perspective of a particular interest, so that the relationship between proposition and fact is not transparent, but mediated by representational activity. So ideology cannot be reduced to 'knowledge' without distortion."

Due to the various views towards the perplex notion of ideology, in the last two decades, many theorists preferred to use discourse instead of ideology.

1.8.4. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a neo-Marxist approach which claims the creation and maintenance of power relations are affected by the cultural and economic dimensions. The well-known scholars in this field are Fairclough, van Dijk, van Leuven and Wodak. Basically, CDA is a kind of discourse analysis which is used in

social sciences. It is an interdisciplinary field that could be used as a theory as well as a method since it could be fitted for linguistic and cultural approaches to translation.

Fairclough (1989:85) mentions the linguistic element could not convey meaning, but its discursive formation reflects a certain form of control, power relations, manipulation, and ideologies. So, CDA relies on the linguistic examination of the text and equals the linguistic analysis which the important part is text which is related to the oral or verbal form of language which is produced in a discursive event.

1.8.5. Intertextuality

Intertextuality is the most common term in contemporary critical studies. It means creating the meaning of a text by already existing ones and its figures include "allusion, quotation, calque, plagiarism, translation, pastiche, and parody". Intertextuality is borrowing and transferring of references of a text in the reading with others. Allen (2000:20) maintains:

> "Intertextuality seems such a useful term because it foregrounds notions of relationality, interconnectedness, and interdependence in modern cultural life."

"In the postmodern epoch, theorists often claim that it is not possible any longer to speak of originality or the uniqueness of the artistic object since every artistic object is so clearly assembled from bits and pieces of already existent arts" (Allen 2000:21).

A definition of intertextuality is:

> "The need for one text to be read in the light of its allusions and differences from the content or structure of other texts, the (allusive) relationship between especially literary texts" (cf. Oxford English Dictionary 1997)

Farahzad (2009:127) explains Toury's term for understanding the nature of the text. There are three definitions proper to categorize a text accordingly, i.e. text as a product, process, and intertext. By the text as a product, the reader considers the text standing by itself that involves meaning, message, author's intention and etc. By the text as process we refer to the poststructuralist's view of translated text which many other factors should be observed when dealing with a translated text such as text producer, the reader as an active participant being engaged in interpretation of the text, and plurality of the meanings that are offered by different people in different times and place.

1.9. Arthur W. Ryder: the Translator

Arthur W. Ryder (1877-1938) was a Sanskrit professor at the University of California who is well-known for translating many works from Sanskrit to English such as the *Panchatantra* and the *'Bhagavad Gita'*. His translation of the *Panchatantra* in 1925 was so fascinating that republished in 1949, 1956 and 1964 by Jaico Publishing House, Mumbai.

He was famous for loving languages who was publishing whatever he liked and satisfied with. He insisted that Sanskrit must be studied due its paramount literature, not for philological reasons only. The only reason that his works are well-concerned is due to his faithfulness to the source text despite translating the ST into the spoken language using rhyme and idioms. Noyes (1939) regarding his translations mentions:

> "Ryder's work is probably the finest body of translation from the Sanskrit ever accomplished by one man if the translation is regarded as a branch of literary art, not merely as a faithful rendering of the meaning of the original text."

Ryder (1949) in the preface mentions:

"The Panchatantra stories have unfailingly offered man significant and dynamic aid […], and at all times, the end purport of the *Panchatantra* is to reveal to man, woman, or child, through the fascinating medium of 'legless fables' that basic knowledge and wisdom which makes one's life richer, happier […], in their endless travel through the ages in India and abroad, these stories underwent many changes not only in regard to their form, color, and setting but even as to their total numerical strength."

It seems that Noyes (1939) believes that Ryder translated the *Panchatantra* from the original Sanskrit due his interest. But it is obvious that Ryder's translation is based on the Hertel's version (1915) which is not based on the original *Panchatantra.* Edgerton (1924) maintains "Hertel had reconstructed the original Sanskrit *Panchatantra;* this version is known as the Southern Family text." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panchatantra#cite_note-thane-29.

Ryder assigned names to the animals and the different characters as well to present a joyful reading for the readers could enjoy the text.

Two English translations of the *Panchatantra* have been published recently. The first one is translated by Chandra Rajan and published by Penguin (1993), and the second one by Patrick Olivelle, by Oxford University Press (1997) and republished in 2006 by the Clay Sanskrit Library. Qaisar (2002:33) argues: "among modern translations, Arthur W. Ryder's translation (Ryder 1925), translating prose for prose and verse for rhyming verse, remains popular."

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

2. Chapter Two: Review of Literature

2.1. Background

Translation is as old as a human being which as a common ground for the cultural meeting has been transmitting insights and views among nations for centuries. People have been in a relation with each other in the different time period by different means such as non-verbal signs. Due to the need for communication and lack of written means, communication has been done through body language, facial gestures and ultimately non-verbal signs among different tribes and nations. Moreover, these tribes had already a sign-system in common as a means of communication such as smoke, fire and different colors which had a specific meaning. Travelers and merchants, later, orally transferred ideas and insights from one nation to another.

Over time, the man came to understand that their needs are beyond the basics for living and felt a need for contact with others. Thus, different sounds patterns produced, the basic form of writing established and civilizations started to emerge through the complicated process of man's progress in language, literature, and art. The civilized man, having the sophisticated means of communication, developed translation for intercultural communication.

Translation in a modern sense has begun to be prominent by Romans, who were interested in forming a new form of culture of Greece. Bassnett (2005:50) states:

> "Translation for Romans was a means of making a statement about the status of vernacular in relation to the original but in the western literary history there was no clear distinction between an original and translation and the term come to being in the early seventeen century."

In the 18th century, translation and text became an issue of property and ownership. The original had more worth than translation and translation were considered as a second-handed production which was valued if it was marketed in a large amount. The different approaches to translation developed but source text was superior to translation, and translations were specimens of the original texts. Finally, the Translation Studies is established as an academic field. Bayar (2007:3) mentions:

> "Its advocates positioned themselves against both linguists and literary scholars, arguing that linguists failed to take into account broader contextual dimensions and that literary scholars were obsessed with making pointless evaluative judgments."

The Translation Studies in the 1980s have been influenced by the postmodern theories which focus was on the function of the text. The contemporary scholars of the field have not been interested in the linguistic theories and concentrated on social, cultural, communicative practices, ideological significance of translations, politics of translation, translator's behavior and socio-cultural factors (cf. Schaffner 2004:136).

Many earlier trends in the Translation Studies have used the technical terms such as the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) which shows that the focus of translation theories have been on linguistics elements. Shifting focus from linguistic equivalence to the function of text brought a number of topics into the field which made the translation problematic and more complex. About the problem and complexity of translation Darwish (2010:153-4) maintains:

> "Throughout recorded history translation has been blamed for major distortions and deviations from the original message, in religion, politics, and

law, among other things. Certainly, translation plays a selective role in the transfer of science, literature, and art into receptor languages and cultures."

The issue of faithfulness, for many years, had been the concern of translation and regarded as a criterion for good translation which had turned translator into a copy device. Leppihalme (1997:19) argues:

"for years translations were considered as derivatives, copies, and translators as mechanical devices replacing linguistic elements, equivalents, from one language into another, and the translator's autonomy was always questioned, and is still being questioned, by those who thought of him/her as a monkey, with no choice save to make the same grimaces as his master."

Those ideas and idealistic beliefs were not changed until new thoughts emerged with the consideration of the target readers, unavoidable translator's subjectivity and the purpose and function of translation. Until recent years when, "the focus of attention has been shifted to the issue of translator's agency and subjectivity, and the notions of originality and (absolute) equivalence and also author's superiority over translator have been severely questioned" (Karoubi 2005).

Translation today is not seen as a branch of the Linguistics but it is an inter-disciplinary field which links two languages and cultures and it is regarded as a process and a product. The 20th century has become the great age of translation due to people moving through the world encountered the different languages and cultures and the need for translation are felt greater than ever before. Translation is then understood as a complicated activity with a much broader scope. Following the Manttari's (1984) translation action theory, "translation is viewed as a human activity having purposes and involving an intercultural transfer".

From the 80s, the Translation Studies has been developed very quickly and a number of related books and papers appeared in print or online every month faster than one could read. Robinson (1997:3) states:

> "In a field […] suddenly everyone has something exciting and innovative to offer and the translation is steeped in power relations, between men and women, between colonizers and the colonized, between academics and professionals."

The linguistic approach to translation which was dominated theory until the 1980s is faded because the discipline took the cultural orientation and the theories of translation have tended to fall into two categories: 1) pessimistic which sees translation as a failure and emphasizes on lost; 2) optimistic which acknowledges the difficulties but seek solution and views translation as a fundamental means to enrich the literary polysystem.

As a result, translation has become a useful means for linking nations and to be familiar with their beliefs, thoughts, religions and cultures. Gradually, translation began to play an essential role in the intercultural development and became a crucial component in the communication process. It, today, is an active process, transferring the intended meanings, creating the new form of thinking, reproducing the literature and keeping it fresh, a tool for negotiations among nations and bridging the gaps among cultures.

Dyson (2009:299) maintains "the rich diversity of this human community cannot be appreciated or even understood without the essential tool of translation".

Translation turns into the complicated activity bridging the gap between the cultures. It is worthy to be celebrated since it makes a nation to be familiar with the different

nations' culture as well as their heritage. Furthermore, it provokes the issue of globalization and the mono-cultural world in which people would have no understanding of his own heritage. But without translation, we would not be able to understand the culture of either neighbor or other nations.

2.1.2. Literary Translation

Literature is a nation's property which reflects the cultural, religious, ideological background as well as their identity. It is the reason that people are interested in literature and translation of literary work. So, the translation becomes a great task and even more when the literary translation is involved. Literary translation does not represent the original work due to the ideological or aesthetic issues. It is one of the translation categories and deals with the translation of books, plays, poems, short stories and other written or oral works such as jokes, documents, a travel guide and science textbooks. For Devy (1999:183):

> "Literary translation is a type of translation which distinguishes from non-literary translation in general. A literary translation must reflect the imaginative, intellectual and intuitive writing of the author. Little concern has been devoted to the aesthetics of literary translations because these translations are popularly perceived as unoriginal" (qt. from Hassan 2011:2).

Literary translation is a kind of creative task by which a work which is written in one culture and language could be recreated in other regarding the intellectual and intuitive writing and aesthetic. Moreover, in literary translation, the role of language is more beyond the communicative purpose. In order to change the common language into a literary one, the figures of speech should be employed by the translator. It is

where we reach to Frawley who maintains: "Literary translation mediates between a concrete text and a virtual text" (qt. from Venuti, 2000:258).

Classe (2000: viii), regarding literary translation, maintains "the translation basically refers to interlingual translation, and *'literature'* and *'literary'* tend to imply *'aesthetic purpose'*. The literary translation is read as distinguished from the technical translation."

For France (2001: xxi) literary translation is:

"Literary translations as translations *'designed to be read as literature'* and cites with approval Toury's distinction between *'literary translation'* and the *'translation of literary texts'*, the latter, nonliterary form of translation being described as informational."

Therefore, the literary translation should possess literary features and qualities and had to legitimize itself in the context of literary polysystem by concerning the significance of translations which reflects the ideas, attitudes, and values of the original. So, "literary translation demands literary translator who has to handle literary translation which is an original subjective activity at the center of a complex network of social and cultural practices." (cf. Baker & Malmkjær 2005:127)

The scholars such as Even-Zohar (1978) and Bassnett (1992) argue that literature, as tradition or system, is developed connecting to various languages and literary exchange through translations. Therefore, preparing for literary translation includes critical re-reading, understanding of source text, reading other work by the same author and intertextuality since it is a cultural and social practice. Bassnett (2005:86) argues:

"Within the field of literary translation, more time has been devoted to investigating the problems of translating poetry than any other literary mode. Rarely do studies of poetry and translation try to discuss methodological problems from a non-empirical position, and yet it is precisely that type of study that is most valuable and most needed."

Furthermore, research on literary translation provides evidence about the interaction of cultures, the problem of translating linguistic elements and the cultural-bounded items due to the literary translation traditionally was the source-target based. Baker & Saldanha (2009:154) put:

"The second approach to literary translation as a process is more theory-driven and maybe termed cognitive-pragmatic. The analysis of literary translation processes here may be informed by literary cognitive stylistics and the pragmatics of translation […] these studies attempt to model communication between source writer, translator-as-reader, translator-as-writer and target reader."

Literary translation does not concern the intended meaning and message of the original author but endeavors to connect linguistic and literary customs of receiving culture that to fit the foreign language and its own culture.

Obviously, language has various functions and uses i.e. literary and non-literary. So, the literary translation should reflect differences. Belhaag (1997:20) mentions:

"The characteristics of literary translations are including expressive, connotative, and symbolic, focusing on both form and content, subjective, and allowing multiple interpretations, timeless and universal. Moreover, literary translations must reflect all the literary features of the source text such as sound effects, morphophonemic selection of words, figures of speech" (qt. from Hassan 2011:2).

Literary translation is an action in a real-world context and deals with the real world issues such as subject-setting relationship: ideology, identity, and ethics (qt. in Baker & Saldanha 2009:155). The issue of equivalence is problematized in literary translation not "for lexis, syntax or concepts, but for style, genre, figurative language, historical stylistic dimensions, polyvalence, connotations as well as denotations, cultural items and culture-specific concepts and values". So, literary translating is not dealing only with linguistic considerations and a number of issues must be taken into account, otherwise, the translation appears abnormal to the target culture.

A focus on literary translation clarifies that literature overtly and covertly carries a number of factors. In other words, the nation's cultural and ideological background could be comprehended from their literature. In this regard, literary translation deals with culture as well as aesthetic issues and does not concern much about the author's intended meaning.

2.2. Translation and Culture

The new insights known as *'cultural turn'* emerged in Translation Studies by the end of the 1980s and in the beginning of 1990s, which created new perspectives on translation and translator as well. It viewed translation as a means of transferring cultural elements as well as linguistic ones and translator as a cultural mediator who exerts his cultural and ideological views in translation to create a meaningful work for receiving culture. In fact, the cultural turn was shifting focus from language-based translation to the issues such as culture, ideology, power, post-colonialism, gender, context, and discourse. Tymoczko (2000:34) stated:

> "Approaches pertaining to power and translation began to more sharply focus
>
> when Translation Studies took the *'cultural turn'*, approximately a decade ago,

and translation scholars began to privilege question of cultural context and cultural function, as well as, ideology and purpose, in descriptive studies of translations. The issues were also foregrounded when translation began to be theorized with poststructuralist approaches, showing how translation is a site of cultural production, a product of cultural discourse, but also a means of shifting discourses, a means available for the purposes of identity formation."

The term *'culture'* is a relative matter and has a vast scope which is closely linked with language. Hansen & Sperber (1987), Street (1993), NCCC (2010), believe that the base of culture is language and language has a basic role in the formation of culture and vice versa. In the next part, the relation between culture and language is discussed to see how language projects culture.

2.2.1. The Cultural Manifestations in Language

Language and culture are in a reciprocal relation and language can be seen as a verbal form of culture which affects and shapes the culture. There are different views about the relation between language and culture saying that without language, culture would not be possible. On the contrary, it is claimed that language and culture are not in relation and they can be analyzed separately.

For Cook (2003):

"Language is the most significant feature of a human being which is regarded as an integrated part of the meaning and thought. In fact, language is commonly used, to tell the truth, nevertheless, it should not be neglected that it is served to distort realities, construct people's worldview and to convince them to take a particular position towards the false facts through manipulating feelings, ideas, beliefs, and thoughts."

Therefore, language is a part of the culture and the speaker's identity which enables him to perceive the world or to manipulate the reality. Karamanian (2002:1) argues "since language is the only social institution without which any other social institution can function; therefore, it underpins the three pillars upon which culture is built."

In the same vein, Brown (2006:165) maintains:

> "A language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture. In a word, culture and language are inseparable."

Any culture has a certain form of language use to express itself. That is to say, culture could be communicated through language explicitly or implicitly. In this regard, Sapir (1956:104) insists: "every cultural pattern and every single act of social behavior involve communication in either an explicit or implicit sense."

Language is the means of the communication since people value specific things and act in a specific way. They use their language in a way that reflects what they value and how they act as well as their ideological, social and political views.

Furthermore, culture is reflected in language and culture could be seen through language. The relation between language and culture is like an iceberg. The small visible part is language and the great hidden part is culture. Many linguists explored the relationship between language and culture. For Jiang (2000:328), "language and culture are living organisms. Language is flesh and culture is blood. Without culture, the language would be dead and without language, culture would have no shape."

In the same way, Hongwei (1999:121), mentions that "language is the lifeblood of culture and that culture is the track along which language takes shape and develops." Nida, (1998:29) stated:

> "The language and culture are two symbolic systems. Every language form we use has meanings, carries meanings that are not in the same sense because it is associated with culture and culture is more extensive than language."

Language, like other aspects of culture, is acquired and shared by members of the society. Language reflects the different parts of culture, supports the other aspects of culture, spreads them and helps them to develop. Furthermore, textual meaning is interwoven with cultural meaning in a way that language could reflect, influence culture and is influenced by it. Larson (1984:432) mentions "language itself reflects various aspects of culture and culture affects the vocabulary which is present in the language."

Thus, language is a sign system having the cultural value which enables the speakers to identify themselves and distinguish themselves from others through the language use. Language symbolizes cultural reality through all its verbal and non-verbal aspects and determines the way one thinks and acts. So, the structure of language determines the worldview of its speakers. But Wardhaugh (2002:13) mentions language and culture are not a part of each other and they could be analyzed separately. In this regard, Kramsch (2003) mentions:

> "If speakers of two languages do not understand one another, it is not because their languages cannot be mutually translated to one another. It is because they do not share the same of viewing and interpreting events i.e. they do not have the same cultural background."

It is mentioned earlier that translation is not only dealing with written words and expressions of a language but culture as well. Translation involves transferring the cultural implications expressed in one language into the appropriate expressions of another language. It is because, if a text is loaded with cultural value, its translation must be with great care due to ideological translations would subvert the basis of culture. It is the reason that any literary polysystem has a cultural filter. Wardhaugh (2002: 225) notes:

> "People who speak languages with different structures (e.g. Germans and Hungarians) can share similar cultural characteristics, and people who have different cultures can also possess similar structures in language (e.g. Hungarians and Finns)."

Therefore, People by the same language mean different things in the different cultural context. For example, for European people, the term *'lunch'* would mean hamburger or pizza, but for the Turkish people, it will be different kinds of Kebabs. So, translation of a cultural-loaded text must be taken subtly and with more care.

2.2.2. Cultural Turn

During the 1990s the scholars of Translation Studies realized that in addition to the linguistic properties, various issues are involved when translating a text. The term *'cultural turn'* is used to show the shift of focus from language to intercultural analysis. It was a theoretical and methodological shift that in the early 1990s, achieved to drew scholar's attention such as Bassnett & Lefevere (1992), and Venuti (1992) claiming that "the limitation of linguistic theories was that they cannot go beyond language". Thus focus changed on the relationship between language and

culture since translation regarded as a cultural activity. Snell-Hornby (1990:84) stresses that:

> "The cultural approach also reflects a more general shift in epistemological stance in the humanities and beyond, from *'positivism'* to *'relativity'*, from a belief in finding universal standards for phenomena to a belief that phenomena are influenced by the observer."

By the emergence of cultural turn, translation is reconsidered as a tool for transferring the cultures and ideologies which are controlled by the translator, powerful individuals, and institutions. Trivedi (2005:3) stresses that:

> "The cultural turn also affected the domain of language by Saphir and Whorf hypothesis which explained that a language defined and delimited the particular world- view of its speakers […] and seems to support the view that the specificity of a culture was coextensive with a specificity of its language."

In the time of cultural turn, power became one of the key topics in translation and scholars began to establish new approaches to study issues such as context as well as purpose, function, and ideology. Gentzler and Tymoczko (2002: xvi) argue that the cultural turn could even be considered as a *'power turn'* and it is important to acknowledge that translation is not, and perhaps has never been, an isolated activity carried out independently of the power struggles within societies.

The cultural turn was a movement in Translation Studies which was in the forms of cultural studies, multiculturalism, and identity.

2.2.3. Culture in Translation

Translation has been playing an essential role in negotiation among human beings. It is presented in all communications invisibly and visibly which contributes to the

understanding of cultures and sub-cutlers of the world. Translation made cultural exchange possible throughout history due to connecting the nations. Snell-Hornby (1988:46) mention:

> "Language expresses the culture, so, translators expected to be bilingual and bi-cultural and to be familiar with two cultures in which they operate. Culture then is not a word, sentence or text but an operational unit of translation."

In this respect, translation became a tool to manipulate culture in order to make translation understandable for receiving culture which would be similar to already existing one. Translation influences and manipulates culture when the source culture is too far or there is a gap between source and receiving culture. Lefevere (1992:5) mentions:

> "Translations often operate under different constraints that include manipulations of power relations and aim at constructing an image of the source culture that preserves or extends the hegemony of the dominant one."

A number of case studies indicate that translations can be used as a cultural weapon in a struggle to break down the norms of an established system. For example, one could hardly call England early in the twentieth century a 'weak' nation (cf. Alvarez & Vidal 1996:120). Thus, cultural translation is a transforming process which compares cultures in order to transform source culture based on one's cultural knowledge and language. For Trivedi (2005:4) the most comprehensive sophisticated and influential formulation of the concept of cultural translation occurs in the work of probably the postmodernist theorist of our time.

The extensive domain of culture within Translation Studies is growing every day. Bassnett (2005:2) believes:

> "Despite the diversity of methods and approaches, one common feature of much of the research in Translation Studies is an emphasis on cultural aspects of translation, on the contexts within which translation occurs."

So, it can be concluded that translation is an act of transferring the cultural elements into the appropriate elements of receiving culture which is cultural decoding, recoding, and encoding. In this regard, Snell-Hornby (1988:41) mentions that:

> "The degree of probability for perfect translation depends on how far the source language text (SLT) is embedded in its culture and the greater the distance between the culture between SLT and target language text (TLT), the higher is the degree of impossibility."

Snell-Hornby further mentions "if the language is an integral part of culture, the translator needs not only proficiency in two languages but at home in two cultures. This *'at homes'*-ness would refer to a thorough knowledge of the culture and its nuances." (Snell-Hornby 1988:41)

Since cultural issues are involved in translation, the sociocultural role of translation must be taken into account due to translators are not only dealing with a text but sociocultural contexts in which a text is produced and interpreted. The sociocultural role of translation should be taken with great care since a text implies the different meanings in different contexts.

2.2.4. Sociocultural Role of Translation

Translation, for years, has focused on linguistic properties of the text. It is about few decades that linguistic approach to translation is slightly faded due to the interest of translation scholars in various issues other than language.

Nida & Taber (1982) put:

"In some case, the sociocultural role of translation is trivial due to that certain aspect of culture are universal and are not culturally bounded. Human experience is so much alike throughout the world. Everyone eats, sleep, works, is related to families, experiences, love, hate, jealousy, is capable of altruism, loyalty, and friendship, and employs many facial gestures which are almost universal."

One of the sociocultural roles of translation could be manipulation since translation entering within the literary polysystem of a society, manipulates language and thoughts. So, speakers of different languages think differently. In other words, languages direct speakers' attention to different aspects of the external world. Therefore, the role of translation is not simply transferring meaning into another language, but investigating the way of thinking of others as well.

Larson (1984:431) maintains:

"One language cannot express the meanings of another; instead there is a distinction between the meanings built in the SL and the meanings that must be captured and expressed in TL."

Regarding the sociocultural role of translation, it can be said that different societies interpret a text regarding culture, idea, tradition, customs, religion, and politic among the others. In translating a text, the way that people of source culture think must be regarded in order to interpret the text in an appropriate way. In doing so, the concept or reference of the lexical items of source culture should be studied carefully to transfer them into target language and culture.

Then, meaning is bounded to both language and culture and meaning can be culturally and socially conditioned since the translated text is further culturally and socially

conditioned. To put simply, language is a part of culture and translation as a sociocultural act links language with culture.

Language has a sociocultural role and translation as a linguistic activity plays the same role. Since language has different roles, a text has different interpretations in a different context. It means that society and culture are wider contexts in which a text is produced and taken meaning In this regard, Halliday & Hasan (1985:5-7) states:

> "There was the theory of context before the theory of text. In other words, context precedes text. The context here means context of situation and culture. This context is necessary for adequate understanding of the text, which becomes the first requirement for translating. Thus, translating without understanding text is nonsense, and understanding the text without understanding its culture is impossible."

Cultural develops and reforms language and language develops and reforms culture but these reformations and developments of language and culture take place through translation. It means that language could take different roles in different cultural contexts and consequently, translation plays the same role in target culture to convey cultural and linguistic meaning.

Thriveni (2001:43) states:

> "The understanding a message means interpreting it on the basis of the required background knowledge. If such knowledge is missing due to cultural differences, it should be supplied or compensated for. The cultural specifics influence the way the language units are used and understood. Culture finds its expression in the language and through the language. A linguistic theory of translation must incorporate the cultural aspect as well."

The study of meaning shows that how a culture affects language and its role. The cultural meaning is interwoven into the language in a complex way and translator should be able to capture and reflect them in translated work. Transmission of cultural meaning through translation is a very perplex task which demands a great deal of understanding of linguistic and cultural meanings on the part of the translator.

The sociocultural role of translation is undeniable since with no understanding of the message of original author no communication would take place. This understanding can be achieved through having background knowledge of cultures and languages. Therefore, translation plays a social, cultural and political role in any cultural context. Thoughts and insights of foreign author enter the receiving culture through translation which makes receiving culture familiar with the foreign customs, thoughts, and beliefs.

2.2.5. Cultural Implications in Translation

A translation like writing constructs reality for the audiences of receiving culture which has own system of meaning, thoughts, beliefs, values and ideas. Thus, translations could be seen as a threat to the receiving culture because the cultural implications in translation could be in various forms such as words and different ideologies and the way of thinking of other people.

James (2002) mentions "the cultural implications for translation may take several forms ranging from lexical content and syntax to ideologies and ways of life in a given culture."

In this regard, in Indian and Persian cultures, the plural form of pronoun addressing a single person could be regarded as respect. Singular cannot be substituted because there is a cultural value in the structure. As it is obvious, any social group has its own

specific language structure and language use which imply different cultural dimensions. So, translators need to understand cultural implications in order to understand a text and be able to transfer beliefs, attitudes, and values of the source culture. In some cases, cultural implications are not translatable because there is no cultural equivalence in receiving language and culture.

Adegbija (2004:50) stressed the speaker must employ politeness strategies when the addressee is an elder or his/her social status or culture is high. Thriveni (2001) argues:

> "Regarding social relationships, most Indians used to live with their extended families. For this reason, there are different words in all Indian languages to refer to each relation. There are words to address a wife's mother or father, a wife's sister or brother, a husband's sister or brother, a mother's sister or brother, and so on."

Therefore, translation involves alteration of lexical, syntactic elements and structure of TT to reconstruct the same features of a given text in receiving language. This strategic move denotes that ideology appears not only in translated text but in the grammar, style and the voice of the translator which is related to target audiences. So, the cultural and ideological implications exist implicitly in text and should be regarded by the translator.

Mohanty[1] (2015) mentions customs, tradition, religious elements, myths, legends are part of a culture and these issues vary from culture to culture. For instance, in a European marriage ceremony, kissing is a part of the ceremony but in India, it is not appropriate in public. Even showing feelings in public is offensive in Indian culture. Moreover, the meaning of different colors, in addition, varies from one culture to

---

[1] Professor Panchanan Mohanty, Department of Applied Linguistic and Translation Studies, Hyderabad University. The materials is obtained from discussions.

another. Black signifies evil and white represents purity in Indian cultural, but these colors probably have a different meaning in other cultures.

The cultural implications in translation is a complicated issue and translator must be familiar with various issues such as history, language, literature, religion, and intertextuality in order to convey the meaning of cultural elements in given text. In some cases, the translator must know the history of the country which translating from to understand the value of the cultural element. For example, a soldier's dress or his medal has more than culture value since they symbolize the issue of martyrdom which has different values among different nations.

So, it is not an easy task to convey the whole values of cultural implications in translation and it demands literary language and literary translation. Because literary language differs from non-literary language and literary translation pays attention to the translation of the culture implications and cultural-specific items. Therefore, a word or expression which is used to express a cultural phenomenon has a cultural implication. So, the problem appears in translation where there is a gap between the SC (source culture) and the TC (target culture).

Thus, it may be said that literary language consists of cultural-specific words which imply customs, beliefs, identity and shapes reality, and understanding these cultural-specific items are essential in translation. The counterparts of theses cultural-specific words translating to another language are called cultural equivalence which is discussed in the next part.

2.2.6. Culture and the Issue of Equivalence

Regarding the diversity of cultures and frequency of culture-specific words, expressions, idioms and a number of lexical and grammatical categories related to

culture, a good translator must be able to recognize them and translate them accurately into the target language i.e. to find cultural equivalences. It is worthy to note that in some cases, cultural equivalence overlaps linguistic equivalent.

For Baker (1998:77) equivalence is "the relationship between a source text (ST) and a target text (TT) that has allowed the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place."

Cultural equivalences are the components of any language and a good translator knows how to convey them appropriately to help his reader more clearly understand the intention of the foreign author. So, translator's task is to create the closest equivalences of foreign text in receiving culture in terms of content and function.

"One of the strategies to achieve 'equivalent effect' used in the latter situation is a translation by cultural substitution. This strategy is called cultural equivalent" (Newmark, 1988:82). It involves "replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning" (Baker, 1992: 30).

Baker (1992:31) further, mentions that "the term *'cultural equivalence'* gives the reader an insight by which he can recognize familiar and appealing things which have a similar impact on the target reader". Regarding aim of cultural equivalence, Zakhir (2009:8) maintains:

> "The cultural equivalence aims at the reproduction of whatever cultural features the ST holds into the TT. These vary from things specific to the geographical situation, the climate, the history, the tradition, and the religion, the interpersonal or inter-community social behavior. Actually, *'cultural*

equivalence' can be easily reached in case the cultural words under translation are universally known."

It is clear that *'cultural equivalence'* is the interpretation of cultural features of the source language into target language which contributes the reader to understand a foreign culture through his own culture and language. The cultural elements of a text may appear in different form in different contexts. Therefore, besides the understanding of cultural-bounded elements in translation in order to provide TT reader with a clear understanding, the cultural presupposition is essential as well.

2.2.7. Cultural Presupposition in Translation

The issue of presuppositions is vast and diverse which could not be discussed in detail but general remarks are discussed briefly in this part. In the last part, it is discussed that cultural differences and different lexical and grammatical categories of languages by which cultural implications manifest create problems in translation.

In fact, the *'cultural words'* are words or phrases which their translation is hardly impossible. It is because they are deeply rooted in source culture and the target language does not have equivalents for those words. So, their translation demands paraphrasing, inappropriate equivalent or even establishment of different lexemes in the TL.

The problem of culture and cultural words in translation can be solved by access to cultural background knowledge, but speakers of target language do not have access to this knowledge.

Members of a culture belong to the same linguistic community which shares many cultural issues and have much common knowledge about the cultural issues such as geography, history, climate, politics, economy, institutes, norms, and moralities

among the other factors. All these issues are the base of speakers' presupposition which enables them to communicate messages and understand it.

Access to cultural background knowledge will be possible through presuppositions and assumptions which are interwoven into ST and influence the perception of ST and structure of TT. Therefore, specific attention must be paid to the translation of presuppositions which results in an appropriate cultural or ideological translation.

Levinson (1983:9) identifies:

> "Presuppositions refer to those pragmatic inferences or assumptions which seem to be built into linguistic expressions and can be isolated by linguistic texts" and then he clarifies that the problem of presupposition is essential in both production and reception of a translation. But focusing on the presuppositions only could not yield an appropriate translation of cultural implications and translation supposed to preserve the importance of every ST constituents" (qt. from Ehrman, 1993:149).

For Pott (2013:2) "presuppositions of an utterance are the pieces of information that a speaker assumes or acts assuming that his/her utterance to be meaningful in the current context".

In this regard, Fawcett (1997:123) distinguishes two types of presupposition: "Presupposition could be linguistic and nonlinguistic. The former is related to linguistics presupposition and the latter to contextual and cultural one."

When you start taking a sentence apart to find out just what presuppositions it contains, you will find there are lots of triggers, both linguistic and nonlinguistic that show that when we talk or write we make a very large number of presuppositions. One reason for making the rather crude distinction between linguistic and

nonlinguistic presuppositions is to make the point that the latter are of most interest to translators (qt. from Fawcett 1997:124).

A presupposition is a shared assumption that creates the background knowledge and meaning. So, translating presuppositions violates the thematic meaning of the SL text and produces a text with a different information structure. Stalnaker (1972:387) mentions that:

> "The presuppositions are probably best viewed as complex dispositions which are manifested in linguistic behavior and one has presuppositions in virtue of the statements he makes, the questions he asks, the commands he issues. Presuppositions are propositions implicitly supposed before the relevant linguistic business is transacted" (qt. from Ostman & Verschueren 2005:61).

Chen (2008:83) states "the cultural presupposition is the cultural knowledge of source text that a target reader is assumed to have by translators. Translator constructs the impression on target audience by translating the cultural presupposition."

Translation of the cultural presuppositions is a major problem in understanding the different cultures and inappropriate translation of cultural presuppositions may result in intercultural misunderstanding. Ping (1999:133) mentions:

> "One of the reasons causing misunderstandings of ST is cultural presuppositions. He pays attention to the relation between a text (cultural) presuppositions and understanding that text […] a misreading by the translator will distort the source message and result in some form or another of communication breakdown between the source writer and the target reader."

For Nord (1997) presuppositional analysis is an intratextual factor for ST analysis. "Analyzing the presupposition, problems arise due to the differ cultural backgrounds

between the TT and the ST readers. The solution is to make a comparison of the intended functions of ST and TT, and then to sketch out the hierarchy of functions in the TT" (qt. from Munday 2008:85).

Linguistic aspects of a language allow an author to be more economical in writing and speaking. For instance, translating from Persian to English, it is not possible to translate a Persian word to an appropriate equivalence in English. However, cultural implications cannot be totally transferred to another culture through language and the presupposed information would not be available in the translated work. Regarding the issue, Fawcett (1997:125) concerns:

> "The translator may not share the presupposed knowledge, and if they must undertake research to acquire it, although in reality a lot of translation is done without it and also the translator must estimate to what extent the target audience is likely to share the presuppositions."

Therefore, preserving the ST presuppositions in TT is the matter of importance and contents of ST could be expressed through different structures. Gamal (2001:38) mentions:

> "The degree of proximity a translation may have to the original depends in large measure on the accuracy of relying not only on the conceptual/propositional meaning of the SL text but its thematic meaning as well. Failure to observe the distribution of information in terms of presupposed, given, or new information would result in some loss of meaning and inconsistency will the intentions of the SL text author."

It is not clear that presuppositional meaning is related to the semantic or pragmatic area. Leech (1981) argues "the relation is partly logical, and partly pragmatic, noting

that the area of presupposition is the area where semantics interacts with pragmatics."
Stalnaker (1974:387) concerns all presuppositions are pragmatic terms and states:

"I think all of the facts can be stated and explained directly in terms of the underlying notion of speaker presupposition, and without introducing an intermediate notion of presupposition as a relation holding between sentences (or statements) and propositions" (qt. from Potts, 2014:3).

Therefore, concerning translation and Chen's view, the cultural presupposition has an essential role in the creation of the notions which translators push to the TT readers. Potts (2014:4) believes:

"Although the label *'semantic'* suggests a clean split from pragmatics, even semantic presuppositions are pragmatic in the sense that they must be evaluated in the discourse participants' common ground."

It is a fact that insufficient background knowledge would result in great cultural misunderstanding for TT readers but a translator familiar with the cultural presupposition will be able to convey meaning and message successfully in translated work. However, in different circumstances, translators come to a number of cultural elements which cannot be translated properly or conveyed to the target texts. Baker (1992:259) point:

"The term *'presupposition'* is a pragmatic inference which related to the linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge that the sender of message assumes the receivers to have in order to understand the sender's message. For example, the sentence *'Bill's wife is beautiful'* presupposes the fact that he is married."

Translators must be familiar with cultural background knowledge in addition to linguistic knowledge. However, translator creates the same effect of foreign text to TT

reader and transfers the intercultural meanings through translation based on his knowledge of language, linguistics, extra-linguistic and culture. Therefore, the translator is cultural mediator whose role should not be ignored.

2.2.8. Translator as a Cultural Mediator

In the postmodern theories of translation, it is accepted that translation deals with two languages as well as two cultures and translator as a cultural mediator must know the different characteristics of cultural and linguistic elements of ST as well as TT, in order to make the ST suitable for TT reader. Until a few decades ago, the focus of translation was on text and translator's role was ignored due to translator was regarded as sort of copy device. Not only mediator was ignored but insulted in some case by different scholars. Leppihalme (1997:19) mentions in the past translators considered as "a monkey, with no choice save to make the same grimaces as his master".

The focus has changed from text to mediator due to many scholars have, besides textual consideration, interested in the mediator for whom, within what context, and how their work influences a society. The general approach in descriptive translation, today, focuses on mediators as human, not as an object and the translator's role is considered who mediates between two cultural and two languages as well, filling the gap between them. Bassnett (2005:4) maintains:

"In the 1990s two contrasting roles of the cultural mediator (translator) emerged. The translator is considered as a force for good, a creative artist who ensures the survival of writing across time and space, an intercultural mediator and interpreter, a figure whose importance to the continuity and diffusion of culture was immeasurable. The translator has the responsibility to work out

49

implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture as close as possible in order to create the TT reader same sensation as ST reader."

Most obviously, a mediator should be bicultural as well as bilingual since he mediates between two cultures and two languages in translation challenging to overcome the problems to transfer the foreign meaning. The process is problematic for translators since a cultural value in one society has no importance in other societies and the translator identifies the value system of source texts and transfers appropriately into target text.

There is the reason why Translation Studies focus on the translator as a cultural mediator is that Pym (2006:20) maintains:

"The vast majority of those books and theories, however, were fundamentally ways of studying texts […] texts were the thing. We moved from sociology of source texts to sociology of target-side effects, but little was said about any sociology of translators."

Another view is that translators are mediators who are *'privileged readers'* of the ST and unlike the common readers, the translators read closely in order to decode the ST and recode TT. Benjamin, (1992:77) argues "the task of the translator consists in finding that intended effect [Intention] upon the language into which he is translating which produces in it the *'echo'* of the original."

It is interesting that he uses the term *'echo'*. In fact, the translator produces an echo of the source text, not its originality. It means that we hear our own voices sent back to us. The voice is similar to what we utter but it is violated by who sends back our voice.

Unlike prescriptivism which concerns the text, functionalism focuses on translator's subjectivity in which has more freedom and more responsibility.

Honig (1998:10) asserts:

"Translators may be held responsible for the result of their translational acts by recipients and clients. In order to act responsibly, however, translators must be allowed the freedom to decide in co-operation with their clients what is in their best interests."

Honig (1998:12–3) further argues:

"In functionalism, the translator inevitably has to be visible, since functional approaches do not establish rules but support decision-making strategies and the translator has to make critical decisions as to how to define the translation skopos and which strategies can best meet the target recipient's requirements."

From the outset of translation to the end of the process which is considered as rewriting, the mediator deals with different problems which arise during the translation. Moreover, transferring the meaning of one language to another, translator actually takes many responsibilities. He becomes a mediator of different cultures, social norms, ideologies, and languages who should be able to resolve all problems. Lefevere (1992:24) believes:

"They (translators) possess the divine power of invention to a greater extent than other writers do. They have the grandeur of style, a magnificence of words, a weight to their sentences, an audacity and variety of figures of speech, and a thousand other highlights of poetry."

Toury (1995:241) adapted the norms as principles of human behavior and actions not only the linguistic structures. Accepting the issue of the subjectivity of translator would bring different views towards the translation i.e. the role of translators will change based on the skopos of translation. In this regard, Komissarov (1991:45) says:

> "They are missionaries rather than just translators: they want their translation to influence the receptors, to make them accept the translation as a sacred book, and to convert them or to strengthen their faith. The translator does his best to remove the cultural differences which may in any way alienate the receptors, hinder their understanding of the Bible's message, or prevent them from accepting the Book as their own."

Translator based on the *'Manipulation School'* is the target-text author who is free from a number of limitations but the translator must accept the consequences of his work. Toury (1999:19) points "it is always the translator herself or himself, as an autonomous individual, who decides how to behave, be that decision fully conscious or not."

"An awareness of the requirements of the skopos expands the possibilities of translation, increases the range of possible translation strategies, and releases the translator from the corset of an enforced – and hence often meaningless – literalness" (qt. in Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997:156). Therefore, "the translator becomes a target-text author freed from the limitations and restrictions imposed by a narrowly defined concept of loyalty to the source text alone" (cf. Schaffner 1998:238).

A good translator should be able to communicate ideas, emotions, and impressions which have not been expressed in the text but has been implicated. "A translator as a mediator has various roles. He embodies both the addressee of the original message,

and the addressee of the translated message; both interpreter and utterer; both the patient interpreting the primary sign and the agent uttering the translated meta-sign" (cf. Gorlee 1994:189).

To make it short, the role of the translator is to transfer the cultural elements of the source text in order to generate meaning in the target language. The cultural elements are related to history, literature, language, society, ideas, norms, religion, traditional, and customs. Since culture has been involved in translation, a text seems to be untranslatable and the issue of untranslatability is a matter of challenge for the translators.

2.2.9. Cultural Issues and Untranslatability

Untranslatability is a vast and ambiguous topic which generally arises from differences between cultures and languages especially in poetry when the sounds carry semantic values, untranslatability becomes a big issue because achieving full equivalence stands as a hindrance to the translator. It is the reason that it is claimed since the form contributes to the construction of the meaning so the poetry becomes untranslatable. To some theoreticians, the extent of untranslatability may extend to the plausibility of translation posing the question as to whether the translation is possible at all.

The term *'cultural untranslatability'* in translation is an issue to focus while discussing the culture in translation. However, it occurs in the linguistic level and is beyond the linguistics elements. Theoreticians, like Catford (1978) and Popovic (1976) tried to classify and deal with the problems arising from untranslatability. There are two kinds of untranslatability: linguistic and cultural.

Quine (1960) has dealt with indeterminacy in translation in some detail. He (1960: viii) considers:

"Language as a social art the acquisition of which depends ―entirely on intersubjectively available cues as to what to say and when. Hence there is no justification for collating linguistic meanings unless in terms of men's dispositions to respond overtly to socially observable stimulations‖."

Quine (1960:26) further mentions:

"The effect of this is reflected in that -the enterprise of translation is found to be involved in a certain systematic indeterminacy‖ and such -indeterminacy of translation invests even the question what objects to construe a term as true of. Based on the premise that ―language [is] the complex of present dispositions to verbal behavior, in which speakers of the same language have perforce come to resemble one another; not with the processes of acquisition‖."

So, untranslatability is more a philosophical question than a translational one. Catford (1978:93) maintains:

"The limits of translatability in total translation are, however, much more difficult to state. Indeed, translatability here appears, intuitively, to be a *cline* rather than a clear-cut dichotomy. SL texts and items are *more* or *less* translatable rather than absolutely *translatable* or *untranslatable.* In total translation, translation equivalence depends on the interchangeability of the SL and TL text in the same situation-ultimately, that is, on the relationship of SL and TL texts to (at least some of) the same relevant features of situation-substance."

Bassnett (2005:41) criticizes Catford saying "he does not concern the dynamic nature of language and culture and disprove his own category of cultural untranslatability." Hatim and Munday (2004:15) argue:

"The term is relative and meaning could be expressed across languages regarding linguistic differences in structure (grammar and vocabulary) of languages. They also mention that "but, for this to be possible, meaning has to be understood not only in terms of what the ST contains but also and equally significantly, in terms of such factors as communicative purpose, target audience, and purpose of translation."

Translating the cultural-bound elements entails a comprehensive and sufficient knowledge and understanding of both ST and TT language and culture on the part of the translator. Translators, in order to avoid the untranslatability, is required to understand the attitudes, cultural values and the sociocultural role of ST.

In the first place, it seems practically all of these sociocultural aspects could not be translated properly not because of the linguistic differences but the vast cultural and ideological differences between two languages and if the translation must provide the style, meaning, and aesthetic of one language, then, translation is a matter of untranslatability. It is in the case of poetry where the cultural issues deeply are interwoven with language.

The job, however, will be handled if the aim of translation is to create the general idea of a culture or ideology and only in this regard, the TL is not necessarily carrying all the meaning possessed by the SLT. But in different circumstances, the text is loaded with ideological implications and translator should go for a full translation. In translating the sensitive text such as holy books and or their exegesis, ideological

factors must be fully translated in order to satisfy the followers. This is a moment in translation that the ideology plays a great role and translator must find appropriate strategies to overcome the issue of untranslatability.

2.3. Translation and Ideology

The cavemen were battling for food and shelter with handmade war and hunting instruments such as sword, spear, and shield to defend them and to avoid the attack of other tribes. The modern man, today, battles for different issues with different means. Due to the multicultural and multilingual milieu of the world, one of the fighting means basically is translation. Translation is a linguistic and cultural transaction by which it is possible to influence a nation whose language is unknown. Moreover, translation is the best place to manipulate, violate and change a nation's culture along with the ideological systems.

That is why different areas have been involved in Translation Studies till today. With the advent of Functionalism in translation, the linguistic-based theories have been decreased and the postmodern approaches have emerged over the past decades which are related to different issues including power and ideology.

A nation's identity mainly depends on their ideological system which has been made based on their religious ideas, world views or beliefs and reflected, explicitly or implicitly, in their literature. In this regard, translation involves the transposition of the system of thoughts of a society which are implicated or explicated in one language into the system of thoughts of another society. It is where the ideology and its manipulation power enacted on translation.

The main policy of ideology is to exercise the power to control the translation process since the presupposition is that translator deals with written form of a text of a certain

time as well as ideology and the sociopolitical situation in which a text is produced and interpreted. In fact, nowadays, ideology and ideological factors are the main concerns of translation and Translation Studies. Moyal (2003) maintains translation like all cultural practice is subjected to political forces that govern all forms of exchange within a society and that set the norms of its discourse (qt. in Pym, 2006:85).

The issue of ideology is developed and introduced to Translation Studies which enabled scholars to investigate the translation phenomena from a different perspective. Ideology, today more than ever, is an unavoidable issue which has a great influence on translation. The main idea is that ideology makes an influence on all aspects of translation.

Lefevere (1992:2) believes:

> "Translation is not just a window opened on another world," or some such pious platitude, rather translation is a channel opened often not without a certain reluctance, through which foreign influences can penetrate the native culture, challenge it, and even contribute to subverting it."

Many scholars maintain that translation is under the ideological constraint and cannot be free from it. Hatim (2001:83-4) stress:

> "Ideology appears to be one of the crucial features of discursive expression, and the analyses of ideological structures have proved useful in providing insights into the study of language and discourse."

Therefore, ideology has a great role in translation process and translation is a tool for ideological manipulation. As an example, if a translator produces a text which cannot be considered as equivalence to the original at any level, he does so because he

probably is under the ideological constraints. The ideological issue in translation is connected to language, power relations, distortion, manipulation, and rewriting.

Gentzler and Tymoczko (2002: xviii) maintain:

> "This interest leads to the partiality of translation which is selective in nature including textual choices made by the translator since they create the image, function, and impact of the text in the target culture."

One of the earliest examples of ideology in translation would be the Romans who aimed at adapting source texts to the target culture and their particular needs (cf. Bassnett 2005:50). Especially in the 15th century, numerous literary texts were translated for the European nobility and purposely kept incomprehensible to the common people, as their status would not allow any knowledge of high literature. But Calzada-Perez (2003:5) argues:

> "The political definitions of ideology have also had a refracted impact upon other members of the language-related and TS academic community. These scholars realize the importance of the concept as a set of ideas, which organize our lives and help us understand the relationship to our environment. They contend that certain ideologies become naturalized or common, whereas others are pushed aside to the edges of our societies. For them, some ideologies are dominant, they are more useful to succeed in public spheres while others remain chained to domestic settings."

However, in order to clarify the role of ideology in translation, the present study has provided different notions and viewpoints of influential scholars of the field. But before starting the discussion about ideology and ideological factor in translation, it is essential to briefly discuss the various meaning of ideology. There are major

difficulties with the persuasive definition of ideology due to its numerical definitions within interdisciplinary studies. Indeed, the term *'ideology'* has various meanings regarding different disciplines but most of these meanings are incompatible with each other.

2.3.1. Ideology: Definitions and Insights

We create, distribute, and apply our ideology in all aspects of our life, whether consciously or unconsciously. Then, one could be called 'ideologists' who has understandings of politic but the problem of 'ideology' is that all members of society think they have one and even worse that they do not use with a precise meaning.

van Dijk (2003:6), regarding the definitions of the term, mentions:

> "The term *'ideology'* first used in 1796 by a French writer, Count De Stutt de Tracy to refer to a new rationalist *'science of ideas'*, from the 19th century onwards the term *ideology'* is adapted from French term *'ideologie'* which is a tool in the creation of identity. He mentions that ideology is dealing with the systems of ideas of a social group, which are the social, political and religious ideas. For him, ideology was just a general science of ideas (think, speak and argue), something that is called psychology or cognitive science"

"de Tracy used the term *'ideology'* in an attempt to create a systematic science of ideas, distinct from prejudices. That meaning of the term *'ideology'* is no longer of importance in contemporary debate" (qt. from Freeden 1998:685). Furthermore, ideology is a term that stimulates emotional responses. Freeden (2003:1) mentions:

"When people hear the word *'ideology'*, they think it deals with 'isms' such as communism, fascism, or anarchism. All these words signify ideologies, but a note of caution must be sounded."

Ideology has been defined differently in different areas of studies, such as Marxist "false consciousness", Althusser, 1984 "ideological interpellation of a subject through the state's ideological apparatuses", Seliger, 1976 "political belief system", Foucault, 1980 "effect of ideological discipline on the human body" to van Dijk, 1996 "organized evaluative beliefs" and Toury, 1999 "norms".

van Dijk's (1996) view is very similar to Toury's (1999) due to they argue the ideological realization is an appropriateness and correctness. It is noteworthy to mention that even these differences and discrepancies in definitions of ideology by scholars are ironically based on their own ideological positions. Robertson (2004:232-3) explains the term *'ideology'* as a complicated, but overly used the term in the social sciences which have endless meanings and sub-meanings in an academic and everyday discussion.

The term *'ideology'* would be rendered as *'worldview'*. In this regard, everyone could claim he has one without realizing attitudes and beliefs. However, if ideology is a worldview or set of beliefs which tell us what to do, then they are highly relative and subjective.

The general definition of the term *'ideology'* seems synonymous with the term *'culture'*. In this view, ideology means "a systematic scheme or coordinated body of ideas or concepts especially about human life and culture, a manner or content of thinking and characteristics of an individual, group or culture" (Webster Third New International Dictionary 1993).

Regarding the linguistic viewpoint towards the ideology, Wittgenstein argues:

> "Language was akin to a game, and a central characteristic of a game is that it has rules. From this others deduced that ideologies, too, are a form of language game, whose meaning and communicative importance can only be determined by noting their grammar (the fundamental structures and patterns of relationship among their components), their conventional employment in a social context, and the degree of acceptability of the rules by which they play" (qt. from Freeden 2003:43).

Therefore, ideology has its own grammatical features. Moreover, words and cohesion and coherence imply a specific meaning by which represent something more what their sounds and letters indicate.

"The term *'ideology'* has interacted with political connotation which inspires the negative meaning. It is regarded as a system of ideas and ideals, especially one which forms the basis of economic or political theory and policy. Ideology is acquired a negative meaning because it is related to society, group interest, political power, power relations, and dominance." (van Dijk 2003:6).

Beaton (2007:272) argues:

> "The traditional Marxist ideology which largely contributed to a negative understanding of the concept, defined as a form of cognitive distortion, a false or illusionary representation of the real."

Unlike Williams (1983:154) expresses "this negative sense has had a significant impact on the way it was studied. For example, in Marxist view, an ideology is a distortion of reality which is established in order to control reality and people." but van Dijk (2003:14) argues:

"Unlike common ground knowledge, ideologies are not sociocultural, and cannot be presupposed to be accepted by everyone. On the contrary, as is the case for attitudes, ideologies typically give rise to differences of opinion, to conflict and struggle. Yet, the same 'ideological group' may be defined precisely by the fact that its members share more or less the same ideology, as is the case for socialists, feminists or anti-racists as groups. There are of course subgroups with variants of the general ideology, and individual members of a group may again have individual opinions on certain issues."

In fact, lay-public think that the term ideology directly associated with the dominant power of the society and created by some political group for the purpose of spreading or maintaining their views over the others.

According to Abrams & Harpham (2015:204):

"Ideology is the beliefs, values, and ways of thinking and feeling through which human beings perceive, and by recourse to which they explain, what they take to be a reality. An ideology is, in complex ways, the product of the position and interests of a particular class. In any historical era, the dominant ideology embodies, and serves to legitimize and perpetuate, the interests of the dominant economic and social class."

For Bloor & Bloor (2007:57), it is a set of beliefs and attitudes consciously or unconsciously held by a social group. So, ideology is a set of beliefs and values which reveal the view of group or institution and contributes to their interpretation of facts. Freeden (2003:41) argues:

"Geertz's contribution to the theory of ideology was to grasp that ideologies were metaphors that carried social meaning. Put differently, they were multilayered symbols of reality that brought together complex ideas. Take an ideology that, for example, advocated the importance of the ballot box. That

concrete symbol could be employed as a rhetorical device locating ultimate decision making in the people, though democratic theory may suggest otherwise."

2.3.2. The New Concept of Ideology

The continuity in the changes of concepts through the history is an essential issue which should be considered and examined in various spheres of political, economic, social, cultural, religious and intellectual. These changes imply a clear break with the past and require new insights and definition of the topic in question to meet the new generation satisfaction.

There has been a difficulty for culture and critical theorists in deciding whether to draw on the notion of ideology which refers to discourse. This problem is related to the political climate of the 1990s in which many theorists felt comfortable to draw on the notion of *'Discourse'* than using the term *'ideology'*.

Fairclough (1989:93-4) argues:

> "Ideology certainly does not give the impression of having a single fixed meaning. Indeed, it is not unusual to find words like ideology described as *'meaningless'* because they have so many meanings […] in a small number of main *'families'*. The point to stress is that the variable meanings of ideology are not just randomly generated, but they correspond to different ideological positions and have been generated in the course of the struggle between these positions."

Ideology is viewed in more positive sense "as a vehicle to promote or legitimate interests of a particular social group rather than a means to destroy contenders" (Calzada-Perez 2003:5).

63

van Dijk (2003:7-8) declares: "ideologies are the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members". He further developed the conception of ideology in three general approaches:

a. "Ideology as False Consciousness or Misguided Beliefs

b. Ideology as a General Notion

c. Ideology as the Basis of Social Practices"

Munday (2007:196)

> "As a system of ideas of social groups and movements, ideologies make sense in order to understand the world (from the point of view of the group) and act as a basis for the social practices of group members. Often, ideologies emerge from group conflict and struggle, and they thus typically pitch Us against Them. However, ideologies cannot simply be reduced to ideological practices. In its negative meaning, by ideology, we like to refer to '*others'* not to *'ourselves'*. van Dijk says "Few of «us» (in the West or elsewhere) describe our own belief systems or convictions as «ideologies». On the contrary, Ours is the Truth, Theirs is the Ideology"

"Thus, ideology is not only *'irrational obedience'* beneath which critical analysis has to discern its true reasons and causes; it is also the *'rationalization'*, the enumeration of a network of reasons, which masks the unbearable fact that the Law is grounded only in its own act of enunciation" (cf. Zizek 2001:76).

Freeden (2003:5) regards:

> "Marx and Engels added to that view of ideology a further dimension, which was to be highly influential. They associated ideology and class, asserting that the ideas of the ruling class were the ruling ideas. Ideological illusions were an

instrument in the hands of the rulers, through the state, and were employed to exercise control and domination."

"Thus, based on the Marxists view, ideology interests in concealing the power relations in society and tries these relations to appear natural by achieving the consent of the subordinate classes, to establish the political control or hegemony. For Marxism, an ideology is a belief system, and all belief systems are products of cultural conditioning. For example capitalism, communism, religion, and environmentalism." (Tyson 2006:56).

Fairclough (1995:49) believes:

> "The concept of BGK reduces diverse aspects of the 'backgrounded material' which is drawn upon in interaction -beliefs, values, ideologies, as well as knowledge properly so called - to 'knowledge'. 'Knowledge' implies facts to be known, facts coded in propositions which are straightforwardly and transparently related to them. But 'ideology' involves the representation of 'the world' from the perspective of a particular interest, so that the relationship between proposition and fact is not transparent, but mediated by representational activity. So ideology cannot be reduced to 'knowledge' without distortion."

In political science or social psychology, ideologies are simply taken as a belief system in which allow people as a member of social groups, to build their own beliefs about what is good or bad, right or wrong and to act accordingly.

For Munday (2007:196) the term *'ideology'* was initially applied in a neutral way, but subsequently used in as "a Napoleonic negative, political sense and […] (Marxian) sense of false consciousness, which has generally negative connotation of distortion,

manipulation, and concealment"; unlike, ideology had other manifestations such as social and psychological. Ideology is not only for manipulation of those who are under its control (qt. from Freeden 2003:13).

By the term *'ideology'*, Lefevere (1992:19) concerns, "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." It is clear that many elements of his approach already mentioned by other scholars. Furthermore, he argues ideology is a function, group's interest, and self-serving. Its central role is to exercise power over other groups and hence a purpose for the development of ideologies.

Calzada-Perez (2003:4) quotes Eagleton (1991:30): "[Ideology is] ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interest of a ruling group or class by distortion or dissimulation."

Obviously, the new concept of ideology is not too far from earlier notions. Foucault (1979) mentions:

> "The notion of ideology appears to me difficult to use for three reasons. The first is that, whether wants it to be or not, it is in virtual opposition to something like the truth. The second inconvenience is that it refers, necessarily I believe, to something like the subject. Thirdly ideology is in the second position in relation to something which must function as the infrastructure or economic or material determination for it" (qt. in Mills, 2003:64).

To indicate the variety of meanings, Eagleton (1991:5) "lists sixteen categories which reveal differences in meaning and consideration namely; social value system,

meaning-making process, ideas, characteristic of a social group; ideas which contribute to legitimizing the power."

Hall (1996:26) defines: "by ideology, I mean the mental frameworks -the languages, the concepts, categories, the imagery of thought, and the systems of representation -which different classes and social groups deploy in order to make sense of."

Wodak (2007:1) referring to the modern definitions of ideology argues:

> "In the modern debate on ideology, two main argumentative strands or tendencies can be distinguished. One position argues that ideologies as false theories about reality can be overcome and replaced by scientific theories and/or scientifically founded agency; another (dialectical) position assumes that ideology is an unavoidable moment of all thinking and acting."

Ideology consists of the ideas, beliefs, actions and values which are held by social groups or classes and its power makes these ideas and beliefs to be accepted as true. Since human is an ideological animal, there exist an ideology behind any social phenomena such as living style, the manner of speak, clothing style, foods, literary production and translation in particular.

Therefore, if we reject the ideology of a group then we reject the idea of power, dominance, manipulation and subsequent inequality and subordination. But it seems impossible to reject the ideology by which a society reshapes the social values. So, the social values and norms are a product of ideology.

2.3.3. The Role of Ideology in Shaping Translation

As discussed earlier, Translation Studies declined the debates on the *'equivalence'* and started to concerns other influential issues in the meaning-making process and interpretation such as society, history, and culture, ideology, and power. It is noted

ideology not only affects the translation as a process and a product but determines who to translate what, when and how.

Ideology, among the other influential factors in translation, has achieved considerable attention. Since 1980 many researcher and scholars showed interest in the relationship of power, ideology, and culture (cf. Schaffner 2003, Calzada-Perez 2003, and Fairclough, 1997). Gentzler and Tymoczko (2002: xi) states:

> "With the arrival of new techniques for using mass communications for cultural control, practicing translators began consciously to calibrate their translation techniques to achieve effects they wished to produce in their audiences, whether those effects were religious faith, consumption of products, or literary success."

Considering translation as a communicative act, ideology operates mainly in constructing the text imposing assumptions on interpreter and text producer. So, translators manipulate the ST based on the patron's ideological perspectives.

The definitions of the term *'ideology'* have often been linked with notions of manipulation, distortion, and rewriting. In other words, the target text in most cases has undergone manipulation by ideology. The ideological manipulation in translation could be found in most of the earliest translations. For centuries, individuals and institutions have been applying their beliefs in translation.

The exercise of ideology in translation are as old as translation itself. A number of scholars agree that translation cannot be innocent mainly due to the assumption that almost all language use are partial and cannot be objective, neutral, and value free. Therefore, ideology functions invisibly in translation bringing new insights into the

Translation Studies and concealing, falsifying and violating the ST ideology. Fairclough (1989:77) maintains:

> "Ideology is most effective when its workings are least invisible. Texts do not typically spout ideology. They so position the interpreter or text producer through their cues that he brings ideologies to the interpretation of texts- and reproduce them in the process."

Translation Studies from ideological point offers new perspectives for scholars, critics, translators, and students. Munday (2007:195-6) believes that:

> "It is the negative connotation that Linguistics and Translation Studies are particularly interested in. The most scholars interested in the influence of ideology on language or, more specifically, on translation agree that the major problem with using the term *'ideology'* is its various definitions and wide-ranging scope."

Scholars interested in ideology due to linguistics approaches have focused only on textual forms and failed to address the concept of ideology for many years. Venuti (1998:2) argues:

> "In accounting for social values in translation and other aspects of language use resulted in developing a new trend of research called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) whose primary aim is to expose the ideological forces that underlie communicative exchanges."

CDA scholars such as Calzada-Perez (2003:2) point out: "the translation, like all the other forms of language use, is ideological. Thus, it is always a site for ideological encounters."

"Ideology consists of views and attitudes which are acceptable in a certain society at a certain time based on which translators and critics approach texts. The patron's ideology deemed acceptable and the translation is governed by patron which consists of ideological, economic and status components." (Lefevere 1992).

Lefevere (1992:39) maintains:

> "On every level of the translation, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or pathological nature, the latter tend to win out."

It could be concluded that ideology is a set of beliefs in various forms such as aesthetic, religious, and poetics which seeks to establish the power and dominance and translation is a place where those political and ideological acts take place. Fawcett (1998:109) names the Marxist-Leninist translation theory as an example from history, as it was aiming at ideologically refined translation strategies in order to exploit translations' full manipulative potential. Regarding the full manipulation potentiality of translation, Fawcett & Munday (2009:16) argue:

> "The essence of ideological intervention in the case of translation is that the selections made during the translation process […] are potentially determined by ideologically-based strategies governed by those who wield power.

Lefevere (1992:41) argues:

> "The ideology dictates the basic strategy the translator is going to use and therefore, dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the "universe of discourse" expressed in the original (objects, concepts, and customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in."

Therefore, all translations and translators are ideologically motivated since the choice of what, how, who, when and where to translate is determined by the patron. The ideology can be traced in all translations.

Translation scholars, who are willing to define ideology as a political issue, believe that translating is a political act. Tahir-Gürçağlar (2003:113) argues: "Translation is political because, both as activity and product, it displays process of negotiation among different agents. On micro-level, these agents are translators, authors, critics, publishers, editors, and readers."

Regarding politics, Victor Hugo (1802-1885) wrote: "when you offer a translation to a nation, that nation will almost always look on the translation as an act of violence against itself" (qt. in Lefevere, 1992:14).

2.3.4. The Ideological Involvement in Translation

The ideological views in translation imposed a sort of unconscious manipulation by translators to the translated text and the different political and cultural justifications, rewriting principles, and translation strategies implemented into translation by different dominant powers. It is created consciously or subconsciously an ideological interference which influenced translators in the first place and whole translation and meaning respectively.

Translation generally is an ideological-based and sociocultural bounded act and every original work, considering the intertextual view, could be a recreation of a recreation of a recreation. Gentzler (2002: 196-7) mentions:

> "There are translators who consciously manipulate texts in order to add their own world views and ideas to the text. Consciously or not, translators invariably conform to certain standards and differ from others. A source text

71

will always be more extensive and a translator has to make choices, as to how to deal with the *'untranslatable pieces'*. Consequently, translators *'filter'* foreign texts in order to make them more suitable9 for the target culture, as translators only rarely break with the norms of their society."

"Awareness of the complexity of the translation process and avoidance of the simplistic view which regard translation of political discourse as the mere process of transferring words from one text to another will result in realizing the importance of the ideology underlying a translation."

Alvarez & Vidal (1996:5) claim:

"This awareness will result in realizing the importance of the ideology underlying a translation. They argue that behind every one of the translator's selections, as what to add, what to leave out, which words to choose and how to place them, there is a voluntary act that reveals his history and the socio-political milieu that surrounds him; in other words, his own culture [and ideology]".

The dominant ideological system, as mentioned earlier, is sometimes the religious doctrines which in its turn interfere the process of translation. There have been many examples of religious and political interferences in the history. The Catholicism, for instance, became the only religion in the sixteenth century through the Inquisition in the Portugal. The Inquisition enforced the superiority of Roman Catholicism as the only true religion whose practices could never be questioned by any means.

One of the areas, that they were excessively controlling, was publication and publishers who needed a license to publish a book. Authors were not able to print a book without the license since the book has to be read and authorized by Inquisition

officials. This authorization had to be printed on the title page of every book published in the kingdom, which, in the eighteenth century, included colonies in South America, Africa, and Asia. Venuti (1998:67) argues:

> "In instances where translations are governed by the state or a similar institution, the identity-forming process initiated by a translated text has the potential to affect social morals by providing a sense of what is true, good, and possible. Translations may create a corpus with the ideological qualification to assume a role of performing a function in an institution."

Understanding the ideological systems which were organized around the political traditions is to identify their role in political life. In the example above, the manipulation reveals the norms exclusively created by the members of religious ideology i.e. the norms are ideological driven. The religious ideology through the norm-making process exercises its ideological qualifications on literary polysystem as well as other social institutions. Therefore, the ideological translation of literature must handle with care. Regarding the function of literature, Yan (1897) mentions:

> "The fiction's (literature) influence on men and its popularity far surpasses the classics and histories. It, therefore, has a hold on the thoughts and customs of people. We have heard that fiction had been helped to civilize Europe, America, and Japan" (qt. from Hung, 2005:29).

Furthermore, fiction is used to civilize people in the west. It is discussed that though no writing is neutral and ideologically free but even a literary work with full of cultural significance is banned by the dominant ideological systems and cannot be published. An example is a Persian translation of '*The Princess of Montpensier'*. It was a story about the French aristocracy during the wars of religions and focuses on a

young woman who is forced into marriage while passionately in love with another man. The translation of the book was banned by Nasir al-din Shah Qajar believing that the work has no literary Excellency and all translation removed from the public. One reason would be that Shah considered the work as inappropriate or unsuitable for the religious atmosphere of the time.

Regarding the ideology, translating is a risky act. Translators had to make decisions and apply different strategies in translation process in order to fit the work to the receiving society. In some cases, translators' views were far different from the dominant ideological systems, so, many books were translated by anonymous translators and invisibly published. For example, Monterio (2003) mentions:

> "The first Portuguese version of Robinson Crusoe, where many of Defoe's criticisms of Catholicism were simply omitted due to self-censorship of Leitao since he had experienced the previous conflict with the Portuguese Inquisition" (qt. from Pym, Shlesinger & Jettmarová 2006:67).

Monteiro (2003) regarding the translation, ideologically, being risky, mentions:

> "One of the most dangerous practices was to print forbidden books, then have circulated them in restricted circles in the country. Another was to place the printed pages of banned books between other licensed pages and send them to the colonies, where the Inquisition had greater difficulty inspecting the entire cargo on arrival and checking up what was being read over the whole territory. There, the separate pages would be made into books, which would circulate in restricted circles. However, these practices were not common" (qt. from Pym, Shlesinger & Jettmarová 2006:67)

Obviously, ideology has a fundamental role in translation practice due to its power to fulfill political purposes, controlling the literary polysystem, selecting the translator, selecting the texts, and spreading the translated work. Yan (2007:64) refers:

> "The translation of certain classics of Buddhist Scriptures has been forbidden in Tibet by Emperor *'Song Zhen-Zong'* at the end of *'East Han Dynasty'* because some content thought to be contrary to Confucianism's benevolence and forgiveness."

Ideology uses translation to impose ideas on the society covertly and overtly to succeed the hegemony and support for power exercise. It is noteworthy that translated text is a sort of text which represents a specific ideology for receiving society where most people do not know the foreign language. Therefore, only trusted and authorized translators are eligible to translate and the translated work must be check with the officials. It should be concerned that trust is invested on the producer of the translation, not in the work. Lefevere (1992:2-3) states:

> "Obviously, trust is most important where the most central text of a culture is concerned, a text invoked to legitimize the power of those who wield it in that culture. It may just be possible that the West has paid so much attention to translation because its central text, the Bible, was written in a language it could not readily understand so that it was forced to rely on translators to legitimize power. The other alternative was, of course, not to translate the central text at all, but to have those whose lives are ruled by it learns the language it is written in as in the case of the Qur'an."

The political and religious ideology determines the issues such as what to be translated, who to translate, why translating, how and when. In the confrontation between ethics of translation and ideology, it is clear that ideology wines and translators distort the message of the foreign text.

Gentzler and Tymoczko (2002: xix) mention this confrontation could turn out a very intricate task, taking into consideration the cultural complexity inherent in translation.

Juan L. Vives quoted Quintilian with approval advice that "when we translating from Greek we should not follow that language in all things, especially not when they want to use their words to designate our things" (qt. from Lefevere 1992:46). But Darwish (2010:154) argues:

> "The people who solely rely on translation for making decisions have the right to receive the correct information, and those who provide such information through translation have the legal and moral obligation to provide a safe translation that does not cause harm or injury or result in legal lawsuits and penalties. They have the obligation to transfer knowledge undistorted, or uncompromised, and with its potential benefits and risks. In this connection, ideology plays a major part in translation."

Yang (2007:39) shows "the ideologically-constrained shape of literary translation through the case study of Evan King's translation of Xiangzi's *'Rickshaw boy'"*. To support the claim, he mentions:

> "Among the most significant reasons for Evan King choosing Xiangzi to translate [is] America's good wartime relationship with China and the ever-increasing American appetite for Chinese news in the 1940s."

The suitable example is the translation in the post-colonial era. In postcolonial theory, translation always carries from the colonized literature to the colonist language. In this process, the translators put whatever they wish into the translation.

The acceptance of new ideologies entering a society seems challenging for the dominant ideological systems but is suitable for TT readers. When a culture is in the

crisis, the TL readers accept different ideologies in order to renew or reform their own ideology. So, it is the time that translation can succeed the readers and patron's acceptance and gains the first position of literary polysystem.

Translation is subconsciously under the influence of ideology or set of ideologies interprets a text or studies the elements, particular vocabularies and grammatical structure. Bassnett & Lefevere (1998:136) stresses: "Translation, of course, is a primary method of imposing meaning while concealing the power relations that lie behind the production of that meaning."

Since translation imposes meaning and conceals power relations, it could be said that translation not only is political as well as biased and partial. Tymoczko & Gentzler (2002: xviii) argue "partial nature of translations is what makes them also an exercise of power". The partiality of translated texts is often hidden because in general the translator remains unmentioned and transfer processes unnoticed and power can be efficiently exercised. Munday (2007:197) mentions "it is very complicated to determine as to how far the translator has been ideologically influenced when doing his job, as the results may be very subtle and remain concealed until the ST and TT are confronted."

As discussed earlier through the history, the political and religious ideology interferes translation at all levels. The Elizabethan Era in England is a suitable example to illustrate how ideology can influence translation policies. The translation was purposely used for the enrichment of the English language, which at that time was considered not eloquent compared to some of her European sisters.

The ideological interferences are very bold in translation especially when the political issues are involved. These sort of translations often undertaken by trusted translators.

Munday (2008:152) states:

> "Any study of the translation into English of political texts from Latin America must inevitably take into account the relative strength of the two languages and most particularly the power of the United States that lies behind the English language. This is especially important when the translated text itself deals explicitly with power relations within the Americas."

In fact, the ideological or religious interference must not be regarded negative since a literary work aims at the violation of a nation's ideology, worldview, thought, beliefs and identity. The Japanese translator of Salman Rushdie's controversial work, *'The Satanic Verses'*, was assassinated and then other publishers refused to release the translation of the book. In the case of Iran, the work sparked the public outrage and Imam Khomeini (mercy upon him) also sentenced him to death, when Imam considered his controversial novel as *'The Satanic Verses'* as blasphemy and the translation of the book is banned.

The translation and sale of books of Aziz Nesin are banned in Turkey. He was a Turkish writer, humorist, and critic of Islam. In the early 1990s, he began a translation of Salman Rushdie's controversial novel, The Satanic Verses. This provoked outrage from Islamic organizations, who were gaining popularity throughout Turkey, who then tried to hunt him down.

The issue of ideology in translation is a debate ground for scholars and they investigate the topic in question from different perspectives. Concerning the above-mentioned examples, some factors in translation such as purpose or aim (skopos), the TL readers, the media, and the status of the translated work are under the control of ideology. Nord (2003:111) believes:

"Almost any decision in translation is – consciously or unconsciously – guided by ideological criteria. Ideological factors are very decisive in defining the translation Skopos (target-text intended purpose) and selecting the functionally appropriate strategies by the translator."

Munday (2007:197) examined the position of ideology in Translation Studies and its link to manipulation and power relations. He revealed that the ideological effect on translation comes from the translations of speeches and political writings. As an example, he had interviews with revolutionary leaders in Latin America, such as Castro, Marcos, and Chávez.

Another debatable area that ideology exercises its power is the translation of sensitive texts. Translations are always *'interpretations'* which give *'the meaning'* of the sacred text; they cannot replace the original. In the Christian religion, God's word is embodied in Jesus Christ. The Bible is God's word written down by humans in Hebrew (Old Testament) and Greek (New Testament). Jesus himself not only allows but even demands that God's word should be translated.

An important role in the history has been played by the translation of religious texts. Such translation may be influenced by the tension between the text, dominant religious group, and the religious values. For instance, some of the Islamic scholars forbade the translation of the *'Quran'* believing that "The *'Quran'* is God's word, which is 'too big for human language" said Hussein Abdul-Rauf. The term "God" is not a suitable equivalence to "الله" since the Arabic term has very broad and various ideological, religious and cultural implication.

Centuries ago, in ancient Persia, in the Zoroastrian period, priests or Mogis disagreed to translate the Avesta. They believed translation reduces their strength and primacy.

They were authorized to unveil and hide what are they wanted. Kelly (1998:57-9) explores:

> "How decisions taken in the solution of translation problems can introduce ideological elements, in particular positive Self and negative Other representation, which reproduce and reinforce myths or stereotypes existing in the target culture regarding the source culture, […] by painting a negative image of foreigners and other countries, (*as a result of political-ideological manipulation of the ST*) the target culture is created with a superior image and thus "encourages nationalistic feeling which assures consensus."

Thus, the translation could be regarded as a means of transferring ideological norms rather than poetics norms. Translation contributes the dominant ideological systems enforcing specific ideological views to society and translators who spread these views. Davies (2003:77) believes:

> "When simple preservation of the original [cultural specific item] may lead to obscurity, the translator may decide to keep the original item but supplement the text with whatever information is judged necessary. This strategy of adding notes which are used to supplement extra information for the clear and adequate understanding of the translated text is also ideology-bounded" (qt. from Chung-ling 2010).

Therefore, translating the cultural references has no stability since the dominant ideological system has its own style of manipulation and shed light on the translation process, shape the translators' cognition and further govern their decision-making.

2.3.5. The Position of Ideology in Translation

It is discussed that ideology exists at any level of translation such as translator's behavior, the choice of words, the structure of the text and what, when, who to translate. The position of ideology in translation, according to Tymoczko (2003:182): is:

> "A combination of the content of the source text and the various speech acts represented in the target text […] layered together with the representation of the content, its relevance to the receptor audience, and the various speech acts of the translation itself addressing the target context, as well as resonance and discrepancies between these two utterances."

She further explains that "ideology resides not in the translated work, but in the translator's voice and stance and in its relevance to the TL audience. Since ideology could be covertly exercised in the text, words, and grammar, it could be concluded that any word choice or grammatical structure of the text is ideological" (Tymoczko 2003:182). Schaffner (2003:23) explains:

> "Ideological aspect can […] be determined within a text itself, both at the lexical level reflected, for example, in the deliberate choice or avoidance of a particular word […] and the grammatical level (for example, use of passive structures to avoid an expression of agency). Ideological aspects can be more or less obvious in texts, depending on the topic of a text, its genre, and communicative purposes."

These deformations and violations are based on the linguistic differences between languages but in most cases, all manipulations are ideological regardless to linguistic and cultural differences between ST and TT. Bassnett (1998:78) states:

"But this would be acceptable compared to Edward Fitzgerald's "infamous comment" on the liberties he had allowed himself to take with his version of The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayam really [they] need a little art to shape them."

English as a language of imperialism, is a means of power and the West via its language poses its superiority to the world's literary polysystem. Today, acceptance of a work is subjected to the English language i.e. should be written in English. Language, of course, is not the problem but ideological views that this language imposes are. Lefevere (1992:14) argues:

"Language is not the problem. Ideology and poetics is, as are cultural elements that are clear or seen as completely 'misplaced' in what would be the target culture version of the text to be translated. One such element is the camel dung mentioned in Labid's qasida, which can hardly be expected to make a 'poetics' impression on Western readers."

It is a shock in the modern era that even awarding a global prize for a literary work is based on the ideological interference, i.e. the winner should write for the dominant ideological system of the world and his idea must be along with their ideology. The devotion of Nobel Prize to an Arab author Naguib Mahfouz shows the ideological attitude of West. Thomas (1998:105) mentions the reason that a prize devoted to an Arab:

"The prize clearly supports the view of a literature dependent on the West for its forms. In this regard it is interesting to consider Naguib Mahfouz – the only Arab writer to have been given the full western seal of approval […]. He worked as a censor throughout the Nasser and Sadat eras, eras are not noted for liberal attitudes to the arts or critical awareness."

Ideology could be regarded as a core of translation which cannot be separated. In one hand, this is due to that ideology is hidden in the linguistic form, and while transferring from one language into another, the language is an influential means for ideological operation. On the other hand, ideology enters translation to control, supervise, misplace, violate and manipulate. In fact, ideology exists in every part of the literary polysystem from the beginning of translation to the end.

2.3.6. Ideology and Discourse

There are a few newly debates on language and discourse and different schools look at the topic from different angles. Based on deconstructionism, there is nothing outside the text. It is noteworthy that language has an important role in the transferring of ideology. Since the language and discourse are inseparable, thus concerning the language it is necessary not to ignore the concept of discourse. Through discourse, ideology makes sense and could enact its intentions since language is the birthplace of ideology and ideology influences language and discourse as well.

Regarding the cultural studies as an academic discipline and concerning the language as a core part of culture, many scholars came to investigate the relation of ideology to discourse and language. Olohan (2004:148) "referring to Roger Fowler's idea maintains: the lexical and grammatical options are available to language users and the choice of one option over another may be an indicator of ideological stance."

At the end of this chapter, discourse is discussed and some definitions are provided. Relating the term to ideology, Macey (2000:100) defines discourse as:

> "The discourse used to describe any organized body or corpus of statements and utterances governed by rules and conventions of which the user is largely unconscious."

The term *'discourse'* has become a near-synonym for *'ideology'* and as Fairclough (1992:8) states "discourse constitutes the social. Three dimensions of the social are distinguished knowledge, social relations, and social identity and these correspond respectively to the three major functions of language. Discourse is shaped by the relations of power and invested ideologies". Kress (1985), mentions:

> "The social aspect further is a mode of talking. In essence it points to the fact that social produce specific ways or modes of talking about certain areas of social life, that is, in relation to certain areas of social life, it will produce a set of statements about that area that will define, describe, delimit, and circumscribe what is possible and impossible to say with respect to it" (qt. from Lang & Hatim 2000:178).

Undoubtedly, ideology has a discursive dimension since discourse plays a crucial role in the development, expression, and reproduction of ideology in the society. Similarly, ideology is one of the notions that influences discourse structures. So, a thorough analysis of the discursive expressions would give substantial clues about the prevalence of ideology in language. This analysis could be made at a number of levels such as the lexical, grammatical, syntactic and semantic level.

2.3.7. Translation as Rewriting

Based on the deconstruction view, it is difficult to categorize and separate the source text from target text or language from meaning. It denies the view of independent language or beings original. Therefore, the translated work is a sort of rewriting or

translation of an earlier translation and translated words, are *'material'* which represent nothing but other words.

Translation has always served a special purpose for a certain force, power, and group. Based on this view, some scholars concern translation as a rewriting or textual manipulation. But there is no general agreement that to what extent the rewriting is permitted in practice. The idea of rewriting for translation was developed by Lefevere (1992:12) who concerned that "translation is under the influence of particular norms of systems in a society including patronage, ideology, poetics, and the universe of discourse."

Lefevere's (1992) rewriting model could be regarded as a supplement to the Polysystem Theory of Even-Zohar (1978), which is based on the literary theories of Russian formalism. The literary polysystem theory shows that different kinds of literature such as translated and non-translated works compete for dominance. Lefevere (2005:28) argues:

> "Translation is as important as original writings in the establishment of the poetics of a literary system. It plays an important part in the evolution of the literary system, because the struggle between rival poetics is often initiated by writers, but fought and won or lost by rewriters."

In the translation process, the choice of the works to be translated, how to translate, and the guidelines and goals of the translation activity are set by certain forces. As stated by Alvarez & Vidal (1996:4):

> "Translation is not the production of a text equivalent to another text, but rather a complex process of rewriting the original which runs parallel both to the overall view of the language and to the influences and the balance of power that exists between one culture and another."

Furthermore, translation is a form of rewriting due to that ideology exercise certain constraints and control. This is why Lefevere (1992) moves away from polysystem and considers "translation as *'rewriting'* and concerns the role of ideology, poetics, and patronage in the translated literature. Therefore, the function of translation is rewriting the foreign text in the receiving culture, in accordance with the system of the society."

Lefevere's (1992) model is target-oriented and sees translation as a cultural product and output of the receiving system. He (1992: vii) introduced the rewriting theory stating that translation is on the base of foreign text that aims to adapt the foreign work into a certain ideology of a different system. It is under the certain constraints such as ideology, patronage, and poetics and initiated in order to succeed certain purposes. Lefevere (1992: viii) believes:

> "Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society introducing new concepts, new genres, new devices and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of shaping power of one culture upon another."

Translation as rewriting manipulates the literature in order to function in a given society and culture to perform in the service of power. Although the positive aspect is to help the evolution of the literature and a society introducing new concepts, genres, and devices but oppositely, it represses innovations, distort and does manipulation of all kind. Lefevere (1992: vii) points that:

"The study of rewriting and also manipulation processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards the greater awareness of the world in which we live. Rewriting is of a great significant in translation and has a drastic influence on it. It is believed that rewriting is productive in cultural studies which can improve the translator's statutes and help to promote the integration of the theory and practice of translation."

Lefevere (1992) and Levy (2000) insist that "translation is not done in a vacuum but is a kind of rewritings and a decision process influenced by certain factors such as linguistic, ideology and poetics. Lefevere, by proposing *'Rewriting Theory'*, focuses on ideological dimensions in translations". He investigates "translation as an influential form of rewriting and concerns issues such as power, ideology, and manipulation." Lefevere (1985) before proposing the concept of *'rewriting',* had developed the concept of the *'refracted text'* that refers to texts that have been processed for a certain audience or adapted to a certain poetics or certain ideology.

On the issue of *'rewriting'* and *'refract'*, Hermans (1999:127) mentions:

"The terms *'refraction'* and *'rewriting'* are closely interrelated, and they shall be used interchangeably in this study. Here *'refraction'* is the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience with the influencing the way in which that audience read the work."

"By *'rewriting'* Lefevere (1992) refers to any text productions under the basis of other text in order to adapt at the original text to the certain ideology or to the certain poetics and usually to both. As an example, the abridged and edited versions of classics could be a concern as forms of refractions" (qt. from Gentzler 2002:137). In this regard Hermans (1999:126) states:

"Lefevere developed his idea about systems and the role of *'rewriting'*, the idea that society is viewed as a conglomerate of systems, of which literature is one. This literary system possesses a dual control mechanism. One mechanism governs it largely from the outside, and defines the relations within the environment, where the keywords are patronage and ideology."

Ideology as a phenomenon is prevalent in any society and institutions which influence the individuals. Lefevere (1989:56) points "those who feel unhappy with the ideology and/or the poetics of their own system will plan to use (rewrite) elements taken from the other system to further their own ends" (qt. from Fung 2005:122).

Lefevere (1992:4) further mentions:

"Translation no longer functions as lower activity within the wider framework interactions of professionals and nonprofessionals reader and between institutions and society at large. And types of rewritings are considered as activities of *'ancillary'* kind and they play an enormous impact on their literature and society."

Rewriting unmistakably occupies a dominant position on issues such as power and manipulation and Lefevere & Bassnett (1992: vii) argue:

"[Re] writing is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power. In this sense, rewritten literature turns into an instrument of power. The role of translation or rewriting, today, is much prominent due to that most of the lay-public could not read the literary works in their original format or as written by their writers but as rewritten by their rewriters."

For Lefevere (1992:3), "translation links literature to the nonprofessional readers. He gives an example of reading Bible saying that in the past, more people read the

88

authorized versions than in its various original languages. Very few people had access to the actual manuscripts of the classics and most readers were content or had to be content reading them in the edition."

As mentioned earlier, the translated works achieve the central position of the literary system, today, nearly all of the nonprofessional readers expose to literature by their translation. Lefevere (1992:7) reminds:

> "Since rewritings have a negligible impact on the evolution of the literature in the past, so the study of rewriting should not no longer be neglected. Those engaged in the study will have to ask themselves who rewrites, why, and what circumstances, for which audience. Studying rewriting processes will not teach students how to write well, but it will make them aware of other agents' possible manipulations and how to deal with them in order to alleviate their influence."

Munday (2007:197) argues: "translation is, if anything, rather a *'misrecognized'* form of rewriting, as it is very complicated to determine how far and in which ways the translator has been influenced when doing their job". The rewriting is under the influence of ideology which can affect the source text. Regarding translation, ideology forces translators to manipulate the structure, text or discourse, to misplace meaning, hide information, and violate message and the professional translators in the totalitarian system are supposed to share the patron's ideology.

"Translation is rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way." (Lefevere 1992).

Lefevere (1992: vii) maintains:

"Rewriting can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulation process of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live."

Obviously, translation is an ideological product that is determined by two fundamental factors such as ideology and poetics. Ideology dictates translation selection and translation strategies to some extent. Lefevere (1992) insists that "translation is a rewriting which manipulates literature, whatever their intention, reflecting a certain type of ideology and a poetics to function in a receiving society."

He (1992:7) further argues:

"If some rewritings inspired by ideological motivations or produce under the ideological constraint […] rewritings are inspired by poetological constraints. The combination of ideological and poetological motivations/constraints is at work in the practice of rewriting. Rewriters produce the translation usually to make them fit with dominant, or one of the dominant ideologies but different interpretive communities that exist in open societies will influence the production of the rewriting."

Translation is a sort of rewriting with the intention of influencing the audience according to the system of ideology. Lefevere (1992:9) gives a reason and argues:

"You either rewrite in accordance with the prevalent poetics or ideology of a given time and place or operate outside the constraints and rewrite in such a

way that your work will be at odds with the dominant poetics or ideology. Therefore, no matter if it is done consciously or unconsciously, rewriting is a manipulative and effective strategy, because, after all, it involves interpretation, alteration, or manipulation of the source text in one way or other."

From the above discussion, it could be concluded that translation is a rewriting for under the ideological constraint, competes for dominance and first position in the literary polysystem. Furthermore, it is a discursive manipulative act which endeavors to achieve certain objectives under the certain constraints. Finally, it creates a discourse with an ideological qualification in order to function in an institution.

2.3.8. Patron and Patronage

Obviously, whenever the ideology is discussed in translation, the issue of patron must be involved. Ideology as a means of power is in the hand of patron or patrons. A patron could be a publisher, media, newspaper, political party, and the royal family. Patrons control translation process but leave poetics of translation to the translators. Alvarez & Vidal (1996:6) state: "translators as being constrained by, for example, feelings of superiority or inferiority, their own and common ideologies, prevailing rules of poetics, dominant institutions' expectations, and the public opinion".

The patron (publishers or editors) plays an influential role in translation since they select the works to be translated, commission the translation, handle the economic issues, and often dictate strategies and method. Hence, Venuti (1998:21) says: "that agents, sales teams, and reviewers play a huge role in determining whether a translation will be read."

To put simply, specific individuals or institutions exercise ideology and have a great impact on translation and translator who are called patron. Lefevere (1990:15) mentions that:

> "Patronage is usually interested in the ideology of literature than its poetics and it could be said that patron delegates the authority to the professionals where the poetics is concerned. In fact, patrons count on these professionals to bring the literary system to the line with their own ideology. Patronage could be exerted by a person and also by a group of persons, religious body, a political party, a social class, a royal court, publisher and least, not last media, newspapers, magazines and large television corporations."

The patronage as a power factor controls the literary system which could hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature. Lefevere (1992:15) mentions "power inspires the negative meaning" but it in Foucaultian (1980:119) sense "what make power hold good, what makes it accepted is the simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as force that says no, but it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge and produces discourse."

Venuti (2008:15) mentions that:

> "Yet, it is not the translator alone who exercises manipulative powers. In addition to the textual level of translation, all processes related to translation, such as the choice of texts, editing or reviewing, are exposed to manipulations by the relevant institutions."

Consequently, the translated text offers a capacity of manipulation by a number of agents which are ideology, patronage, and poetics. Patrons have the ability to accept a translation or reject. Further, the *'reader'* as a factor is influential and can affect

translation. Readers could accept or reject translations. The relationship between translators and readers is complex and interrelated in which the role of the reader is significant if the marketing is involved.

The issue of the market for translation is another influencing factor which influences the patron's entire choice of what to be translated. So, the TT reader is influential and decision-making process also depends on the readers' ability or willingness to accept or reject of what is the matter of taste for society.

"A literary work, as an artifact, only comes to life as an aesthetic object when a reader responds to it when it serves as a stimulus in an actual communication process. The reader's role is, therefore, vital." (Hermans 1999:63)

Herman (1999:64) mentions:

> "Within the descriptive paradigm, Lefevere, in particular, went further and began to explore the embedding of translations in social and ideological as well as cultural contexts. His keyword was *'patronage'*, which he understood in a broad sense as any person or institution able to exert significant control over the translator's work. Since patrons were generally driven by larger economic or political rather than by purely cultural concerns, Lefevere claimed that what determined translation was firstly ideology and then poetics, with language coming in third place only" (qt. from Fawcett & Munday 2009:94).

Based on Lefevere's (1992:41) view, two factors determine the work of a literature in translation such as ideology and poetics. "By ideology, the political sphere is not concerned but it is a network of form, conventions, beliefs which order our actions.

Patrons try to regulate the relationship between the literary system and other systems which make up together a society." The patron basically consists of three elements:

a. The *'ideological component'* which controls the selection of form and subject

b. The *'economic component'* is a financial relationship between patron, writer, and rewriter by which the translator agrees on the patron's conditions

c. The *'component of status'* refers to the prestige and the status of translator that to which group a translator belongs to

Lefevere (1992:5) distinguishes between two major constraining factors, the prevailing poetics and existing patronage in a society. "The poetics are determined by professionals of the literary system, such as critics, reviewers, teachers, and translators, and try to control the literary system from the inside within the parameters set by the second factor". Lefevere (1992:5) introduces three types of ideologies such as 1) The translator's ideology; 2) The ideology of patronage, and 3) The ideology of the target audience. Fawcett (1998:106) argues:

> "Translator is unaware that their belief and value system is being conditioned by one patron and ideology, and they become a blind tool to establish or maintain a particular ideology. Nonetheless, simply by reading a translated text it is hard to tell whether the translator's choices are ideologically motivated or simply a matter of taste."

Translations have not only shared by TL readers with similar ideologies and cultural background but patrons apply translation as a tool for strengthening the dominant ideological systems. Lefevere (1998:19) mentions:

> "Patrons also can manage the publication of translations if they consider it acceptable and they can also quite prevent the publication of translations they

do not consider so. Translators tend to have relatively little freedom in their dealing with patrons, at least if they want to have their translations published."

Obvious, translation parameters are set based on the patron's objectives to legitimatize the patron's status and power in the society. It seems that patronage is a far more complex concept and is subjected to detailed scrutiny. Lefevere (1992:15) states:

"Patronage as powerful people or institutions, such as religious bodies, political parties, a royal court, that exercise their power to 'hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature' to some extent. Patrons try to regulate the relationship between the literary system and the other systems, which, together, make up a society, a culture. As a rule, they operate by means of institutions set up to regulate, if not the writing of literature, at least its distribution: academies, censorship bureaus, critical journals, and, by far the most important the educational establishment."

To make short, the patron is a person, a group, a political party, a publisher, an editor, a religious party, a political institution, a newspaper, a magazine, and media who allow or prevent the publication of a literary work. Moreover, patron contributes to the establishment of relationships between other systems and the literary system within the polysystem in order to endorse their practice of power and achieve hegemony of the society.

2.3.9. Poetics as a Controlling Factor

Poetics is a determining form of a literary work. Lefevere (2004:27), maintains: "poetics can be defined as what literature should (be allowed to) be." Lefevere (2004:36) introduces three components of poetics:

"The *'functional component'* of a poetics is obviously closely tied to ideological influences from outside the sphere of the poetics as such, and generated by ideological forces in the environment of the literary system. The *'inventory component'* of the poetics of a literary system is not immediately subject to direct influence from the environment once the formative stage of the system is past. Finally the *'changeable and changing component'* of poetics established mainly by means of rewritings, will dictate which original works of literature and which rewritings are acceptable in a given system, or, rather, such a poetics will be the touchstone used by teachers, critics, and others to decide what is in and what is out."

It is discussed that poetics is determined by the dominant ideological system and any translation is produced for adapting a certain poetics. Then, for Lefevere poetics is a control factor in literary polysystem.

Lefevere (2004:36) argues:

"A poetics, any poetics, is not absolute but always changing. In a literary system, the poetics dominant today is quite different from that at the beginning of the system. The functional component is likely to have changed, so it is an inventory component. However, every poetics tends to present itself as absolute. Obviously, each dominant poetics controls the dynamic of the system. Finally, a changeable and changing poetics, established mainly by means of rewritings, will also dictate which original works of literature and which rewritings are acceptable in a given system, or, rather, such a poetics will be the touchstone used by teachers, critics, and others to decide what is in and what is out. Moreover, different poetics dominant at different stages in the

evolution of a literary system will judge both writings and rewritings in different ways"

In fact, Lefevere (2004) considers "the poetics as factors that govern the reception, acceptance or rejection of literary texts in the society". Hermans (1999:126) mentions "Lefevere developed his ideas about systems and the role of *'rewriting'*" which is that:

> "Society is viewed as a conglomerate of systems, of which literature is one. This literary system possesses a dual control mechanism. One mechanism governs it largely from the outside and defines the relations within the environment, where the keywords are patronage and ideology. The other mechanism keeps order within the literary system, and the key terms are poetics and rewriters."

"Poetics consists of two components: one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole. The latter is influential in the selection of themes that must be relevant to the social system if the work of literature is to be noticed at all." (Lefevere 2004:14)

"In its formative phase, a poetics reflects both the devices and the "functional view" of the literary production dominant in a literary system when its poetics was the first codified. The functional component of a poetics is obviously closely tied to ideological influences from outside the sphere of the poetics as such, and generated by ideological forces in the environment of the literary system" (cf. Lefevere 2004:26-7).

"The inventory component of the poetics of a literary system is not immediately subject to direct influence from the environment once the formative stage of the system is passed. The functional component of a poetics exerts an innovative

influence on the literary system as a whole, while the inventory component of the poetics tends to be more conservative. And the conservative influence by the inventory component is attested by the fact that genres seem to be able to lead to a shadowy existence as 'theoretical possibilities' when not actively practiced and that they can be revived sooner or later" (cf. Lefevere 2004:34-5).

Therefore, poetics determine the form of literary work as well as translation. Obviously, poetics like ideology is an influential factor which controls the dynamic of the system but poetics is under the control of ideology i.e. poetics is ideological driven.

2.3.10. Translation: A Site for Manipulation

Language is an examinable world of symbols which constitutes the linguistic system and social structure. Post-structuralism applied the binary opposition between original and translation resulted in the invisibility of translators. Venuti (1992:7) mentions:

> "They (*Poststructuralist*) believe that the original is itself a translation, an incomplete process of translating a signifying chain into univocal signified, and this process is both displayed and further complicated when it is translated by another signifying chain in a different language. The originality of the foreign text is thus compromised by the poststructuralist concept of textuality. Neither the foreign nor the translation is an original semantic unity; both are derivative, consisting of diverse linguistic and cultural materials, making meaning plural and differential."

Manipulation in translation could be cultural, religious, and political. Ideology is one of the most recurring topics in Translation Studies today which concerned with manipulations in translation. Alvarez & Vidal (1996:2) mention:

"Like the polysystem theory, the manipulation school is based on the target text and the descriptive approach in the analysis of translations. Therefore, translation can also be used as an influential tool for conscious manipulation of a text. Translators can use their authority to manipulate diverse aspects of a text according to personal or external beliefs and agendas."

Based on the above-mentioned points, the manipulation school is among the other approaches is interested in factors such as ideological and social dimensions and it is undertaken in the service of power and under the control of the system. Manipulation in its positive form can help the evolution of literature and society. Hermans (1985:11) suggests:

"From the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose. Therefore, the agents of the act of translating engage in some kind of manipulation in order to achieve a particular aim. However, manipulation is carried out at the expense of the alteration of the target text in one way or other."

According to Garbovsky (2004:554), "the category of meaning is the most important one. A translator manipulates meanings, and the translation unit, in this case, considered as a certain piece of information – a unit of meaning. In such a case, it is not important where this meaning is contained – in a morpheme, a word or a phrase. In the introduction of the book, He maintains based on the target literature all translation implies a degree of manipulation."

This is the core idea of the manipulation school, which is emphasized by Hermans (1991:165-6):

"Translation is evidently a goal-oriented activity, as the translator strives to attain conformity with a model, and uses norms as the way to get there. The

models and norms, of course, are those of socio-cultural system in which the translator works […]. The act of translating is a matter of adjusting and manipulating a source text as to bring the target text into the line with the particular correctness notion, and in so doing secure social acceptance, even acclaim."

Since manipulation is a means of correction, therefore, translation is a means of correcting the source text and directing the minds of the readers. In other words, with manipulation, patron endeavors to direct and correct the target reader's thinking, viewpoint, and actions. van Dijk (1998:87) underlies the cognitive dimension of manipulation:

"Manipulation usually involves a form of mind control, that is, the beliefs of the recipients, such as their knowledge, opinions, and ideologies that in turn control their actions. In the same way, neither the author nor the translator as a reader of source text possesses the authorial power to definitely determine the meaning; and the *'authority'* will always remain collective due to an endless circle of signification."

The scholars of translation agree on the manipulative nature of translation due to that a translator is confined with the dominant ideology, patron's ideology and the norms of receiving culture. van Dijk (1998:260) points:

"The manipulation will be taken as a subtle process of influencing the minds of recipients through the internalization of certain beliefs, values, attitudes or ideologies."

Furthermore, a translator is supposed to follow the norms of a system for which he is translating. Thus, translators misplace the meaning of a text in order to direct the mind of the TT reader.

2.3.11. The Impact of Translator's Ideology on Translation

The functionalism challenged the idea of originality over translation and translator respectively and has foregrounded the position of translator. It is the fact that the structure of the target language (TL) most probably differs from the source language (SL) and any translation process involves a translator who will affect the superstructure of the target texts. Regarding the ideology in translation, selectiveness of linguistics elements could be seen in the textual omissions, deletion or additions of the target text.

From modern translation studies' viewpoint under two major influencing schools of Postculturalism and Functionalism, Karoubi (2005) mentions that "any translation is a product resulted not from the linguistic surface of the source text (ST), but according to the target language norms and conventions, the source language text is retextualized by the translator".

Robinson makes critical remarks about the ideological certainties of both our discipline and practice:

> "Translators know certain things: how to regulate the degree of 'fidelity' with
> the source text, how to tell what degree and type of fidelity is appropriate in
> specific use contexts, how to receive and deliver translations, how to charge
> them, how to find help with terminology, how to talk and generally act as a
> professional, and so on. Translators are those people who know these things,
> and who let their knowledge govern their behavior. And that knowledge is

ideological. It is controlled by ideological norms [...]. If you want to become a translator you must submit to the translator's submissive role, submit to being 'possessed' by what ideological norms inform you" (qt. from Calzada-Pérez 2003).

An ideological aspect not only can be investigated in the process of translation but in the role of the translator who is the producer as well as an interpreter of the source text. As discussed earlier some translators would be against the dominant ideology, and hence they will refuse to translate a work. Fawcett (1998:106) argues:

"Translator is unaware that their belief and value system is being conditioned by one patron and ideology, and they become a blind tool to establish or maintain a particular ideology. Nonetheless, simply by reading a translated text it is hard to tell whether the translator's choices are ideologically motivated or simply a matter of taste."

The studies of translations show that a translator contributes the meaning-making process creating notions such as ideology, power, dominance, hierarchy, and gender. For van Dijk (1997:5) "the ideology, here, is defined as beliefs that are developed by dominant groups in order to reproduce and legitimate their domination in which the translator plays an important role."

For Lefevere (1992: iv), "translation is a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics. Accordingly, translation is determined by the translator's ideology and the poetics dominant in the receiving culture."

Nord (2003:111) argues "almost any decision in translation is, consciously or unconsciously, guided by ideological criteria. These criteria are crucial in identifying

the intended purpose of the target text and in selecting the appropriate strategies by the translator, based on the expectations of the translation clients."

Therefore, translator's ideological views affect the meaning reproduction and form and structure of target texts. Furthermore, Lefevere (1992:7) stresses that the "influence of ideologies does not necessarily have to take a constraining form but can also be a motivating force."

Simon (1996:139) describes:

> "Translators must constantly make decisions about the cultural meanings language carries and evaluate the degree to which the different worlds they inhabit are 'the same' ... In fact, the process of meaning transfer has less to do with finding the cultural inscription of a term than reconstructing its value."

In this regard, it is obvious that translator could influence the final production of translation or leave his ideological traces, as it is clear in Ibn al-Muqaffa's translation of *Panchatantra.* He has expressed his political and ideological views implicitly in his translation which led to institutional and political conflict and his death.

Hatim & Munday (2004:103) define "the translator is mediating and subverting the ST content of a sensitive text. In fact, translators intervene in the transfer process to feed their knowledge and beliefs into processing the text."

Munday (2007:213) points: whereas open conscious choices can be expected to be recognized more easily, the extent of unconscious decisions is often hidden. Hatim & Mason (1997:144) believe: this is because these choices are highly influenced by the translator's ideological orientation, as all use of language reflects a set of users' assumptions which are closely bound up with attitudes, beliefs and value systems.

The productive process of translation involves transposition of cultural specific items of one language into cultural elements of another language. This process is inevitably influenced by the subjectivity of translator and agency. A number of scholars in the field agree that in this processes, translators have an influence on the ideologies prevailing in a translated text. It can be assumed that the choices made by the translator are the way in which ideologies enter the translation.

Considering the concept of ideology, it is difficult to trace borders and define what exactly the ideologically influenced translation product is. Hence, the role of the translator as mediating in between two different cultures and languages is of great importance to be considered. Toury (1999:19) declares:

> "It is always the translator herself or himself, as an autonomous individual, who decides how to behave, be that decision fully conscious or not. Whatever the degree of awareness, it is s/he who will also have to bear the consequences' […] and many translators select the functionally appropriate translation strategy sanctioned by the clients and the audience within the historical, sociocultural context they belong to."

Translators are responsible for the partiality of translation to some extent (Tymoczko 2000:24); and "consciously or not, translators invariably conform to certain standards and differ from others" (Gentzler 2002:197). Regarding the articulation of ideology by discourse, the translator's choices are affected by ideological perspectives which motivate and determine the outcome of a translation (Tymoczko 2003:183).

In this regard, Venuti (2008:21) argues:

> "Thus the translator not only consults but unwittingly absorbs many different materials in the receiving culture, ranging from dictionaries and grammars to patterns

of usage to texts, translation strategies and translation traditions to values, paradigms, and ideologies. Yet no translator will have all these materials and their diverse significance under his or her conscious control."

"A great number of choices are based on the translator's unique experience of the two languages. Again the translator's cultural background and conditioning will determine the ways they use that bilingual knowledge. As a result translator's position, exploring metalinguistic factors in translation comes to light." (Munday 2007:213).

Gentzler (2002:196) states yet, most people, including translators, are not fully aware of these cultural and political biases and the potential impact they might have on their work. Without any negative intentions, a translator may unconsciously manipulate the text in an attempt to make it more accessible for the target culture.

Baker (2006:114) mentions:

> "An especially common way of framing is a selective appropriation of textual material. In this case, omissions from or additions to the original text are affected in order to suppress, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative encoded in the source text."

But framing, as proposed by Baker, could be handled only by the translator and in this process, translator's ideology plays a significant role. Sometimes this selection of appropriate textual material differs from translator to translator due to the different ideological stance of translators. Lefever (1998:41) stress "individual translators could differentiate themselves from their colleagues and predecessors by manipulating these grids and, if they did so successfully, acquire cultural prestige."

Hence, in cases that ideology of the source text does not fit the receiving culture, translators have to manipulate and leave out some parts. In fact, translator's ideology

should be identical to the patron's ideology because different ideological views produce different translations.

Gentzler (2004:138) points out:

> It should be noted here that Translators are always caught in the paradox between his ideology and his status as a professional. They can't produce a text opposite to their ideology, at the same time they must convince other professionals that they are worthy of being a translator. Nobody can escape one's own ideology, which suggests that claiming objectivity is *'dishonest'*."

On the other hand, not all translators are not interested in patron's ideology and drop translation or translate for a personal issue. As Lefevere (1992:13) maintains:

> "Not all translators agree with the dominant ideology and support it. Some may be dissatisfied with it and "choose to oppose the system, to try to operate outside its constraints […] by rewriting works of literature in such a manner that they do not fit in with the dominant poetics or ideology of a given time and place."

Obviously, the issue of ideology in translation is not ignorable and translators also could not ignore the patron's ideology and through translation, they are strengthening the ideology. Fawcett (1995:187) states:

> "In the condition that the relation between the translators and dominant ideologies can vary greatly and would require individual analysis, the translator can, for example, strengthen, weaken or confuse the original source text author's ideology and intentions."

The translator's ideology, in addition to the lexical choice and grammatical structure, could be reflected in the translation strategies. For a translator, it is important to be

aware of certain groups' objectives in order to avoid potential manipulations and to create faithful translations for the public. (Lefevere 1992: xi)

Therefore, translators should be aware of their own manipulative potential since the translated work could gain the first position of literary polysystem and influences the society. Roesler (2009:10) mentions:

> "It is discussed that some translators manipulate consciously, this manipulative potential of a translation depends highly on the dosage of the translator's previous cultural or ideological conditioning. If the translator's unawareness of any personal ideological affiliations is a *'mere'* result of inadequate training and a lack of interest or intellect, the manipulations on the text will be rather random and with no particular aim or underlying agenda."

The impact of the translator's ideology is discussed and how translator awareness and consciousness of ideology could play an important role in the translation process. Furthermore, it is discussed that translator could accept or reject the patron's ideology because the manipulation takes place in order to achieve the objectives of ideology. Angelelli (2014:2) mentions: "dissidents find themselves not only jobless but unable to obtain employment in public office. As a result, any revisionist turned to the private book industry, becoming the translators, editors, and publishers."

In the ideological discussion, the issue of discourse is playing an essential role since any ideology has its type of discourse and language use. In the next part, the relation between discourse, translation, and ideology is discussed.

2.4. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a relatively new trend of research which emerged in the 1980s in the work of Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak. It is an

approach to studying the discourse which concerns the language as a form of social practice. The roots of CDA lie in Rhetoric, Text-linguistics, and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics.

Fairclough (1995: viii) argues:

> "Critical Discourse Analysis is intended to critique some of the premises and the constructs underlying mainstream studies in sociolinguistics, conversational analysis, and pragmatics to demonstrate the need of these sub-disciplines to engage with social and political issues of power and hegemony in a dynamic and historically informed manner… to re-engage with central constructs of power and knowledge, and above all, ideology, to question what is this 'real world' of social relations in institutional practices that are represented linguistically."

In fact, it is not a methodology in itself but a vast term to refer to a series of theories and practices that have certain principles which involve finding out how texts are used to perform certain functions. It is critical due to that it focuses on interpreting or explains the text in detail regarding the notions of ideology, power relations, hierarchy, and gender as well as unmasking the ideologies. It is the modern version of discourse analysis which is not aimed to interpret a phenomenon but to change it.

Batstone (1995:198-9) explains:

> "Critical discourse analysis seeks to reveal how texts are constructed so that particular (and potentially indoctrinating) perspectives can be expressed delicately and covertly; because they are covert, they are elusive of a direct challenge, facilitating what Kress calls the 'retreat into mystification and impersonality" (qt. from Cook & Seidlhofer 2001:198)

The terms *Critical Linguistics* (CL) and *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) are often used interchangeably. The term CDA, recently, seems to have been preferred and is being used to denote the theory formerly identified as CL. There is an agreement among the scholars that CDA cannot be classified as a single method but is rather viewed as an approach, which consists of different perspectives and different methods. So, it is not a direction, school, or specialization next to the many other *'approaches'* in discourse studies.

van Dijk (1993:131) mentions "Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is obviously not a homogeneous model, nor a school or a paradigm, but at most a shared perspective on doing linguistics, semiotic or discourse analysis."

According to Fairclough & Wodak (1997:258), "CDA is a rapidly developing area of language study stemming from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice."

van Dijk (1993:352) mentions:

> "CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. CDA takes a particular interest in the relationship between language and power and explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality."

CDA is not a single method but an approach which consists of various perspectives and approaches to investigate the power relations, social structures, ideological bias and alike. The problem of CDA, regarding various perspectives and methods, is the lack of explicitness in term of data collection and text analysis.

van Dijk (1993:354) points out:

> "CDA aims to offer a different *'mode'* or *'perspective'* of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field. We may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis, among others. The term CDA is used nowadays to refer more specifically to the critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive unit of text to be the basic unit of communication."

Stubbs (1983:208) argues if CDA is to establish a relation between language and cognition, it must present data and theory pertinent for both, which needs to supplement linguistics evidence with non-linguistics of a pattern of beliefs and behaviors.

CDA regards language as a different kind of social practice and investigating it in a detailed and critical framework. CDA is another form of discourse analysis which relies mainly on examination of text at the linguistic level and is a form of linguistic analysis. As Luke (2002:102) argues:

> "CDA requires the overlay of 'social theoretic discourses for explaining and explicating the social contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse, accompanied by 'a principled and transparent shunting back and forth' between the micro and macro."

Moreover, CDA is a discourse analysis of social and linguistic phenomena and deals with integrating two types of analysis: 1) macro level (social structure) 2) micro level (linguistic structure). Many critics of CDA focused on the *'micro-analysis'* claiming that the effectiveness CDA is its ability to analyze *'the social'* in the relation with microanalysis (cf. Luke 2002:103).

Pennycook (2001:87) argued: "The critical discourse analysts, including Fairclough, were engaging in a strange mixture of theoretical eclecticism and un-reflexive modernism". In the same vain, Widdowson (1998:137) accused critical discourse analysis "as a kind of ad hoc bricolage which takes from theory whatever concept comes usefully to hand."

According to Weiss & Wodak (2003:7), "CDA could be seen as "a theoretical synthesis of conceptual tools". They argued that diversity of theory and method should not be considered unsystematic or eclectic nature of CDA but it could be the strength of CDA that provides innovatively and productivity in theory formation."

van Dijk's (1993b:31) idea is similar to Fairclough's idea. He mentions: "Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is obviously not a homogeneous model, nor a school or a paradigm, but at most a shared perspective on doing linguistics, semiotic or discourse analysis."

CDA, nowadays, refers to a more critical linguistic approach to investigate and analysis of the unit of text which the basic unit of communication. This approach contributes making a sense of data from various perspectives (cf. Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002:4).

Phillips & Jorgensen (2002:4) mention:

> "Such work requires deliberate and careful consideration of theoretical compatibilities and the negotiation of theoretical cruxes, and is not the same as "an eclecticism based on a mishmash of disparate approaches" Chuliaraki and Fairclough's 'shifting synthesis', then, can be seen as enabling a principled eclecticism that strengthens rather than weakens the research approach."

The base of CDA is systemic-functional linguistics that adapted and elaborated by Fairclough and van Leeuwen (2006) for purposes of critical discourse analysis. van Dijk (1993b:252) states:

> "A much wider range of methods can usefully be applied in critical discourse analysis, arguing for a multidisciplinary approach which "chooses and elaborates theories, methods, and empirical work as a function of their relevance for the realization of socio-political goals."

"CDA asks questions about the discourse structures which are used in the reproduction of power relations and social dominance, whether they are part of genres and context. The typical vocabulary of many scholars in CDA will feature such notions as power, dominance, hegemony, ideology, class, gender, race, discrimination, interests, reproduction, institutions, social structure, and social order, besides the more familiar discourse analytical notions." (cf. van Dijk 2001).

van Dijk, (2001:354) further mentions:

> "The two main concerns of CDA are how powerful groups control the public discourse and what are the social consequences of such control and inequality. Power is not always exercised in obviously abusive acts of dominant members, but may be enacted in the taken for granted actions of everyday life."

Although Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a term that has been used for critical approaches to discourse but van Dijk (2001) prefers to speak of Critical Discourse Studies (*CDS*). He believes this is a more general term which represents various factors such as critical analysis, critical theory, and critical applications as well. Furthermore, the term CDS further avoid the misconception that a critical approach is a method of discourse analysis.

For these reasons, van Dijk (2001) prefers the term Discourse Studies (DS), rather than Discourse Analysis, saying that it is a multidisciplinary field that is not limited only to the text and talk analysis. Moreover, it is not a method in the humanities and the social sciences. Therefore, it could mention that CDA is not a method but discipline of multidisciplinary Discourse Studies, a critical perspective, and position or attitude.

2.4.1. Objectives of CDA

CDA is a new form of discourse analytical research that investigates how text and talk could exercise and reproduce the social power abuse, dominance, and inequality in the social and political context.

"CDA is not just any social or political research, as is the case in all the social and political sciences, but is premised on the fact that some forms of text and talk may be unjust. One of the tasks of CDA is to formulate the norms that define such discursive injustice. CDA aims to expose and help to combat such injustice. It is problem-oriented rather than discipline or theory oriented." (van Dijk (1998)

van Dijk (1998) argues:

> "CDA is a field that shows the discursive sources of power, dominance and bias studying and analyzing written and spoken texts. The critical discourse analysis is founded on the insight that text and talk play a key role in maintaining and legitimating inequality, injustice, and oppression in society. It employs discourse analysis to show how this is done, and it seeks to spread awareness of this aspect of language use in society and to argue explicitly for change on the basis of its findings" (qt. from Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics, 2009:166).

Furthermore, it examines how these factors are produced and maintained in the social, political and historical context. van Leuven (2006:167) points out:

> "Although there has been a tendency to focus on speeches by politicians, parliamentary debates, and media reports and editorials, critical discourse analysts have also analyzed school textbooks, advertisements, the books of management gurus, transcripts of doctor-patient and workplace meeting interactions, and much more."

The objectives of CDA as below:

a. "Analyzing and contributing to the understanding of social problems which intensified by text and talk

b. This analysis is conducted within a normative perspective allows a critical assessment of abusive and resistance against illegitimate domination

c. The analysis takes into account the interests of those groups that are the victims of discursive injustice e and its consequences"

CDA addresses ideology, power, gender, discrimination, hegemony, class, race and structure. van Dijk (1986:4) argues:

> "Critical science in each domain asks further questions, such as those of responsibility, interests, and ideology. Instead of focusing on purely academic or theoretical problems, it starts from prevailing social problems and thereby chooses the perspective of those who suffer most, and critically analyses those in power, those who are responsible, and those who have the means and the opportunity to solve such problems."

In short, CDA associated with critical social theory and various discourse analytical paradigms. A great deal of work, particularly by Wodak (e.g. Wodak & Matouschek,

1993) and van Dijk (e.g. 1991, 1993b) and their associate, nowadays, has focused on racism, immigration, and asylum.

2.4.2. Domain of CDA

van Dijk (1993: 249) argues:

> "CDA is a complex, multidisciplinary and underdeveloped field of study and its domain is vast. It focuses on the role of discourse in the (re)production of dominance. Dominance is the exercise of social power by elites, institutions or groups, that results in social inequality, including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial and gender inequality. This reproduction process may involve such different modes of discourse power relations as the more or less direct or overt support, enactment, representation, legitimating, denial, mitigation or concealment of dominance, among others. More specifically, critical discourse analysts want to know what structures, strategies or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events play a role in these modes of reproduction."

Van Dijk (1993:250) states "social inequality at the societal level is not simply or always reproduced by a speech act such as commands but commands planned appropriately and legitimately in relationships, accepted by power relations, such as those between parents and children, between superiors and subordinates, or between police officers and citizens."

Therefore, special social conditions are needed for discourse properties to contribute to the reproduction of dominance. The same is true for all other properties of text and talk, and hence for all text-context relations.

van Dijk (1993: 249) further mentions:

"Another focus of CDA is on the social cognition. It is a fact that macro-notions (group or institutional power and dominance, as well as social inequality) do not directly relate to micro-notions (text, talk or communicative interaction) and in addition to the problem of macro-micro relations in sociology, the relation between society, discourse and social cognition is required. So, it is essential to examine, in detail, the role of social representations in the minds of social actors. The social cognition is the necessary theoretical and empirical link between discourse and dominance. The mentions that neglect of such social cognitions has been one of the major theoretical shortcomings of most work in critical linguistics and discourse analysis."

"A focus on dominance and inequality shows that CDA does not aim at contributing constructing a specific discipline, paradigm, and school or discourse theory. It is interested in pressing social issues, which gives better understand through discourse analysis. CDA focuses on the understanding of social problems such as dominance and inequality. On the contrary, without complex and highly sophisticated theories no such understanding is possible." (van Dijk 1993: 252)

"One of the aims of CDA is to analyze the complex relationships between dominance and discourse. The critical discourse analysts take an explicit sociopolitical stance: they spell out their point of view, perspective, principles, and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large. Although not in each stage of theory formation and analysis, their work is admittedly and ultimately political." (van Dijk 1993: 253)

In this sense, critical discourse scholars should be social and political scientists, as well as social critics and activists. Therefore, the critical discourse analyst should go beyond the immediate, serious or pressing issues of the day. Their structural understanding presupposes more general insights, and sometimes indirect and long-term analyses of fundamental causes, conditions, and consequences of such issues.

"The critical discourse scholars want to make a more specific contribution to get more insight into the role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality. As suggested above, it requires true multidisciplinary and an account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society, and culture." (van Dijk 1993: 254)

2.4.3. Methodology of Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA, as discussed earlier, mainly deals with two levels, the 1) micro-analysis of texts including linguistics, semiotic, and literary analysis and 2) macro-analysis of social structures, the discourse of institutions, ideological orientation and power relations that texts influence and be influenced.

In Luke's (2002:100) words:

> "CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistics, semiotic, and literary analysis and the macro-analysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct"

The work of Fairclough (1992), is mainly based on the linguistic analysis that was drawn from Halliday (Systemic Functional Linguistics or SFL), which analyze the lexical resources and moves to an analysis of syntactic functions, genre, and text meta-function systematically. Unlike, van Dijk (1997) approach is not linguistic-

based i.e. it is not focused on lexico-syntactic features of texts but on cultural and social resources and contexts. His approach is mainly of ideology, power, action, and context.

Luke (2002:101) further argues:

> "A linguistic and text analytic meta-language, no matter how comprehensive, cannot 'do' CDA in and of itself. It requires the overlay of a social theoretic discourse for explaining and explicating the social; contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse."

2.4.4. General Principles of CDA

The leading scholars of CDA such as van Dijk, Wodak, and Fairclough have provided different principles which have many issues in common and some are controversial. Fairclough and Wodak (1997:271) have introduced the eight principles of CDA as follows:

1. "Language is a social practice through which the world is represented

2. Discourse *'language use'* as a form of social practice in itself not only represents and signifies other social practices but it also constitutes other social practices such as the exercise of power, domination, prejudice, resistance and so forth

3. Texts acquire their meanings by the dialectical relationship between texts and the social subjects: writers and the readers, who always operate with various degrees of choice and access to texts and means of interpretation

4. Linguistic features and structures are not arbitrary. They are purposeful whether or not the choices are conscious or unconscious

5. Power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse

6. All speakers and writers operate from specific discursive practices originating in special interests and aims which involve inclusions and exclusions

7. Discourse is historical in the sense that texts acquire their meanings by being situated in specific social, cultural and ideological contexts, and time and space.

8. CDA does not solely interpret texts but also explains them"

2.4.5. Fairclough's Approach to CDA

Fairclough is one of the leading figures of the CDA, who calls his method critical language studies. His approach focuses on investigating the sociocultural aspects of language and challenged to move to do a critical analysis of text interpretation and use which is beyond text analysis.

His work was a mix of linguistic and social theories concerning that language is part of society. He maintained that the linguistic phenomena are a type of social phenomenon and that social phenomena are partly linguistics. In this regard, Fairclough (2000:163) mentions "the researchers should be open to a wide range of theory and should allow CDA to mediate interdisciplinary dialogue between social theories and methods."

Sheyholislami (2001:24) stated:

> "One element of CDA by which it is differentiated from other forms of discourse analysis lies in its attribute of *'critical'*. The term *'critical'* implies connections and causes which are hidden; it also implies intervention. It is important to expose the hidden things, since they are not evident for the individuals involved, and, because of this, they cannot be fought against."

"Fairclough added stylistic of language to construct and enact social identities. He further maintains the text is an essential part of CDA which related to the written or

spoken language produced in a discursive event. For him, the key term is a genre, which is the use of language associated with a particularly social activity. This relationship between language and culture is reciprocal. It means that language use affects the society and culture and is affected by the cultural or social practice." (Fairclough, 1993:134)

It can be concluded that discursive practices determine the social structures, the same way as the social structures determine discursive practices. Hence, the term *'mediation'* is employed to explain whether the relationship between language and society is bi-directional. In other words, language or discourse is the medium to reveal the values, beliefs, conventions and norms of society. Then Fairclough (1993:135), based on the influence of language on cultural context, maintains:

> "CDA is a discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between discursive practice, events and texts and wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes, to investigate how such practices, events, and texts arise and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony."

Due to the multi-functionality of language in texts, Fairclough's (1993) assumption was that texts and discourses are socially constitutive; it means that "Language use always simultaneously constitutes (1) social identities, (2) social relations and (3) systems of knowledge and beliefs".

In spite of many disagreements and arguments, Chuliaraki & Fairclough (1999) look at CDA as an approach and theoretical and analytical framework that brings social sciences and linguistic together. They (1999:7) mentioned:

"Thus CDA can help to theorize a new frame for creating awareness of what is, how it has come to be, and what it might become, […] and so the ways of analyzing, operationalizing, and practical-theoretical constructions of discourse in social life, which contribute to the development and elaboration of these theoretical constructions."

The language use is a social practice. Social practice can be both a social action at a particular time and at a particular place and also a habituated way of acting (Chuliaraki & Fairclough, 1999:8). Social practices are an abstract and complex system that has been practicing through the discourse which questions the relation of a text with other texts and people's representation of the world. Different discourses are different ways of representing associated with different positions (Fairclough 2000). Fairclough (2003:93) is interested in how discursive practices sustain relations of domination and argues:

"Further, discursive practice, the production, distribution, and consumption (including interpretation) of texts is a facet of hegemonic struggle which contributes in varying degrees to the reproduction or transformation not only of the existing order of discourse […] but also through that of existing social and power relations."

His model is based on the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life. The dialectic relation between language and social reality is realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures (languages). The model describes the meaning-making process and the end-products of, i.e. how the interpretation of meanings in texts takes place within the plenty of social contexts.

Furthermore, this model contributes to the understanding of the text construction, the specific linguistic selections, their sequencing, and their layout. This understanding

requires recognizing the historical determination which tied to the conditions of possibility of that utterance.

Regarding the usefulness of Fairclough' model, Janks (1997:329) points out:

> "Why Fairclough's approach to CDA is so useful is because it provides multiple points of analytic entry. It does not matter which kind of analysis one begins with, as long as in the end they are all included and are shown to be mutually explanatory. It is in the interconnections that the analyst finds."

Fairclough's (2003:157) approach provides a tripartite framework for the analysis of text and discourse as follow:

1. "text (description), the linguistic description of the formal properties of the text

2. Discourse Practice (interpretation), the interpretation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the text

3. Sociocultural Practice (explanation), the explanation of the relationship between discourse and social and cultural reality"

Fairclough's (2003:158) dimension of textual analysis involves investigating the linguistic features of texts including vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and textual structures. The vocabulary (lexicalization) addresses the role of words in signifying the world. Grammar deals with ways in which words are used and combined in order to achieve a particular effect or meaning. Cohesion addresses how clauses and sentences are linked together and structure addresses the organization of texts.

The textual analysis is an essential part of social analysis which is the social and cultural practices. "The first stage of the CDA deals with the analysis of the texture of

texts" (Fairclough 2003:158). This stage is based on morphological and grammatical levels.

For Fairclough (1989:41) the term '*interpretation*' is used for a stage of the procedure and discourse participants. In other words, interpretation is associated with participants' processes of text production and text interpretation as well. The interpretation is divided into two *'institutional and discourse processes'*, i.e. society and culture & language and text. In fact, interpretation is a matter of the understanding of the meaning of a text which is associated with production and understanding of a text (interpretation).

Fairclough (1989:142) maintains:

> "Texts are produced and interpreted against a background of common-sense assumptions. The interpretations are generated through the combination of what is in the text and what knowledge and beliefs the interpreter holds."

Therefore, the formal features of the text are '*cues*' by which interpreters' background knowledge can be activated. This background knowledge in Fairclough's view is MR (Members' Resource often called common-sense assumptions) that help to interpret and understanding of the ideological constructions.

For Fairclough (1989:144):

> "The interpretation of context is partly based on the external cues and interpreter's MRs, i.e. the representations of societal and institutional orders in particular situations. Hence, the issue of intertextuality is essential in the interpretation of a text which is based on the previous knowledge of various discourses."

"Intertextuality and interdiscursivity are directly related to the interpreter's MRs which is acquired from the world of texts and discourses. It is a knowledge to interpret the meaning of textual elements presented in other texts and discourses which contribute constructing a common ground in the act of communication and to trace presupposed information. (Fairclough 2003:39). In order to an understanding of the presupposed information in the text, Fairclough (1989:154) puts that:

> "Presuppositions are usually marked in texts with the usage of the definite article, subordinate clauses and pronouns, signaling that the information is already known and taken for granted. Presuppositions can be sincere or manipulative or they can have ideological functions when what they assume has the character of "common sense in the service of power."

Therefore, the textual analysis cannot be isolated from other discursive practices, since the discursive practice focuses on the production and interpretation of the text. Fairclough (1995:233) differentiates between linguistic analysis of the text, which he describes as *'descriptive'*, and analysis of discursive practice which he describes as *'interpretative'*, suggesting that analysis of discursive practice interprets the text in relation to the social practices in which they are produced. Fairclough (1989:143) categorizes the four levels of interpretation as mentioned below:

> "The first level *'surface of utterance'* is the interpreter's knowledge of a language such as phonology, grammar, and vocabulary which associated with sound and mark interpretation into words, phrases, and sentences based on person's MR. The second level *'meaning of utterance'* is devoting meanings to a text. The interpreter collects meanings of the word and grammatical information in order to understand implicit meanings, speech acts, and utterances (the pragmatic level). The third level *'Local coherence'* constructs

meaning between utterances, producing coherent of them. The process of interpretation establishes connections between parts of the text (coherence and implicit assumptions of ideological character). The fourth level 'text structure and point' is a matter of understanding how a whole text hangs together. This involves representations of a characteristic of the organization associated with different types of discourse."

For Fairclough, "the interpretation is understanding (interpretation) of context and text as well. The issue of context is the mentally represented structure of those properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or comprehension of discourse". Fairclough (1989:148) discerns four dimensions in the process of interpretation of situational context:

1. *'what's going on'* within the social event such as activity, topic, and purpose of the situation

2. *'who's involved'* such as speaker, addressee, hearer, over-hearer or spokesperson within institutional settings

3. *'In what relations?'* forms of relationships (power, social distance) in a certain situation

4. *'What's the role of language?'* Language is being used as an instrument for institutional aims. The role of language is to determine its genre whether spoken or written language is used.

Fairclough (1989:150) maintains that:

"The interpretation as a process, as it is discussed earlier in this part, takes place on two levels. In the first level, the interpreter arrives at the determination of the institutional setting of the interaction based on his/her

MRs (e.g. at the school). In the second level, comes at a determination of the situational setting (the situation type of the interaction, e.g. classroom) based on the first stage."

The problem is that the context is not equally accessible to participants like the production and interpretation of the text and in many cases, powerful participants of institutions impose their interpretation on others as Fairclough (1989:151) argues:

"Ideologies and power relations have a deep and pervasive influence upon discourse interpretation and production, for they are embedded in the interpretative procedure. Text interpreters operate with a certain context in mind, which influences the way in which linguistic features of texts are processed."

Therefore, ideologically, one's ability to interpret a text could be based on the background knowledge may be shaped by the social context and ideologies, e.g. the way of thinking of a particular social movement. The next and last level of CDA framework explain how textual and interpretative procedures may be related to the social reality.

Fairclough (1989:162) maintains:

"The transition from the stage of interpretation to the stage of explanation is noting that, when aspects of MR are drawn upon as interpretative procedures in the production and interpretation of texts, they are thereby reproduced. The analysis of the context involves an analysis of the broader sociocultural environment in which the texts and the discursive practices are situated. This level of analysis is concerned not only with the way in which social structures determine discourses but also with the way that social structures are the

product of discourse. Fairclough is interested in the way in which discourses signify and constitute ideological power."

Fairclough (1992:87) identifies ideologies as constructions of reality which are built into various dimensions of discursive practices, and which "contribute to the production, reproduction or transformation of relations of dominance", but he rejects Structuralists approach to ideology in which ideology figures as one-sided, and all interactions are seen to be a struggle against the dominant position. Rather, he sees social practices as a network of power relations. Within this complex network of power relations, there are discursive practices that sustain relations of dominance.

"The explanatory stage in CDA sees discourse as a part of processes of social struggle and power relations. It shows how discourses are determined by social structures and what reproductive effects discourses have on those structures, e.g. by sustaining them or changing them. These social determinations and effects are mediated by person's MRs" (Fairclough 1989:163).

The explanation has two dimensions, depending on whether the emphasis is upon process or structure -upon processes of struggle or upon relations of power.

1. "On the one hand, we can see discourses as parts of social struggles, and contextualize them in terms of these broader (non-discoursal) struggles, and the effects of these struggles on structures. This puts the emphasis on the social effects of discourse, on creativity

2. On the future. On the other hand, we can show what power relationships determine discourses; these relationships are themselves the outcome of struggles and are established (*and, ideally, naturalized*) by those with power"

Fairclough (1989:163) says:

"For example, a friendly conversation between couples may be seen from three different perspectives: the situational, institutional and societal. From a situational point of view, the wife's supportive understanding is interpreted as characteristic of women in a domestic relationship. In institutional and societal terms, women are obliged to obey the husband in a patriarchal society."

Not all discourses manifest conflict (social struggle) and do not necessarily take the form of overt struggle or conflict. The social struggle may be expressed implicitly as well. Even a discourse in which participants apparently arrive at the same interpretations of the situation, and draw upon the same MRs and discourse types, may be seen as an effect of power relations and as a contribution to the social struggle.

The Fairclough's CDA model has three stages as description, interpretation, and explanation and all three stages are involved simultaneously in analyzing a social event. The texts can be produced and interpreted on the basis of one's MRs which shaped by social and ideological structures. The linguistic elements are employed based on the ways that one interprets (understand) the social context which consequently creates certain relations in the communicative encounter, e.g. unequal power relations. (Fairclough 1989:164)

2.4.6. Critical Discourse Analysis and Ideology

The relation between ideology and discourse discussed earlier. The relation between discourse and ideology is bidirectional i.e. ideology creates discourse and influence its internal structure and external form and is influenced by discourse.

As Baxter (2010:120) underlines:

"The term discourse is used in the Poststructuralist and Critical Theory to mean social and ideological practice which can govern the way in which the people think, speak, interact, write and behave."

Regarding the relationship between ideology and discourse, for van Dijk society, discourse and social cognition is a conceptual triangle in which ideology has an essential role in constructing the common social cognitions accepted by organizations, institutions or social groups. van Dijk (2003:88) argues:

"Different discourse genres, such as newspapers and political propaganda have the explicit aim of teaching ideologies to group members and newcomers. Thus ideologies are not innate but learned, and precisely the content and form of such discourse may be more or less likely to form intended mental models of social events, which finally may be generalized and abstracted to social representations and ideologies."

Regarding van Dijk, and if discourse able to form the intended model of social event, therefore, discourse could change and control every sort of social practice such as language use as well as the social event. van Dijk (2003:88) mentions "one important condition for the exercise of social control through discourse is the control of discourse and discourse production itself."

Therefore, discourse as a social practice affects ideology and influences our cognition contributing realizing ideology, inequality, power relation and power misuse, and biases in the society. Then CDA could be an appropriate tool to tackle these issues. Puurtinen (2000:178) states "CDA aims at revealing how ideology affects linguistic choices made by a text producer and how language can be used to maintain, reinforce or challenge ideologies".

In the same vein, Kress (1985:240) maintains:

> "CDA offers a framework which uncovers this ideological content as well as the ways in which ideology is constructed and reinforced in texts. For instance, CDA helps analysts identify the linguistic manifestations of ideology in a text through an analysis of lexical units. Any text would have a different organization if is written from another ideological viewpoint."

Since ideology is hidden in any language and discourse and ideological meanings are embedded in any language or discourse, therefore, language befalls in the scope of CDA which analyzes other social practices such as the exercise of power, ideology, hierarchy and domination. As Fairclough (2003) points out the linguistic choices are not random and arbitrary but have a purpose and intention even they are unconscious which express producers' certain ideological views.

CDA brought an awareness of ideological implication in any form that embedded in discourse and as mentioned earlier, CDA employs a critical approach to the investigating the language which could be regarded as an analytical tool for the study of the text, language use, and context and for developing specific language skills. The next part deals with the role of CDA in Translation Studies.

2.4.7. Critical Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies

In this part, the integration of three stage of CDA with the text production and interpretation in Translation Studies is discussed. As it discussed earlier, *'Critical Discourse Analysis'* or (CDA), is a different form of discourse analysis and novel theoretical approach which is established systematically during the 1990s by Fairclough.

Translation theorists have given attention to discourse analysis since the 1980s and critical discourse analysis since the 1990s (qt. from Pym, 1992:227); and the functionalist theories of translation began to integrate the discourse analysis in Translation Studies which, involves analysis of the ST text, text type, language function, the effect of participants in the translation (Munday 2001:73).

However, in Translation Studies, CDA as an approach not only is applied on source text (ST), but it focuses on target text (TT) as well. CDA within Translation Studies has been mainly used to analyze political discourse due to the fact that the main aim of CDA is to uncover ideology and power structures in language.

Schaffner (2002:53) states:

"Most of the scholars have chosen an existing CDA approach or some parts of the approach, for example, the cognitive or ideological, and have described it from a translation point of view without creating a formal framework. There have been debates whether CDA should be applied to TS and whether a full linguistic analysis of the ST before translation is necessary."

CDA, as a means of analyzing the ST and TT, is brought the translation theories into a completely novel level. Most of the researchers in Translation Studies employed CDA concerning translation as a social practice. Furthermore, they challenging to answer the questions such as, who is translating for whom, what is being translated, when is it being translated and what are the effects on the receiving culture?

Schaffner (2004:136) states:

"It is the human communicative activity in the socio-cultural settings which is common in both CDA and TS, and that texts and discourses are the product of this activity. CDA may be used to analyze discourse, including translated

discourse, in its three dimensions as texts, interaction or communication. Translations are perceived as target texts in a new socio-cultural context, which is based on a source text which functioned in its original socio-cultural context."

In Translation Studies, the comparative analysis of ST and TT in terms of the translation strategies and lexical choices is a common practice and a precondition in Translation Criticism. Reiss (2000:3) regarding the issue argues:

"The same procedure may be attributed to the CDA implementation in TS as well. On the one hand, CDA may be used by the translator to analyze the lexical and grammatical elements in the ST in order to provide a better understanding of the power relations and ideological clues in the ST. On the other hand, CDA may be used to analyze to spot the lexical, grammatical or ideological changes made in the TT by the translator. It is necessary to emphasize that the latter analytic stages must be perceived as functioning interchangeably and not independently since they describe the cognitive process of text interpretation and production."

"The study of the discourse of translation could certainly benefit from the insights gained by a critical analysis of primary and secondary discourses, understood here as source texts (STs) and target texts (TTs). For this reason, it could be a complementary tool to existing methodological approaches in order to provide us with a comprehensive reflection on language and culture. In fact, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is meant to analyze discourse in its three dimensions, as text, as interaction or communication involving people, and as part of a piece of social interaction" (Fairclough 1992: 10-11).

Arrojo (1998: 44) argues:

> "These three dimensions are also present in source texts (STs) and translated texts (TTs), subsuming the various components of the transformative act we call translation: "language, culture, and the relationships between different peoples, different identities, and even different points in times and space" (qt. from Valdeon 2007:100).

The further discussion of CDA within TS will deal with the description of the most important aspects in the field. The research on CDA within TS is very new and thus there is no theoretical approach which serves as the backbone of this study. This leads to the fact that CDA is continuously adapted to new phenomena. In translation studies, CDA has an optional role and is mainly used as an auxiliary tool to the existing methodological approaches providing a comprehensive reflection on language and culture.

Schaffner (2004:102) observes "the translation and audience design from two angles, i.e. target audience with knowledge of the ST issue and with lacks knowledge about the ST matter. Hence, it is possible to state two main purposes in the translation:

a) The translator must convey information with certain changes in the TT omissions, additions, permutations, and substitutions may be included in the vocabulary of CDA as well since they are connected to the editing and production processes of STs and TTs (dynamic approach)

b) The translator conveys information in the TT with no significant changes according to word-for-word translation strategy (static approach)"

Hatim and Mason (1997:30) "briefly describe their focus on the skopos of the translation (purpose) and to translation dichotomies: dynamic and static, which means

that in dynamic translation, the translator is either creative and may suggest his/her original solutions to the translation or the translator must transfer the meaning as closely as possible to the ST, i.e. the literary translation method."

"The analytic approach of Hatim and Mason's (1990) incorporates the semiotic, pragmatic and communicative levels, which then added the fourth dimension, as the relations of power and ideology within discourse. This approach maintains that the linguistic elements influence the language users and the social context influences the selection of such elements." (cf. Hatim & Mason 1990:10)

Translators, unlike the discourse analysts, use their linguistic, social and cultural background knowledge to create a new form of communication in the target language environment by negotiating the meaning between the ST producer and the TT reader. Hatim and Mason's (1997) framework, however, describes a variety of aspects instead of providing a ready-to-use model. They combine translation dichotomies (dynamic vs. static translation), speech act theory, politeness theory, argumentation theory, discourse analysis and register analysis.

Hatim and Mason (1997) consider "translation as an act of communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries and investigate the underlying strategies behind the production and reception of texts, all texts: written and spoken, technical and non-technical." (cf. Hatim and Mason 1997:1)

Hatim and Mason (1997:26) consider translator as a language user who is the receiver and producer of the text. In other words, the translator as a communicator interacts in first place with the source text, whether for the immediate response (simultaneous interpreting) or in a more reflective way (translation of literature). The similarity between CDA and Hatim and Mason's (1997:14) work is that both deal with the

analysis of intended meaning, text effect, considering the linguistic elements, users, and context in which they occur in. Niranjana's (1991) mentions:

> "The translator has to constantly bear in mind the so-called gap existing between the source and the target culture with the aim of exploring the awareness of asymmetry as well as historicity made repressed or absent in several kinds of writings by different techniques" (qt. from Hatim & Munday, 2004:210)

CDA, in Translation Studies, provides an insight of the linguistic elements and social elements of the text and makes translator aware of the possible social, cultural and linguistic differences between the ST and TT. So, CDA could be a helpful tool in the determination of the translation strategy, contexts of ST and TT, cultural and social differences between the source and target language. It provides translator an understanding of the cognitive process of translation and the interpretation of the different layers of source text meaning.

Translation Studies applies CDA for both ST and TT and adapted different aspects of CDA in order to determine the purpose of translation and clarify the ideological manipulations and influence of power in the translation process. Hatim & Mason (1997:120) argue "if translating not only has never been a neutral activity as appeared but also undeniably the political in terms of either activity or product."

Lande (2010:26- 27) argues:

> "CDA is a text-linguistic approach which mainly focuses on one language and one culture. However, in Translation Studies (TS) the CDA model has been applied not only to source text (ST), but it also focuses on the target text (TT) as well. CDA within TS has been mainly used to analyze political discourse

due to the fact that the main aim of CDA is to uncover ideologies and power

structures in discourse."

The hard part in linking the translation and CDA is to create an approach specifically for TS due to the fact that it is optional and serves for a better understanding of the ST meaning and its manipulation in the TT. Hence, in Translation Studies, CDA has an optional role and is mainly used as an auxiliary tool to the existing methodological approaches providing a comprehensive reflection on language and culture.

2.5. Intertextuality

Intertextuality is the most commonly used term in the contemporary literary study. *'An Intertextual Study of…'* or *'intertextuality and …'* are the titles of critical works but it seems that intertextuality is a term that provides critical procedures for interpretation; anyway, it is a concept often associated with postmodernism and as an inherent feature of all literature and interconnectedness between texts. It is making a meaning of a text by another text using various devices such as translation, allusion, plagiarism, quotation, calque, pastiche, and parody. In other words, it is borrowing and transformation of a part or whole of prior text and referencing one text in reading another (qt. from Allen 2000:2-1).

The concept of intertextuality was created in the beginning of the 20th century by the Structuralists movement. They focused on Saussurean semiotics which was insisting on the relationship of signs to each other within the text. The concept is represented by Bulgarian-French literary critic, Julia Kristeva. She in the late 1960s mixed Bakhtin's idea of the social context of language with Saussure's idea of the systematic features of the language claiming that every text is from the outset under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose a universe on it.

Waghmare (2012:2) believes "intertextuality is the term coined and expounded by Kristeva in her interpretation of Bakhtin's dialogism in her seminal work 'Word, Dialogue and Novel."

"Hence, intertextuality is derived from Bakhtin's dialogic theory of language, which argues that every utterance is made in the context of (implicit) dialogue, responding to something said before, and expecting a response in turn. "Like other useful terms, however, *'intertextuality'* has been appropriated by critics whose assumptions and purposes are disparate from its *'original'* meaning." (cf. Stoneman 2005:17)

Waghmare (2012:2) claims that Bakhtin's *'polyphony'* is an equivalent term to *'intertextuality'*. Polyphony literally means *'many voices'*. The '*Polyphony*' means several origins and voices. Therefore, Polysemy means creating several meanings.

The concept of intertextuality grew with post-structuralism in the *'Tel Quel'* group including Philippe Sollers, Julia Kristeva, Marcelin Playnet, Pierre Faye, Jacqueline Risset, John Ricardo, Rolan Barthes, Tzvetan Todorov, Pierre Boulez, and Derrida. Klimovich (2014:256) states:

> "Kristeva initially employed the neologism intertextualité in the late 1960s in an attempt to challenge the prevalent concept of text as a product by shifting the focus towards the productive forces that shape textuality. Consequently, intertextuality is the quality of the literary text and represents the ability of a text to accumulate information not only directly from the personal experience, but also indirectly from other texts."

Intertextuality developed within literary studies where the focused was on the nature and status of the literary author. In order to succeed proper understanding of how texts rely on and relate to each other, it seems necessary to find a definition that fits the

requirements of literary practitioners, researchers, and educators, in order to apply it into a practice.

Intertextuality emerged from intellectual movements in the 1960's and 70's, such as Deconstruction, Russian Formalism, psychoanalysis, Marxism, and linguistics. It's best-known theorists were mostly French: Riffaterre, Genette, Kristeva, Derrida, and Barthes. Bakhtin actually introduced the phenomenon as such but did not name it. Mishra (2012:2) argues:

> "Text by its Latin route *'textere'* means *'to weave'*. A text is made up of words and phrases. It is related to textile or fabric. When a piece of art weaves quotations, references, images etc. from other centers or texts into its build-up to serve some intended purpose, it is called *"intertextual"* text. Hence, it is the responsibility of critics to focus on texts and their identification with other several texts. If a text texturizes references, quotations, and even revisions; such text is an *'intertext*."

"The prefix, *'inter',* taken from Latin, inspires the idea of relationships among texts: The status of the word is defined horizontally: the word in the text at the same time belongs to the writer as well as the reader; vertically: the word in the text is oriented to the anterior or synchronic literary corpus" (cf. Hilali 2015:1).

According to intertextuality, a perspective of both reading and writing texts is a way of looking at a text's interactions with prior texts, writers, readers, and conventions. Bloor & Bloor (2007:58) mention:

> "Every text carries resonances of all the texts that have preceded it, and that all discourse is the sum of past discourse. A text stands in contrast to all other texts since it reflects specific context of its creation. This sounds somehow unlikely at first, but it is not so strange if one thinks of how both ideas and the

form of language and human interaction change and develop over the centuries."

According to Plett (1991:8), "priests are said to *'quote'* passages from the Bible, but also composers from a symphony or painters from a picture. This indicates that the quotation represents a material kind of intertextuality."

Farahzad (2009:126) argues:

"For Plett whenever a new text comes into being it relates to previous texts and in its turn becomes the precursor of subsequent texts. From an intertextual perspective, no text is original; no text is the source of another. There is no beginning or end to any text, but endless connections and references to other texts."

Therefore, there would no beginning and no clear end, since every text is interwoven with many others and can only be understood on the basis of others. This is the only reason that intertext could appear in another text, which is edited, transformed, even distorted by the writer; to suit the purposes. As a matter of fact, the term *'intertextuality'* is used in contemporary literary theory and is an essential tool in order to understand literature, the ideological and cultural implication in the text.

Kalogirou & Economopoulou (2012:180) point out:

"According to the theories of intertextuality, works of literature, after all, are built from systems, codes, and traditions established by previous works of literature. Texts, as viewed by modern literary theory, are lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now called intertextually."

The intertextuality is not the matter of study of sources and influences but is the discursive practices. It deals with conditions of later texts in which the origins are lost.

It leads to the dialogue of a text with others, an act of absorption, parody, and criticism, rather than as autonomous artifact which harmoniously adapts the possible attitudes towards a given problem.

Culler (1976:1382) argues:

> "The concept of intertextuality names the paradox of linguistic and discursive systems: that utterances or texts are never moments of origin because they depend on the prior existence of codes and conventions, and it is the nature of codes to be always already in existence, to have lost origins. It is difficult to explain what it is that enables us to make sense of a new instance of discourse, but whatever intelligibility a discursive sequence achieves depends on intertextual codes."

It is the fact that linguistic expressions have a sort of allusion to other texts in their structure, which investigated in the literary texts but since the 1970s, the phenomenon is known as *'Intertextuality'* has become a central issue in literary and semiotic studies. Gasparov (2010:3) states:

> "The prevalent mode of speakers' linguistic activity can be called *"intertextual",* in the sense that speakers always build something new by infusing it with their recollection of textual fragments drawn from previous instances of speech."

Besides the literary theory, other efforts are clear to expand the term. For example, Culler (1976:1382), as discussed above, used the term "to study the presuppositions of what is already known and unknown, conventions, and systems of combination [and] logic of assumption".

According to Pope (2002: 246):

"Explicit intertextuality refers to all the other texts that are overtly mentioned and all the specific sources that the writer has demonstrably drawn upon. Pope (2002) cites T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* (1922) and its annotated references to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. On the other hand, implied intertextuality refers to 'all passing ... allusions to other texts and to the ... effects, which seem to have been contrived by the writer so as to be picked up by the alert and similarly informed reader"

Panagiotidou (2010:1-2) maintains:

"Culler's proposal, albeit linguistically sound, does not seem to add anything new in relation to the literary aspect of the intertextuality, while Fairclough borrows the term in order to use it in a context far removed from literary reading. It was David Birch's work that brought it closer to a literary context but his approach lacked a framework that would allow its broader application."

Regarding the issue, texts are not isolated but function within social, cultural and ideological milieu which is influenced by re-workings of other texts. Juvan (2009:1) argues:

"Every literary text is, in its quality of utterance and as an enactment of meaning, historically individual and unrepeatable, yet the very uniqueness of the meaning effect bases itself in structures, forms, and semantic nets that recur – before and after the text's production – in a vast variety of transformations."

For Bakhtin, intertextuality acts as a mechanism by which textual elements convey meaning depending on other relevant texts but the term *'intertextuality'* is a more punctual phenomenon which transforms and circulates the ideologies. For Hatim & Mason (1997:188) the term is:

"A precondition for the intelligibility of texts, involving the dependence of one text as a semiotic entity upon another, previously encountered text. However, the intertextual reference, instead of evoking an image, can preclude it, parody it, or signify its exact opposite."

Regarding the intertextuality, a text is a summary or commentary which shows how utterances within texts reflect the other texts, and as a sign that to what they refer.

For Fairclough (1992):

"Intertextuality is basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth."

Therefore, texts cannot be interpreted in isolation and all texts (and all utterances) are intertextual. Fairclough focuses on the intertextuality as a base for interpretation of a text. If all texts are in an intertextual relation then they would refer and point to other texts as Saldanha & O'Brien (2013:94) put: "the dependence of one text or part of text upon other previously encountered texts is called Intertextuality."

2.5.1. The Nature of Intertextuality

For Allen (2000:20) intertextuality highlights the notions of relationality, interconnectedness, and interdependence in postmodern life. He maintains:

"In the postmodern epoch, theorists often claim, it is not possible any longer to speak of originality or the uniqueness of the artistic object, be it a painting or novel, since every artistic object is so clearly assembled from bits and pieces of already existent art".

There is one accepted general definition of the term and it is that intertextuality is the most doubtful term. A possible starting point to discuss the issue of intertextuality is to search in the most common and accessible sources such as dictionaries. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary which defines the term as:

> "The complex interrelationship between a text and other texts is taken as basic to the creation or interpretation of the text which might be referential but by no means sufficient".

The term *'complex'* seems not appropriate and the original theories will discuss to make an easy understanding of the term. There are different definitions of the term *'intertextuality'* based on the field of study or point of views. Oxford English Dictionary (1997) defines intertextuality:

> "The need for one text to be read in the light of its allusions to and differences from the content or structure of other texts; the (allusive) relationship between especially literary texts."

A definition characteristically followed by Steiner (1989:96) as "All theories of hermeneutics and intertextuality –a characteristic piece of current jargon which signal the obvious truth that, in Western literature, most serious writing incorporates, denies, and refers to previous writing."

Bazerman (2004) argues:

> "Understanding how we use intertextuality as writers and readers can improve our practice as individuals and as collectives. Our writing can be more sure-footed as we notice the intertextual ground we stand on. [..] As readers we cannote more exactly those intertexts the writer is invoking, how and for what purposes; further, we can also decide as readers if we want to bring other texts

to bear on the issue that the writer has not seen as relevant" (qt. in Ball & Freedman, 2004:53)

Therefore, any writing basically is a kind of transformation and benefits of intertextuality in the form of universality i.e. intertextuality is a feature of a text which is universal in literature, art and translation as well.

2.5.2. Types and Features of Intertextuality

Every text is a product of the snatches that the new producer or writer takes from the old prior texts to make a new text. So, intertextuality comes in many different forms and different discourse communities use it for different purposes.

Fairclough (1992:104) offers "two types of intertextuality i.e. manifest and constitutive intertextuality". According to Fairclough (1992:104), in the manifest intertextuality, the text overtly is related to definite references through which other's ideas will be manifested in the discourse and the new text using quotation marks or reporting clauses explicitly states its relationship with the old texts. By constitutive intertextuality, the text covertly refers to the prior old texts.

Hatim & Munday (2004:86) state:

"Fairclough believes that there are two basic types of intertextual reference: First, horizontal intertextuality, involving direct reference to, or straight quotation from, other texts. Second, vertical intertextuality, conjuring up other texts *'virtually'* in this way enables us to see a diverse range of linguistic or rhetorical devices as tokens of a type of textual occurrence. They are not necessarily concrete references to a text form we have actually encountered, but cues which conjure up images of other texts or genres."

Derrida (1988) speaks of *'iterability'* throughout his works. For him *'iterability'* means any word which can be said by one human being to another is repeatable, i.e. the repeatability of the linguistic elements. When one uses words, he would probably imagine that he is citing a dictionary. That is why texts do not refer to but contain other texts. "Searle argues that it is not, as Derrida claims, the iterability, the repeatability of the linguistic elements that distinguishes writing from oral speech, but the relative permanence of writing" (qt. from Derrida 1988:25).

Porter (1986:35-6) introduces two kinds of intertextuality i.e. *'iterability'* and *'presupposition'*;

> "The *'Iterability'* refers to the repeatability of certain textual fragments, including not only explicit allusions, references, and quotations within a discourse, but unannounced sources and influences, clichés, phrases in the traditions; and *'Presupposition'* refers to assumptions a text makes about its referent, readers, and its context- to portions of the text which are read, but which are not explicitly there."

Based on the intertextual theory any new text is indebted to the past texts and linked to the future texts that are coming. In other words, she considers "a new text as a consequent of old text or—heir to the past" (qt. from Farahzad 2009:125-6). Intertextuality is not a feature of the text alone but of the *'contract'* forms a link between its author(s) and reader(s).

According to Chandler (2002:7), features of intertextuality are:

1. "Reflexivity: how reflexive (or self-conscious) the use of intertextuality seems to be

2. Alteration: the alteration of sources

145

3. Explicitness: the specificity and explicitness of reference(s) to other text(s)

4. Criticality to comprehension: how important it would be for the reader to recognize the intertextuality involved

5. Scale of adoption: the overall scale of allusion/incorporation within the text

6. Structural unboundedness: to what extent the text is presented as part of a larger structure -Factors which are often not under the control of the author of the text"

2.5.3. Intertextuality and Translation

Intertextuality recently has entered into Translation Studies claiming that translation is an intertextual issue. In the late 1960s, following the coinage of the term *'intertextuality'* by Kristeva, new perceptions are established towards the issue of equivalence and target and source text in Translation Studies. Denisova (2003:207) states "now translation is being understood not only as the interlinguistic phenomenon but as the intertextual phenomenon" (qt. in Klimovich 2014: 256).

Genette (1997: xx) argues:

> "Translation, particularly when the author is collaboratively engaged in the process, is the issuing of the text in serialized form; and the inclusion of illustrations, especially those supplied by the author."

Translation for Toury (1995) is an intertextual phenomenon which occurs in the certain phrases and sentences which evaluated not from the equivalence viewpoint but from the viewpoint of the intertextual connections towards the language and/or cultural system.

Garbovsky (2004:554) stated:

"Intertextual elements could be considered as translation units. Translating the intertextual elements a translator should consider onomosemiological i.e. from sign to the meaning, the approach in the definition of the translation unit. According to this approach, the translation unit is identified as the unit of meaning."

If the intertextuality put meaning on a text then the loss of intertextual elements in translation will lead to distortion of author's meaning. In the process of translation of intertextual elements, Alekseeva (2001:13) stated:

a. full or partial loss of intertextuality

b. replacement of an intertextual element of the original text to the intertextual elements, with the same connotations in the translated text (qt. in Klimovich, 2014:260)

Farahzad (2009:125) introduces different types of intertextuality and argues:

"The *'metatext'* repeats the *'prototext'* in terms of content and form without being limited to it. The first kind of intertextuality i.e. horizontal is at the intralingual or local level so that the *'prototext'* is related to all texts appearing before it in its own language in terms of content and form. The second kind of intertextuality i.e. vertical which is at the global level, the *'metatext'* is related to the *'prototext'* and to its all other possible metatexts appearing either in the same language or any other language."

The *'prototexts'* and *'metatext'* as equivalent pairs used for ST and TT which have a textual relationship to each other. Thus, the majority of the literary texts are translations which become *'prototexts'* and influence the other texts of this language

which is *'metatexts'*. In other words, any original text is a translation of the already existed text which the source is lost and could not be traced.

Kuzmina (1999:268) maintains:

> "Intertextuality is the ontological quality of any text and is the criteria of the aesthetic value of a text, and if a piece of writing doesn't have this quality, it has no chances to be accepted into the world literature. So, intertextuality is the quality of the literary text and represents the ability of a text to accumulate information not only directly from the personal experience, but also indirectly from other texts" (qt. in Klimovich, 2014)

In the same vein, Klimovich (2014:260) mentions the intertextual elements are the external level of a text, as performing a stylistic and compositional order of text, which conveys information of the implied sense of a text and actualizing the main function of fictional text i.e. aesthetic.

Regarding the Kristeva and the issue of intertextuality in translation, it should not consider the translated text as an isolated but it is a transposition of texts in from other texts but any text (translated or foreign) is a quotation or a product of another. Due to the reason, the translation and intertextuality are in close relation.

Hatim (2001:121) argues "the term *'intertextuality'* is the way we relate textual occurrences to each other and recognize them as signs which evoke whole areas of our previous textual experience". He further maintains that texts are dependent on the already existing texts which are not easily identifiable and may have conditions of appropriateness governing the entire genres.

In order to transfer the intertextual reference by translators, Hatim (2001) developed a set of procedures, tackling translators in transferring the intertextual reference in the

process of translation. Hatim (2001) sets "a framework for translators in order to recognize and transfer the intertextual references". He (2001:122) maintains that "firstly, translators will encounter intertextual signals which are tangible elements in a text and initiate the intertextual search. Second, translators deal with the exercise of charting the various routes through which these signals linked up with its pretext". He believes:

> "Intertextuality is an aspect of both the reception and production of texts, while readers and writers wrestle with intertextual reference as an important aspect of text construction and deconstruction."

Denisova (2003:298) states that translating intertextual elements, there is a tendency to focus on the peculiarities of the original text. However, currently, researchers' attention is focused on the social and culturological function of translation (qt. in Klimovich 2014:256).

Klimovich (2014:257) stresses that what does it mean when one would say, 'it sounds wrong' and why it is difficult to explain that feeling. Thus, the intertextual elements correspond with the criteria on perceptive and productive marking, in particular:

1. are optional in use

2. used only among *'neutral'* phrases

3. give additional meaning to the phrase (have an intensive informational effect)

4. Should be adequately perceived by an addressee

Obviously, intertextuality is an essential factor for understanding a text in translation as Neubert & Shreve (1992:117) say:

> "It is not the result of the presence or absence of any single grammatical or lexical pattern in a text. It is a function of a configuration of grammatical and lexical properties. Intertextuality is a global pattern which the reader compares to pre-existing cognitive templates abstracted from experience. Intertextuality is a property of "liking other texts of this kind" which readers attribute to texts."

All the literary genres can be produced via intertextual relations but poetry is known to be one of the challenging genres in translation. A reader who is familiar with the Turkish language will find numerous examples of intertextual relations in Turkish poem. For example, Shahriyar's highly cultural bound poem *'Khan Nana'*, is full of intertextuality. So to understand Shahriyar, one should be familiar with the intertextuality. The issue of intertextuality in the translation seems complicated and translators are doubtful that which aspects os text should be retained and which should be cast off regarding the *'form and function'*.

According to Nida (1984:91):

> "Dynamic equivalence is determined primarily by a comparison of the impact and appeals the texts of the source language and the target language. So translators should take into consideration the ways in which intended readers might respond to such a translation."

The *'dynamic equivalence'* is based on the reader's response. First, the translator should find the intertextual elements of the original, and then find the pretext of these signals. From this pretext, the translator would claim that what relations this signals might evoke for the SL readers from their previous experience.

Therefore, translators should have intertextual knowledge of two languages to understanding intertextual signals. It is hard to find any intertextual signals in TL, then translator is better to paraphrase the SL to explain their connotation for TL readers. It means that the focus should be on signals of verbal signs which have certain meanings for receptors.

Xu Ying (2005:117) insists:

> "Translators should try to find in the target language and culture system the intertextual signals which can call up the same association (pre-text) as the source language signals do. But in most cases, the chance that we find the appropriate intertextual signals is so slim."

Regarding the intertextuality as an important condition of all texts, it is essential to concern the dimension in the literary translation. Literature is very potential for the issue of intertextuality and literary translators should be aware of. So, in the process of transferring intertextual elements, different effects on readers in two cultures should be taken into account.

It is the only demand to translation activity, for a translated text in the result of its contact with other semiotic systems produced the *'third'* intertextual space, conceptually different and unpredictable, and become, in the frames of another language's culture, a producer of new meanings. For example, choosing a method of translation of the intertextual element from the Bible, the difficulty for a translator lies in the identification of the intertextual element from the Bible in fictional text and relating it to the certain type. Following this procedure is considered to be the necessary condition to retain the intertextual element from the Bible in a translated text. (cf. Denisova 2003:298)

2.6.   The Panchatantra

Literature is a reflection of a nation's culture, ideology, values, myths, and identity and folktales are anonymous stories known as *'folklore'* which are a great part of a nation's literature. Folktales reveal the cultural values of a nation which have been transferred beyond the boundaries by merchants, religious pilgrims, and immigrants. These people on various occasions were telling their own folktales reflecting the culture of their own homeland. In the transferring process of stories, characters and places were given new names and were made similar to native ones. These tales were communicating the moral, cultural and social values developing the literature as well.

One of the most popular ancient famous fables is the *Panchatantra* which is a collection of Indian fables. The *Panchatantra,* due to unique characteristics of fiction and education, has a great reputation not only in the literature of Iran but in the history of world literature. The original work was written in Sanskrit and collected in the third century BCE by an anonymous Brahman named Vishnu Sharma.

Lessing (1999:13) states:

> "The *Panchatantra* (five principles) is an ancient Indian inter-related collection of animal fables in verse and prose, in a frame story format. The original Sanskrit work, which some scholars believe was composed in the 3rd century BCE, is attributed to Vishnu Sharma. It is based on older oral traditions, including "animal fables that are as old as we are able to imagine" (qt. in Ramsay 2008:9).

Mahjoub (2001:13) believes, based on the narrator of the *Panchatantra*, it was written for teaching the three sons of the Amarashakti the King of Mahilaropya. He was concerning the capabilities of his sons. They were not interested in education and

learning. King decided to employ Vishnu Sharma for teaching his princes and invited Vishnu Sharma to his palace. Vishnu Sharma was eighty years old and a proud teacher. Mahjoub (2001:14) mentions that:

> "He took it as a challenge and declared, Oh, king, I pledge today that I will make your sons wise and intelligent within six months. I will not accept anything in return. Let them come with me right now."

"Vishnu Sharma took the king's sons to his place. They have lived with him and he taught them by telling the stories from the *Panchatantra* that was collected by him. After a short time, Vishnu Sharma took the sons back and the king was surprised by his sons' intelligence and wise. The king was happy and asked Vishnu Sharma, *'What did you do?'* Vishnu Sharma answered, "I just told them some stories". Vishnu-Sharman, in fact, did nothing especial but made the three sons to memorize the stories" (Mahjoub 2001:14).

Some scholars such as Mahjoub (2001:13) believe that "the original work which Hindus gathered has ten chapters and why the book has five chapters due to that from the 6th century until now, the book has appeared in different versions and translations."

Regarding the name of original work, (Panchatantra or five principles), it seems that the original work must have five chapters or books. The five books are called:

1. The Separation of Friends (The Lion and the Bull)

2. The Gaining of Friends (The Dove, Crow, Mouse, Tortoise, and Deer)

3. Of Crows and Owls (War and Peace)

4. Loss Of Gains (The Monkey and the Crocodile)

5. Ill-Considered Action / Rash deeds (The Brahman and the Mongoose)

The most interesting features of the *Panchatantra* which make it popular among the nations and led to the life of the book for thousands of years is its concise and simple form but so profound and complex meaning structure. The narrator through few lines tells a story which is rich and profound semantically and represents the wonderful relation between lexis and makes a judgment and came to conclusion. This feature of the book turns it into a postmodern storybook (Mahjoub 2001:15).

Bradbury (2001:116) maintains "the character is at the heart of all fictional writing…plot is itself often the product of a character… in their processes of development, growing self-knowledge or interaction with others."

Olivelle (2006:23) regarding the number of stories and chapters mentions:

"This book contains around thirty stories, mostly told by the two jackals. It is the longest of the five books, making up roughly forty-five percent of the work's length."

The *Panchatantra* is an inter-woven series of colorful fables, many of which involve animals exhibiting animal stereotypes. It is certainly the most frequently translated literary product of India. (cf. Olivelle 2006:26).

Ryder (1925) claims:

"These stories are among the most widely known in the world. It is also explained that Niti 'represents an admirable attempt to answer the insistent question how to win the utmost possible joy from life in the world of men' and that Niti is the harmonious development of the powers of man, a life in which security, prosperity, resolute action, friendship, and good learning are so combined to produce joy."

The *Panchatantra* is an India literary masterpiece which provides life lessons and guidance to everybody from every nation. The book was the textbook of the royal family with an educational purpose. It is claimed that the book is teaching politic and the main theme of the book is struggling for survival between animals.

Mohanty[2] (2016) mentions that the book is written in fable format due a few reasons. The first reason could probably because of love for animals among the Indians. It is the fact that Indians love animals and takes care of them which is a part of Indian culture. The second reason would probably be the lack of the literary genre in the time of rewriting the book that imposed upon the author to take the exact form of the folktales which have been reproduced orally among the natives and tribes.

Ghosh (2005:111) states about the *Panchatantra:*

> "These stories too have no settings to speak of, except the notion of a forest. Yet the *Panchatantra* is reckoned by some to be second only to the Bible in the extent of its global diffusion. Compiled in India early in the first millennium, it passed into Arabic through a sixth-century Persian translation, engendering some of the best known of middle eastern fables, including parts of the Thousand and One Nights. The stories were handed on to the Slavic languages through Greek, then from Hebrew to Latin, a version in the latter appearing in 1270. Through Latin, they passed into German and Italian. These stories left their mark on collections as different as those of La Fontaine and the Grimm brothers, and today they are inseparably part of a global heritage."

---

[2] Professor Panchanan Mohanty, Department of Applied Linguistic and Translation Studies, Hyderabad University. The materials obtained from discussions.

Tales were told by a teacher named Visnu Sarma to teach the sons of king Amarasakti Storytelling had been an effective tool to teach the culture of the society. The stories of *Panchatantra* give a sense of intertextuality since they have similarity to the stories from the neighboring countries. "The *Panchatantra* approximated its current literary form within the 4th–6th centuries CE, though originally written around 200 BCE. No Sanskrit texts before 1000 CE have survived." (cf. Edgerton 1924)

The *Panchatantra* is not a mere set of animal stories for children but a Niti-Shastra and a sort of ambivalent text. Regarding the Niti-Shastra, Ryder (1925:5) maintains:

> "The *Panchatantra* is a Niti-Shastra or textbook of Niti. The term 'Niti' means roughly "the wise conduct of life." Western civilization must endure a certain shame in realizing that no precise equivalent of the term is found in English, French, Latin, or Greek. Many words are therefore necessary to explain what Niti is, though the idea, once grasped, is clear, important, and satisfying. First of all, Niti presupposes that one has considered, and rejected, the possibility of living as a saint. It can be practiced only by a social being, and represents an admirable attempt to answer the insistent question how to win the utmost possible joy from life in the world of men."

Although it mentioned that it was told by a teacher named Visnu Sarma but many scholars disagree on the exact dates and the authors of the Sanskrit original. Olivelle, (2006:18) states:

> "The Shastra is a technical or scientific treatise; thus it is considered a treatise on political science and human conduct. Its literary sources are "the expert tradition of political science and the folk and literary traditions of storytelling". It draws from the Dharma and Artha Shastra, quoting them extensively."

156

The *Panchatantra* is an evidence of a tradition of storytelling of Indian which backs to the earliest times of civilization. The twenty-five versions exist in India which in some of them the name of the author mentioned as Vishnu Sharma who first collected and compiled the book. There is a claim that many stories of the *Panchatantra* are similar to the Buddhist Jataka tales, which told by the Buddha before his death around 400 BCE. Regarding the issue, Olivelle (2006:18) believes:

> "It is clear that the Buddhists did not invent the stories. [...] It is quite uncertain whether the author of [the Panchatantra] borrowed his stories from the Jataka or the Mahabharata, or whether he was tapping into a common treasury of tales, both oral and literary, of ancient India."

"Many scholars believe the tales were based on earlier oral folk traditions, which were finally written down, although there is no conclusive evidence. In the early 20th century, Norman Brown (1919) found that many folk tales in India appeared to be borrowed from literary sources and not vice-versa" (qt. from JAOS vol. 39).

Regarding the book, Edgerton (1924:3) argues:

> "There are recorded over two hundred different versions known to exist in more than fifty languages, and three-fourths of these languages are extra-Indian. As early as the eleventh century this work reached Europe, and before 1600 it existed in Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, German, English, Old Slavonic, Czech, and perhaps other Slavonic languages. Its range has extended from Java to Iceland... [In India,] it has been worked over and over again, expanded, abstracted, turned into verse, retold in prose, translated into medieval and modern vernaculars, and retranslated into Sanskrit. And most of the stories contained in it have 'gone down' into the folklore of the story-

loving Hindus, whence they reappear in the collections of oral tales gathered by modern students of folk-stories."

The variations of stories of the *Panchatantra* may be found in other traditions in the Indian neighborhood such as Malaya, China, Tibet and so on but the *Panchatantra* stories which originally written in the Sanskrit, are didactic in nature which were written for specific purposes.

The *Panchatantra* has ideological similarity to the well-known politicians' view and West political view. Allen & Unwin, (1965:13) state:

"An early Western scholar who studied the *Panchatantra* was Dr. Johannes Hertel, who thought the book had a Machiavellian character. Similarly, Edgerton noted that the so-called 'morals' of the stories have no bearing on morality; they are immoral and often immoral which glorify shrewdness and practical wisdom in the affairs of life, and especially of politics and of government."

de Blois (1990: 43-4) argues:

"Unlike, that in the first view the book looks a collection of native stories or animal myth, the stories of the book were written for specific aims and objectives. This book was the course book of Indian Royal family and people of the high social level, to teach them how to deal with political and international political issues. It is not the Dharma (Buddhist ethical book) but undoubtedly is literary work without responsibility and moral mission. The basis of the book is what which is called Machiavelism in Europe. The morality which the book teaches that a smart should be successful and non-smart are doomed to fail. In the book, details of deceits and betrays were

explained ignoring the moralities and insisted that these are essentials of life and politic."

Folktales are inherent of all traditions in which animal reflect the different symbolic meaning and have different characteristics. Wong & Hines (2001:9) point out:

"Perhaps, within the Indic tradition, associations of certain animals with a specific set of inherent characteristics specifically attributed to them could be traced back to the set of folk tales collected in the *Panchatantra* and Jataka (stories of Buddha's earlier births) stories. Later in this essay, this topic will be discussed in more detail."

"Apart from a short introduction -in which the author, Vishnu Sharma, is introduced as narrating the rest of the work to the princes- it consists of five parts. Each part contains the main story, called the frame story, which in turn contains several stories "emboxed" in it, as one character narrates a story to another. Often these stories contain further emboxed stories. The stories thus operate like a succession of Russian dolls, one narrative opening within another, sometimes three or four deep. Besides the stories, the characters also quote various epigrammatic verses to make their point" (cf. Ryder 1925:6).

Jafa (2004:1) states:

"The central theme of the *Panchatantra* is the harmonious and integrated development of man, a life in which security, prosperity, friendship and learning are combined as to produce a lasting joy. It exemplifies and upholds ethical values, social order, and customary law and yet is an important medium through which protest, dissent, and reform are articulated. The *Panchatantra* stories are not moral stories. It suggests that there is no place for

a fool in the world. Different points of view are expressed through dialogues in the stories accompanied by maxims. At one place, for example, it is said, 'Shun him who is rogue and fool'. In another story, it is said, Scholarship is less than good sense, therefore seek intelligence. Some of the other maxims are: "Nothing is impossible if one has intelligence."

The *Panchatantra* is an ambivalent text which means appeals to children and adults. The other feature of the book is the strong plot, humor, fascinating events, high quality of storytelling which is impressing for children as well as adults. As an instance the story *'Rabbit and Numskull'* could be enjoyable to young children and other stories of wisdom could be truly stimulating to the elders and teenagers. The adults may enjoy the satirical implication of a story giving an insight into the situations which individuals face in everyday life.

There are several types of the *Panchatantra* in India and Hertel was able to find the oldest Sanskrit edition namely, the *'Tantrakhyayika'* in Kashmir, a Sanskrit text by monk Purnabhadra in 1199 CE that had been the three earlier versions. Hertel's own translation is based on this book. Edgerton also studying the book mentions that "to provide useful evidence on the lost Sanskrit text to which, it must be assumed, they all go back, and believed he had reconstructed the original Sanskrit *Panchatantra* ; this version is known as the Southern Family text."

Ramsay (2008:10) mentions:

"Anyone with any claim to a literary education knew that the Fables of Bidpai or the Tales of *'Kalila and Dimna'* these beings the most commonly used titles with us -was a great Eastern classic. There were at least twenty English translations in the hundred years before 1888. Pondering on these facts leads

160

to reflection on the fate of books, as chancy and unpredictable as that of people or nations."

In these stories, animal characters behave like a human which may delight the readers who are interested in symbolic and allusive stories. Since the characters are animals, many people mistakenly believe that the story was written especially for children and categorize the *Panchatantra* into children literature. The stories are implied from a real world and everyday life which bring insight to the society and change the perspectives.

The stories of *Panchatantra* reveal the real situations of life-giving an approach to a successful life. Though the book was written thousands of years ago, the ideas of the book seem very fresh due to that it teaches us how to be wiser.

2.6.1. The Indian Version

"In the Indian version also the two main characters' name are very close to the Persian version, i.e. the two jackals namely the Karataka (Horribly Howling) and the Damanaka (Victor) who are the king's servant. Against Karataka's advice, Damanaka breaks up the friendship between the lion and the bull out of jealousy." (cf. Olivelle 2006:23)

    a. Mitra-bheda

    b. Mitra-labia or Mitra-samprāpti

    c. Kakolukiyam

    d. Labdhapranasam

    e. Apariksitakarakam

"In the first book, a friendship arises between the lion 'Pingalaka', the king of the forest, and Sanjivaka, a bull. Karataka (Horribly Howling) and Damanaka (Victor) are two jackals that are retainers to the lion king. The second book, seeing the favor the rat performed to free the dove (or pigeon) and her companions, the crow decided to befriend with the rat, despite the rat's initial objections. The storyline evolves as their friendship grows to include the turtle and the fawn. They collaborate to save the fawn when he is trapped, and later they work together to save the turtle, who falls in the trap." (cf. Olivelle 2006:23)

"The third book, traditional enemies, the crows and the owls are at war. One of the crows pretends to be an outcast from his own group to gain entry into the rival owl group; he learns their secrets and vulnerabilities. He later summons his group of crows to set fire to all entrances to the cave where the owls live and the creatures suffocate to death." (cf. Olivelle 2006:24)

"In the fourth book, the story tells of a symbiotic relationship between the monkey and the crocodile. The crocodile risks the liaison by conspiring to acquire the heart of the monkey to heal his wife. When the monkey finds out the plan, he avoids the grim fate. In the last book, a Brahman leaves his child with a mongoose friend. When he returns, he sees blood on the mongoose's mouth, and kills his friend, believing the animal killed his child. The Brahman discovers his child alive and learns that the mongoose defended the child from a snake. He regrets having killed his friend." (cf. Olivelle 2006: 25)

2.6.2. The Persian Version

The translation of *'Kalile va Demne'* into Pahlavi by Borzoi in the 570 CE was the first translation of the *Panchatantra* which is believed that is busted or lost. The book

was translated into Arabic *'Kalīla wa Dimna'* by Ibn al-Muqaffa around 750 CE. His translation was regarded as an objection to the Khaliphate and led to his death (his translation is discussed briefly at the end of this part).

de Blois (1990:22) states:

> "By the time the Sanskrit version migrated several hundred years through Pahlavi (Middle Persian) into Arabic, some important differences arose. The introduction and the frame story of the first book changed."

"The Nitial introduction explains how the book was first composed at the time of Alexander the Greats (called 'ذو القرنين' in the book- he with two horns) attempt to reach India. In it, an Indian King repents past misdeeds and requests an Indian sage (called Bidpai) to compose a body of work with wisdom and fables are to be passed down for the future generations. This is then stored in the great vault of kings as a national treasure. A New Persian version from the 12th century became known as Kalīleh o Demneh" Persian: 'كليله و دمنه' and this was the basis of Kashefi's 15th century *'Anwar-e Soheyli'* Persian: 'انوار سهيلى', The Lights of Canopus. The book in a different form is also known as The Fables of *'Bidpai'* or Pilpai, in various European languages."

Wyndham (1962) mentions:

"The *Panchatantra* is one of the oldest collections of stories in Indian literature. It is unknown how long these stories were related orally, but it was not until around 200 B.C.E. that they were written down. They were collected by a priest-scholar-teacher, named Bidpai, and were used to teach young princes how to understand a diversity of people so that they might one day rule more wisely. By the Silk Road, the *Panchatantra* was transported to distant lands."

The Persian scholars such as Tehrani (2009) and Mahjoub (2001) believe that Persian tradition and literature has borrowed a number of stories from the *Panchatantra* which Borzoi translated from Sanskrit to Pahlavi (Middle Persian language). There are two different views in how Borzoi was commissioned to go to India and brought the book or its translation. In the Sassanid period the Persian king *Khosru Anushiravan I* heard about this book of wisdom in India. First, he sends one of the most trusted men. This man spent many years in India and won the trust of the guards of the treasury, got the book and took it to Iran. This man was given rewards and allowed to translate the book into the Persian in order to be read by everyone in Persia. About the second view according to the story told in the Shah Name (The Book of the Kings, Persia's late 10th century national epic by Ferdowsi), Borzuy sought his king's permission to make a trip to Hindustan in search of a mountain herb he had read about that is "mingled into a compound and, when sprinkled over a corpse, it is immediately restored to life.

They (1985:333-4) further mention that:

> "He did not find the herb but was told by a wise sage of "a different interpretation. The herb is the scientist; science is the mountain, everlastingly out of reach of the multitude. The corpse is the man without knowledge, for the uninstructed man is everywhere lifeless. Through knowledge, man becomes revivified." The sage pointed to the book Kalila, and Borzuy obtained the king's permission to read and translate the book, with the help of some Pundits."

In Borzoi's translation, the name of two main characters (two jackals) completely changed into *'Kalila and Dimn'*. There are two reasons behind the translation of the book *Panchatantra* into the name of two jackals *'Kalila and Dimna'*. First, probably

the first part of the book constituted most of the work, and/or second, probably there was not an equivalent in Zoroastrian Pahlavi language for the term *Panchatantra* which expressed in the Sanskrit. Then the jackals' name turned into the generic name for the work. But the second reason seems illogical. If the translator was able to translate the book and even to add three chapters to it, then the translator was able to find an equivalent for the term *Panchatantra.*

2.6.3. Ibn al-Muqaffa and the Ideological Translation

The Abbasid dynasty (750–1258 AD) came to power in the eighth century. This period was the greatest development of caliphate of Abbasid dynasty. It was also the period for cultural exchange when the Persian and Greek political theories were influential to Abbasid political institutions.

"In the nascent Abbasid dynasty, the first caliph Abu al-Abbas (750–4 AD) worked with his brother Abu Ja'far al-Mansur to ensure political stability. Abu al-Abbas also worked with his uncles. These uncles were Ibn al-Muqaffa's patrons. When Abu al-Abbas died, his uncle Abdullah ibn-Ali the governor of Basra, claimed to be the next caliph with the support of the governor Abu Muslim. Ibn Ali's brothers solicited Ibn al-Muqaffa to write a letter of protection (Aman Nameh) for ibn-Ali. Ibn al-Muqaffa apparently attached his addendums to the traditional format of the letter that may have angered al-Mansur. Al-Mansur arranged for the murder of the governor Abu Muslim and appointed a new governor of Basra, Sufyan ibn al-Muawiyah." (Lambton 2006:50-1).

Regarding the issue, Meri (2006:346) states:

> "This new governor hated the secretary Ibn al-Muqaffa and decided to kill him under the alleged charge that he was practicing Manichaeism. al-Mansur

assumed the role of the caliph and paid no attention to his uncles' complaints about Ibn al-Muqaffaʿs sentence […] private revenge have contributed to Ibn al-Muqaffa's fate. Apparently, the caliph did not object to the scribe's execution, as he was unhappy with him for his document of aman nameh."

It seems that there is another reason for killing the Ibn al-Muqaffa as Amir-Arjomand (1994:27) mentions:

"Ibn al-Muqaffa was a Persian convert to Islam and was part of a class of Persian secretaries (kuttab) who worked in the Abbasid administration. It was in his role as secretary that Ibn al-Muqaffa participated in Abbasid court life. But the politics of the time and Ibn al-Muqaffa's colorful personality contribute to any story about his influence and its limits."

"The Persian Ibn al-Muqaffa' translated the *Panchatantra* (in Middle Persian: Kalilag-o Demnag) from Middle Persian to Arabic as 'Kalīla wa Dimna'. This is considered the first masterpiece of Arabic literary prose. Ibn al-Muqaffa's version (two languages removed from the pre-Islamic Sanskrit original) emerged as the pivotal surviving text that enriched world literature" (Nadwi 2013:35). "Ibn al-Muqaffa's work is considered a model of the finest Arabic prose style and is considered the first masterpiece of Arabic literary prose." (Kritzeck 1964:73).

In his translation, Ibn al-Muqaffa wrote a long introduction and filled the story with morals, wisdom, and fables to show his anger and objection. de Blois (1990:22) writes about his death:

"Ibn al-Muqaffa' inserted additions and interpretations into his translation in 750CE i.e. re-telling. He added the Dimna's trial. The jackal is suspected of a convict of the death of the bull *'Shanzabeh'*, a key character in the first

chapter. The trial lasts for two days without conclusion, until a tiger and leopard appear to bear witness against Dimna. He is found guilty and put to death."

It is the fact Ibn al-Muqaffa has manipulated the book by adding his own interpretation and thematic changes of the text in order to show his political orientation. Nadwi (2013:33) believes:

> "In the first frame story, the evil Damanaka Victor wins, and not his good brother Karataka. There is a persistent theme of evil triumphant in his translation Some scholars believe that Ibn al-Muqaffa inserted a chapter at the end of Part One, which puts Dimna in jail, on trial and eventually to death, in an effort to assuage religious opponents of the work."

Ibn al-Muqaffa, in order to show his political perspectives and the model of indirect speech, applied different literary devices. The politic theorist London (2008:201) states "Ibn al-Muqaffa was expressing risky political views in a metaphorical way. Al-Muqaffa' was murdered within a few years of completing his manuscript". London (2008:201) "has analyzed how Ibn al-Muqaffa could have used his version to make *'frank political expression'* at the Abbasid court."

Meri (2006:346) mentions:

> "In the Abbasid dynasty, Ibn al-Muqaffa expressed his political views in various forms of writing (some of which were more direct than others), such as a book on the behavior of the ideal prince (Kitab al-Adab al-Kabir) and a treatise on practical politics and military advice to the Abbasid caliph (Risalah fi al-Sahabah). He is also said to have translated a political treatise into Arabic from Persian writings of the Sassanid Period (Kitab Tansar). In fact, Ibn al-

167

Muqaffa commissioned to translate the *'Kalileh va Demnah'* to the Abbasid caliphate Mammon 8th century."

Kritzeck (1964:73) argues:

> "The *'Kalileh and Dimnah'* is, in fact, the patriarchal form of the Indic fable in which animals behave as humans -as distinct from the Aesopic fable in which they behave as animals. Its philosophical heroes through the initially interconnected episodes illustrating [...]. It seems unjust, in the light of posterity's appreciation of his work, that Ibn al-Muqaffa was put to death after charges of heresy about 755 CE."

"Ibn al-Muqaffa's historical milieu itself, when composing his masterpiece in Baghdad during the bloody Abbasid overthrow of the Umayyad dynasty, has become the subject (and rather confusingly, also the title) of a gritty Shakespearean drama by the multicultural Kuwaiti playwright Suleiman Al-Bassam." (cf. Olivelle 2006:17).

Olivelle (2006:18) further argues:

> "Indeed, the current scholarly debate regarding the intent and purpose of the *Panchatantra* whether it supports unscrupulous Machiavellian politics or demands ethical conduct from those holding high office -underscores the rich ambiguity of the text."

In fact, Ibn al-Muqaffa's view was political and ideological and his particular genre was contributed to resources for politics through rhetoric. Although, he was writing in a non-democratic milieu but his writing techniques and genre can be useful in non-democratic context and contemporary democratic atmosphere as well. London (2008:191) mentions:

> "His work further urges contemporary scholars of democratic theory, interested in a link between self-expression and public identity performance, to look beyond the conceptual confines of the public sphere. The term *'public sphere'* has become a *'cue'* that contemporary scholars use to locate critical debate."

The story of *'The King and his Companions'* which is in Ibn al-Muqaffa's translation of "Kalila wa Dimna" saturated with political ideas in association with the Sassanid era (226–651 AD). Obviously, by translating these stories, he tried to transfer the ideas from Sassanid to Abbasid since he was Iranian. Ibn al-Muqaffa used the translation of the *Panchatantra* (*Kalila wa Dimna*) as a means of introducing his ideological/political views in the Abbasid court. (London 2008:191)

By his approach, Ibn al-Muqaffa aimed at teaching how to influence the leaders and authorities using the fables and enacted his approach in storytelling. He used the *Panchatantra* to introduce morality to leaders which one could use in making political decisions. His translation showed how translating parables, one could influence a prince as Ibn al-Muqaffa did to the Arabic princes.

In this regard, it seems that the Machiavelli's book namely *'The Prince'* was written under the influence of the *Panchatantra.*

de Blois (1990:31) argues:

> "This story is of Indian origin and was not part of the *Panchatantra* or the Mahabharata (*an epic poem from ancient India*) but was part of another unknown text that was available in Middle Persian. While the text is of Indian origin, it embodies ideas that scholars associate with Sassanid models of kingship. Perhaps Ibn al-Muqaffa may have wished to bring these ideas out by

adding this text to his Arabic edition. The congruence of Indian and Sassanid political ideals in this context makes sense given the geographical location of the Persian Empire that led to the influx of Indian political ideals. Scholars who discuss the Sassanid period often speak of 'Indo-Persian' ideals that animate this epoch."

Ibn al-Muqaffa offers an approach for frank and indirect speech. This approach reveals how political speakers perform and apply the indirect speech in a way that can help listeners experience what exactly they wish to convey. Disch (1993:489), regarding the issue, maintains:

"The storytelling as a vehicle for frank but indirect speech implicitly, […] it is *'more truth'* than fact because it communicates one's own critical understanding in a way that invites discussion from rival perspectives […] truth is sharing a critical perspective with others, while fact is an explicit description of events; alluding to the possibility of frank but indirect speech."

Ibn al-Muqaffa, furthermore, offers a model specifically for a frank and indirect speech by the translation of the *Panchatantra,* but it is amusing that he was immorally bold, direct and offensive in the real life. Regarding the issue, if his translation offers a model for indirect political expression, then by translation he probably wished to show how to communicate politically and in order to communicate these political perspectives, he translates metaphorically. In addition, he shows the use of different narrative forms as a means to express the political views (London 2008:201).

London (2008:201) further mentions:

"Moreover, the role of translator enables Ibn al-Muqaffa to transform social power dynamics that characterize his traditional relationship with elites

reading his story […] and exposes important truths about politics from another context. If he spoke in the first person, however, he might be viewed as just another bureaucrat at court. An ordinary person can elevate his social status with elites if he is a translator; he can communicate political wisdom from another context. In this case, elites can learn more from Ibn al-Muqaffa telling them stories than if he speaks to them directly. The translator can also use fables as media to introduce ancient Sassanid ideas he deems important.

Al-Muqaffa's translation was a sort of domestication/localization in a way that he altered the characterization most probably in order to the native readers would recognize. To have some examples among the others, in chapter four, he changed the crocodile to the tortoise and the mongoose into a weasel and Brahman as a hermit. Nadwi (2013:34) argues that Al-Muqaffa begins each chapter of *'Kalila wa Dimna'* with a guiding frame-story theme that suggests key aspects of leadership:

a. One should always be wary if one friend accuses another of crime

b. (Added chapter) Truth will be revealed, sooner or later

c. Cooperation among friends is vital to their survival

d. Mental strength and deceit are stronger in warfare than brute force

e. One must be careful not to betray friends, especially guarding against one's own tendencies towards foolishness

f. One should be wary of hasty judgments

In this regard, it could be claimed that his translation is highly ideological. The pre-Islamic original, The *Panchatantra,* contains no such dogmatic moralizing. As Joseph Jacobs observed in (1888:48), "…the very *'raison d'être'* (the purpose of life) of the

Fable is to imply its moral without mentioning it". In fact, Ibn al-Muqaffa translated the *Panchatantra* to be read by literalities and lay people and to teach various ideological and political views in the Sassanid court as well.

2.6.4. Similarities to the World's Masterpieces

The impact of these stories can be observed in the literature of different nations. The *Panchatantra* wields worldwide impression by influencing the nation's literature. No doubt it has delighted children of all ages in all places at all times and still doing so. It has traveled far and wide. A number of stories such as Arabian Nights, Canterbury Tales, Sindbad, Western nursery rhymes, and ballads have been modeled by the *Panchatantra.* Concerning the influence of the *Panchatantra* on the world literature and especially West, Sir William Wilson Hunter, an Ideologist writes:

> The fables of animals, familiar to the Western world from the time of Aesop downwards, had their original home in India…*Panchatantra* was translated into the ancient Persian in the 6th century A.D. from that rendering all the subsequent versions in Asia Minor and Europe have been derived. The most ancient animal fables of India are at the present day the nursery stories of England and America. This graceful Hindu imagination delighted also in fairy tales, and the Sanskrit compositions of this class are the original source of many of the fairy stories of Persia, Arabia and Christendom (qt. from Lingam 2012).

"Scholars have noted the strong similarity between a few of the stories in the *Panchatantra* and Aesop's Fables. Examples are 'The Ass in the Panther's Skin' and 'The Ass without Heart and Ears'" (Allen & Unwin 1965:13). "The Broken Pot is similar to Aesop's 'The Milkmaid and Her Pail', 'The Gold-Giving Snake' is similar

to Aesop's "The Man and the Serpent" and 'Le Paysan et Dame serpent' by Marie de France (Fables) Other well-known stories include 'The Tortoise and The Geese' and 'The Tiger, the Brahmin, and the Jackal'. Similar animal fables are found in most cultures of the world, although some folklorists view India as the prime source" (Pearson 1996:279).

2.6.5. Panchatantra in Different Nations

It is mentioned that "from the 6th century, the work has gone through various versions and translations. Borzoi translated the original work into the Pahlavi in 570 CE, then it went to the Arabic in 750 which is the source of European stories. A German translation *'Das Der Buch Beyspiele'* of the *Panchatantra* was printed in 1483, making this one of the earliest books to be printed by Gutenberg's press after the Bible" (qt. from History of the Migration of the *Panchatantra* 2008). "The Latin version was translated into Italian by Antonfrancesco Doni in 1552. This translation became the basis for the first English translation, in 1570: Sir Thomas North translated it into Elizabethan English as The Fables of Bidpai: The Morall Philosophie of Doni (reprinted by Joseph Jacobs, 1888). La Fontaine published The Fables of Bidpai in 1679, based on "the Indian sage Pilpai."

http://www.orientalthane.com/speeches/speech2008.htm.

Nadwi (2013:35) points that:

> "The *Panchatantra* approximated its current literary form within the 4th–6th centuries CE, though originally written around 200 BCE. No Sanskrit texts before 1000 CE have survived. According to Indian tradition, it was written by Pandit Vishnu Sarma a sage. Buddhist monks on pilgrimage took the influential Sanskrit text (probably both in oral and literary formats) north to

Tibet and China and east to South East Asia. These led to versions in all Southeast Asian countries, including Tibetan, Chinese, and Mongolian, Javanese and Lao derivatives."

Hertel (1914) is one of the scholars who engaged himself to the study of *Panchatantra* and made his. He writes:

"The *Panchatantra* has made an unparalleled progress from its native land over all the civilized parts of the globe, and for more than thousands of years has delighted young and old, educated and uneducated, rich and poor, high and low and still delights them. Even the greatest obstacles of language, custom and religion have not been able to check that triumphal progress."

"As early as the 11th this work reached Europe, and before 1600 it existed in Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, German, English, Old Slavonic, Czech, and perhaps other Slavonic languages. Its range has extended from Java to Iceland. In France, at least eleven *Panchatantra* tales are included in the work of La Fontaine." (cf. Edgerton 1924).

"Almost all pre-modern European translations of the *Panchatantra* arise from this Arabic version. From Arabic, it was re-translated into Syriac in the 10th or 11th century, into Greek in 1080, into modern Persian by Abu'l Ma'ali Nasr Allah Monshi in 1121, and in 1252 into Spain (old Castilian, Calyla e Dymna). Perhaps most importantly, it was translated into Hebrew by Rabbi Joel in the 12th century. This Hebrew version was translated into Latin by John of Capua as Directorium Humanae Vitae, or *'Directory of Human Life'*, and printed in 1480, and became the source of most European versions." http://www.ebooklibrary.org/articles/Kalila_wa-Dimna

Chapter Three

Methodology

3. Chapter Three: Methodology

The general view of the present study is that there is no only one perfect way to translate a foreign text since any individual translates a text for a specific purpose based on his background knowledge. The purpose of the translation is mostly determined by the dominant ideological systems of the receiving society. In other words, ideology as a control factor not only determines the purpose of translation but what, who, when and why to translate. Translation is gone through the various filters in order to be fitted for the TT reader, so it can be regarded as rewriting which is subjected to addition, deletion and violation of meaning.

Almost all of the postmodern theories of translation rejected the issue of the author and authority. The Poststructuralism argues that there is neither begging nor end of a text and a text is not created by their authors but by the previously existing texts. In fact, what we call the original is a translation of a translation of a translation. The only thing that mainly influences the translation of a translation is the factor of ideology since a text producing a text cannot influence it.

However, the present study is not intended to suggest that the ideological elements of two translations must be similar to each other or ideologically translations of the same work must be similar. The study wishes to claim that a translation as a phenomenon, inevitably, undergoes ideological interferences and manipulations. So, in order to investigate such interference and manipulations, the present study is employed the Qualitative approach.

For Williams & Chesterman (2002:64):

> "The goal of the Qualitative research is to describe the quality of something in some enlightening way. The method can lead to conclusions about what is

possible, what can happen, or what can happen at least sometimes; it does not allow conclusions about what is probable, general or universal."

The Qualitative approach is employed in Humanities and social academic disciplines as well as non-academic contexts including market research, business, and services. The qualitative approach is concerned with the subjective assessment of attitudes, opinions, and behavior. In fact, research in this situation is a function of the researcher's insights and impressions.

As it is clear from above-mentioned materials, the approach of the present study is Qualitative in nature which is associated with non-statistical methods. The method of the present study is *'interpretive'* in nature which is based on data selection, observation, the content analyzing, and discourse analysis which generates non-quantitative form and does not intend to evaluate the correctness or accuracy of linguistic equivalents or the way the translator interpreted and translated the foreign text.

The present study emphasized on the ideological manipulations rather than on the idea that two translations of the same work should be as equivalent to each other as possible and rejects the issue of originality.

3.1. Research Questions

Language is a means by which one conducts the social life and reflects his thoughts, ideas, and identity. Today, communication is linked with culture and ideology in a complex way. Since people express facts, ideas or events, they do a kind of translation which does not happen in a vacuum. They carry their ideologies through language in which linguistic elements are the physical manifestation of ideological directionality.

Regarding that any language use is ideological; the present research endeavors to answer the following questions:

- Whether a literary work ideologically colored or not, if so, to what extent ideology manipulates the meaning and message of the source text in the translation process?

- Since the issue of patronage in translation has fundamental importance acts as a mediator among a foreign text, a translator, and TT audiences, should translator be faithful to the ethics of translation or to the patron and his ideology?

- If the translator is obliged to translate a foreign work in the favor of ideological system of the receiving society, then to what extent the translator's ideology would be influential in the translation process?

3.2. The Purposes and Objectives of the Study

Since translation, as a type of intercultural communication, inevitably undergone a sort of ideological manipulation, ideological knowledge is quite important on the part of the translator in order to transfer the meaning of the original author. Under this circumstance, the translator manipulates the foreign text in order to fit the work to the dominant ideological systems. The basic ideological manipulation in the past was to add some kind of preface or chapter to the translated version as we could observe in the old translations of the *Panchatantra.*

So, the purpose of the present study is to clarify the role of ideology in language and in translation in particular. A translator must be familiar with the different ideological values associated with languages, i.e. how different ideologies manifest in different languages and how they shape the internal structure of a language and subsequently a

translation. Furthermore, the study intends to describe and explain the ideological manipulation (addition, deletion, and omitting) through the translation process and to investigate to what extent the translator was able to handle the ideological problems.

Moreover, the present study challenged to claims that an analysis of the two different translations of the same work could take place regardless of the ST since the main objective of the analysis is to find ideological manipulation in the two texts.

3.3.   Corpus and Sampling

Corpus has been widely used to identify regularities of translation and features of a translated text such as explications, simplifications, back/foregrounding and unique elements of translation. There are two main types of corpora in Translation Studies, such as 1) comparable corpora and 2) parallel corpora.

The comparable corpora or a monolingual corpus consists of two sets of texts in the same language which one is the original text and the other is the translation. The aim is to find the patterns that are distinctive of translated text as opposed to non-translated text. The latter, parallel corpora or translation corpora which widely used in translation are typically made up of one source text in language A with their translation in another language B. it is when the researcher tries to evaluate the accuracy of the linguistics elements between L1 and L2. Sometimes the parallel corpora consist of two translations or one translation and one parallel text in another language which is claimed translated from the same source.

Based on the above-mentioned view and in order to investigate what sort of manipulation takes place in the translation process, the corpus type of the present study is *'parallel or translation corpus'* which selected two translations of the *Panchatantra* from two different cultures and different time era claiming that:

1. there is no original text and all texts are a translation of a translation which the source is lost or access is impossible

2. all translations of *Panchatantra* are based on the Persian translation by Borzoi since the book found a way into the world's literature from his translation

Therefore, the corpus of the present study is the Persian version of the *Panchatantra* (*Kalileh va Demneh*) rewritten in the 12th century (between 1143 and 1146) by Abu'l-Ma'ali Nasr Allah Monshi translated from the Arabic translation of the *Panchatantra* to Persian and dedicated to Sultan Bahram. The Persian translation edited by M. Minovi Tehrani in (2010) and the English version written and translated by Arthur W. Ryder in 1925 in the University of California, US.

In the present study, ten short stories are selected from the *Panchatantra* or (Kalileh wa Demneh), not randomly but purposefully. It is purposeful because the study was searching for the ideological manipulation in both translations and to investigate how both translators applied their ideological view in their translations. The Persian versions are given first to analyze it based on the model along with their transliterated versions and English equivalents. The English versions from Ryder are given after the Persian versions for comparison.

The reason for selecting of ten short stories from the Panchatantra purposefully in the present study was due to a few reasons: 1) the study was searching for the ideological manipulation in both translations and to investigate how both translators applied their ideological view in their translations; 2) the English version of Panchatantra has the 87 stories and the Persian version has 47 stories. The two translations have 25 stories in common; 3) the study has taken the stories which had the most manipulation.

3.4.   Theoretical Framework

It is assumed that translation of foreign literary works could succeed the first position of the literary polysystem, if could meet the ideological dimensions of receiving society, otherwise could not find a way to reach the TT audiences.

Regarding the issue, Lefevere (1992) discusses "literature and translation can and should be analyzed in systematic terms. For that reason, he uses the term *'literature as system'* which is introduced into the domain of literary studies by the Russian formalists. He distinguishes two control factors in the literary system, namely ideology and poetics". Regarding the ideological manipulations in translation, what matters is that translation must meet the regularities of dominant ideological systems of TT, in order to reach the audience. Ideology means what society should be.

One of the factors, which Lefevere (1992) maintains "is *'poetics'* by which professionals hinder certain works of literature, i.e. what literature should be. The other factor called *'patronage'*. He added this concept to his model in order to investigate ideological pressures in the translation process in a more efficient way. By *'patronage'* he means any kind of force that can be influential in encouraging and propagating, but also in discouraging, censoring and destroying works of literature."

Therefore, the concept of ideology and patron has special significance in translation due to in the translation if linguistic consideration enters into conflict with considerations of an ideological nature, the latter tends to win out. In this regard, the Translation Studies could benefit, at least in the research, from linguistics, discourse, cultural studies, critical discourse analysis, intertextuality and ideological manipulation to highlight the ideological consideration in the translation process.

Lefevere (1992) mentions "translations are not made in a vacuum. Translators function in a given culture at a given time. The way they understand themselves and their culture are one of the factors that may influence the way in which they translate. Then it probably takes place in the head of the translator, it happens in a certain culture, the environment under the supervision of patron with the translator as an active agent aware of the norms and ideology of the receiving system."

Lefevere (1992) has made a few keynotes on ideology in terms of translation in which a network of forms, conventions, and beliefs are to shape the final work. For Lefevere (1992), the most important consideration is the ideological one, which refers to the translator's ideology or the ideology imposed upon the translator which dictate the translation strategy and the solution to specific problems based on the ideological view.

In order to understand the role of ideology, highlighting its manipulations, the impact of patron on translation, and ideological conflicts on manipulation of a work, the present study employed Lefevere's (1992) *'Manipulation School'* as a framework which postulates ideology is hidden in language and manipulates the literature.

So, translation is a rewriting of an original text and rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. So, to provide a better understanding of the function of literature, the present research focuses mainly on the socio-ideological manipulations.

3.5. Research Instrumentation

While there are various approaches to CDA, a central tenet of Fairclough's approach is the idea that discourse constitutes social practices and being constituted by them as well. (Fairclough 1992)

The present study challenged to draw on Fairclough's (1992) basic work which provides more theorization of approach to CDA. Fairclough's (1992) critical discourse analysis model is a means for comparative analysis that explores the internal ideological factors which determine the translator's particular solution in the translation process.

As a result, the analytical instrument of the present study and conceptual basis is adopted from Fairclough's (1992) ideas on text and discourse claiming that *'ideologies reside in texts'*; and *'it is not possible to get rid of ideologies from texts'* and *texts are open to diverse interpretations'*. At the same time, analytical part of this study analyzes the possible interrelatedness of textual properties which is underpinned by Fairclough's conceptual work. Furthermore, this study attempts to deconstruct ideology which is hidden in the text.

However, it is proposed that Fairclough's approach to CDA leaves a theoretical and methodological gap with respect to sociocognitive aspects. Fairclough (1992) recognizes the psychological and cognitive aspects of the way in which people both interpret and produce texts, suggesting that discourse participants bring their own *'Members' Resources'* (MR) with them as part of the text processing and text production process.

His approach is the most appropriate tool for a systematic analysis of ideological manifestations in the text. The ultimate goal of the present study is 1) to juxtapose CDA with Translation Studies in general; 2) substantiate the suitability of translated works as a practical source of data for CDA scholars in particular.

Fairclough (1992:9) states that the only difference between CDA and other forms of discourse analysis lies in the term *'critical'*. The term *'critical'* shows connections, intervention, and causes which are hidden.

It is mentioned that, if people express the facts, ideas or events, it is a kind of translation and it does not happen in a vacuum, people carry their ideologies through language and linguistic elements are the physical manifestation of ideological directionality.

3.6.   Research Procedure

The present study looks at ideology and ideological manipulation in the literary texts and attempted to determine to what extent both translators treated, manipulated the same literary work and what they have in common based on the ideology in translation. Therefore, the corpus of the present study is the Persian version of *Panchatantra* (*Kalileh va Demneh*) is rewritten in the 12th century (between 1143 and 1146) by Abu'l-Ma'ali Nasr Allah Monshi from the Arabic translation of *Panchatantra* to Persian and dedicated to Sultan Bahram. The Persian translation edited by M. Minovi Tehrani in (2010) and the English version was translated by Arthur W. Ryder in 1925.

The Persian version was analyzed to show the ideological directionality. It is explained that translators alter the ST to deal with the ideological orientations through deletion, addition, and deception. To this end, the study is going to present the beginning sentence of the Persian story as well as the beginning sentence of English story. For the economy of the space, the study prefers to bring the complete stories in the appendix.

Firstly, the story has been analyzed and discussed at the textual level. The focus is specifically on the structure in which ideologically contested words are used. Then the story is interpreted in order to understand the meaning of the text and underline the hidden ideological implications. Interpretation is describing the reasons why translator has applied the lexical items which are associated with production and understanding of a text. Moreover, the sociocultural environment is analyzed in which the texts and the discursive practices are situated. In other words, the meaning of the action in a larger and broad context such as Islamic or Christian cultural context.

The study is endeavored to clarify the translators and patron's ideological view which resulted in such text production and meaning making process. The study did not intend to compare two translations since it is agreed that any translation carries its own ideological views. Then, all above-mentioned process is applied to the English version to see what sort of ideological manipulations took place in the English translation.

The purpose here is to demonstrate how two translators have used different structures, treated the text in different ways, and applied their own ideological orientations. For the present study, any deletion, addition, hedging, violation, and deception are regarded as ideological and manipulating acts. The research has taken manipulation into consideration and tried to determine to what extent the two translations are influenced by ideology.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis

4. Chapter Four: Data Analysis, Results and Discussions

Translation is a means of transmitting ideological norms as well as the poetics norms which contribute imposing the ideological manipulation on literary polysystem. In this process, translators apply specific strategies to maintain the dominant ideological perspectives in translations.

The analysis of collected samples from the source text and target text is the task of comparative literature. However, considering the concept of ideology in translation, the study provided a critical analysis of the English and Persian translation to keep track of the ideological orientation in both translations. Moreover, the samples are analyzed to show how both translators have handled the message and idea of the book.

Nonetheless, the study struggled to integrate all three dimensions of Fairclough's CDA model (text, interpretation, and explanation) and described all three stages by focusing on how CDA model provides an understanding of the social, cultural and ideological clashes between two translations from same text in different time era. Fairclough's (1992) "model is based on the assumption that language is an irreducible part of a social life. The dialectic relation between language and social reality is realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures (languages)."

As it is mentioned, ten short stories are selected as the samples of study. The first sentence of the stories is mentioned in this chapter and the full stories are available in the appendix part as a reference for critics, examiners, and readers. The *Panchatantra* is such a well-known work that any addition, deletion, and violation of message appear catchy and obvious. Because a number of scholars have agreement on the issues such as the number of stories, general theme, the message, plot and

characteristics of the book. Therefore, any unnecessary added items such as words, sentence, poems and proverbs or cultural and ideological items would be recognized.

The Persian story is written first, then the transliteration of Persian version and the English version is written respectively. The Persian story analyzed first and then English version to shed light on different discourses which are created from different socio-ideological viewpoints of translators.

The reason for selecting of ten short stories from the Panchatantra purposefully in the present study was due to a few reasons: 1) the study was searching for the ideological manipulation in both translations and to investigate how both translators applied their ideological view in their translations; 2) the English version of Panchatantra has the 87 stories and the Persian version has 47 stories. The two translations have 25 stories in common; 3) the study has taken the stories which had the most manipulation.

Since the ten stories have selected, it does not mean that there is no ideological manipulation in other stories. In fact, the Persian version is saturated with ideological views and manipulations. The English translation also is manipulated whenever it was possible for a translator.

4.1.   How the Crow-hen Killed the Black Snack

Persian version:

...آورده اند که: زاغی در کوه بر بالای درختی خانه داشت ، و در آن حوالی سوراخ ماری بود ، هرگاه که زاغ بچه بیرون آوردی مار بخوردی...

/…averde ænd ke: zaghi dær ku:h bær balay e deræxti xane daʃt, væ dær an hævali su:rax e mari bud, hærgah ke zagh bætʃe birun averdi mar bexordi.../

English version:

How the Crow-hen killed the Black Snack

In a certain region grew a great banyan tree. In it lived a crow and his wife, occupying the nest which they had built...

Analysis:

Persian version

The story is about enmity due to the word مار /mar/ 'snake' is connected to killing and death. It is of concern that the gender of the crow and the place where the story took place is not overtly mentioned. The story shows deception and trick by using the words such as ربودن /rubu:dæn/ 'steal'; دشمن /doʃmæn/ 'enemy'; بلا /bæla/ 'disaster'; شکایت /ʃekayæt/ 'complain'; ایمن گردد /imæn gærdæd/ 'to be safe', and هلاک /hælak/ 'perish'.

The translator has used the words to show that how playing a trick could be helpful in fighting with an enemy and how one can ignore the morality in the hard times. The cohesion is created by the recurrence of these words. The words have used to show

that the morality could be ignored in different circumstances. It is written in the third person narration and based on what characters do and say.

The word جان شکر /dʒan e ʃekær/ is a metaphor for 'love' and مطوه دل /mætvæ e del/ and نور دیده /nuːr e dide/ are metaphors for 'child'. The synonyms such as مطوه دل and نوردیده with giving more literary form to the story show that how much the crow loves his children.

The politeness strategy is preserved in the sentence: من ترا وجهی نمایم /mæn tora væjhi næmayæm/ 'I tell you something' and used to show the positions of the participants whether they are the main or the subordinated character. There are three participants: a jackal, a crow, and a snake whose genders are not clearly mentioned. The interaction of the participants is monolog. The crow is the addressee and subordinate and the jackal acts as an advice-giver who suggests a solution and teaches a trick to crow to fight with the snake. The jackal's statements are mostly imperative as صواب آن می نمایم /sævab e an minæmayæm/ 'I suggest you'.

Crow based on the mythology is a symbol of health, wealth, and prophecy. Jackal is a symbol of cunning and trick which is considered as the protagonist in all Iranian folktales. The jackal and the crow have different social stances i.e. there is an unequal power relation between them. The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to the jackal which implies authority in this context. It is obvious from the crow's word as in the sentence: رای خردمند را... /ræy e xerædmænd ra.../ 'the idea of a wise person...'.

The focus of the story is on deception which is regarded as a powerful weapon to kill the enemy. The jackal acts as an advice-giver who changed the crow's mind and advised him in sentence: شگال گفت: خردمند قصد دشمن بر وجهی کند که درآن خطر نباشد /ʃogal goft: xerædmænd gasd e doʃmæn bar vadʒhi konæd ke dær an xætær næbashæd/

'jackal said: a wise person kills the enemy in a safe way'. It implies that it is not logical and wisely to face a powerful enemy but one must play tricks to kill the enemy.

The story normalizes the robbery as a social action inspiring that robbery is not a blameworthy when someone is in danger and wants to save his family as in the sentence: نظر بر پیرایه ای گشاده افگنی که ربودن آن میسر باشد. فرود آیی و آن را برداری /næzær bær piraye ei goʃade æfkæni ke rubu:dæn e an moyæssær bashæd…furu:d ayi væ an ra bærdari/ 'fly in the sky to search a jewelry which stealing is easy…fly down and take it'.

There is an ideologically-contested word طهارت /tæharæt/ 'cleanliness' which shows the translator's religious view in the sentence: زنی را دید پیرایه برگوشه بام نهاده و خود بطهارت مشغول گشته /zæni ra did piraye bær guʃe e bam næhade væ xod be taharæt maʃghu:l gæʃte/ 'he saw a woman who put her jewelry in the corner of the roof and she was cleaning (طهارت) herself'. طهارت /tæharæt/ is a religious duty is practiced by Muslims. The word طهارت mostly is accompanied by نجاست /nædʒasæt/ 'excrement' refers to different sort of cleanness which carries various Islamic implications.

The main theme of the story is deception. However, the story is not just for reading or listening but it is like an anecdote which gives advice and shows how to conquer the strong enemy by tricks. It implies that physical power in some cases cannot do what the deception can do. The structure of the story is simple and easy to understand which make the story to resemble a native folktale.

English version

In the English version, the words such as "crow, crow-hen, my dear, sorrow, violence, desert, tree, husband, and children" shows a family issue. The words are used to create the cohesion. They show a family quarrel between the crow and the crow-hen about moving to another tree.

The main theme of the story is sacrificing. It says that the family should be given the priority and all members should sacrifice themselves to save the family. The overall structure of the text is not homogenous and consistent since the translator mixed different issues in his translation. It is written in the third person narration based on what characters do and say.

There is a cultural-bounded word such as "banyan" which refers to the national tree of the Republic of India. The story sounds an Indian folktale. The translator made the story complex by adding the cultural words in a way that one could hardly say whether it is written for children or adults.

The word "foe" is a metaphor for "snake". The synonyms such as "villainous and mighty" are used to show the stance of the snake. The politeness strategy of the agent is preserved in the sentence: "courteously called…". The language is formal and descriptive.

There are four participants in the story: a jackal, a crow, a hen-crow and a snake. The interaction of participants is dialogue. The crow is not an addressee and subordinated for that the jackal's words are not imperative. The hen-crow is added by the translator which does not exist in the Persian translation.

There is an ideologically-contested word "baptize" which shows the translator's religious view in the sentence: "ate their chicks as fast as they were born, even before

baptism". The word "baptize" is mentioned explicitly in the story by the translator. Baptism is the sacrament that all Christian denominations share in common. In the Catholic Church, infants are baptized to welcome them into the Catholic faith. In the view of the Catholic Church, any Baptism uses water and the invocation of the Holy Trinity. So if a follower of a Christian church that performs Baptism to these standards, wants to become Catholic.

The focus is on the sacrifice for the family but the translator also mentions a few points. The first point is the cast system. It implies that gold and jewelry could be found in the palace of monarchs in the sentence: "Go to some spot frequented by a great monarch. There seize a golden chain, pearl necklace, and gems".

The other point is the female's braveness and scarification. The crow-hen is added to the characters and its gender is clearly mentioned by the translator. From the middle of the story, the male-crow disappears. Obviously, the translator added the crow-hen to emphasize the role of the female in the family and society which is clear from the title of the story 'HOW THE CROW-HEN KILLED THE BLACK SNAKE'. The crow-hen is suffering for the death of her children and puts herself into trouble by seizing the gold as in the sentences: "crow-hen came to the palace seized…" and "the crow-hen dropped the golden chain". The translator by adding poem makes the story long comparing to the Persian version and it does not resemble a folk tale.

4.2. The Mice that Ate the Iron

Persian Version:

... آورده اند که بازرگانی اندک مال بود و می خواست که سفری رود. صد من آهن داشت، در خانه دوستی بر

وجه امانت بنهاد و برفت ...

/... aværde ænd ke bazærgani ændæk mal bud væ mixast ke sæfæri rævæd. sæd mæn ahæn dasht, dær xane e du:sti bær vædʒh e æmanæt benæhad væ beræft .../

English Version:

The Mice that ate the Iron

In a certain town lived a merchant named Naduk, who lost his money and determined to travel abroad…

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as صد من آهن /sæd mæn ahæn/ 'three hundred kg of iron'; امین/æmin/ 'faithful'; فروخته /furu:xte/ 'sold'; ودیعت /vædi'æt/ 'trusteeship'; دوستی / du:sti / 'a friend'; بازرگان /bazærgan/ 'merchant' and کودکی /kudæki/ 'a child' imply deception. These words showing trick and deceit, are created the cohesion. They show that money issues uncover the real personality of people and lead to delude for the benefit. There is no re-wording or over-wording strategy and the story enjoys the simplicity and simply teaches social issues. The sentence دل تنگ چرا می کنی؟ /del tæng tʃera mikoni/ 'why are you bothering yourself?' is a metaphor for "getting nervous".

The politeness strategy is preserved in the merchant's word as in the sentence: آری، آهن موش را نیک دوست دارد" /ari mu:ʃ ahæn ra nik du:st daræd/ 'yes, mouse like the iron

very much'. The formality in merchant's words is a sign of self-confidence to take revenge.

There are three participants in the story: a merchant, his friend, and his friend' son. The interaction of participants is dialog. The sentence: در شهری که موش آن صد من آهن بتواند خورد... /dær shæhri ke mu:sh an sæd mæn ahæn betævanæd xord/ 'If a mouse could eat iron...' is an allusion which implies that the merchant did not accept his friend's lies but did not complain and preparing himself to take revenge. The role of the language is advice-giving and solution mentioning that one must playful against the cheaters.

The merchant is a symbol of patience who has very highly self-confidence and merchant's friend is a symbol for greed. The 1st pronoun singular "I" refers to "merchant's friend" which is used to show his responsibility. The clear usage of the pronoun in the story reflects the commitment of the merchant's friend to what he has done to the merchant as in the sentences من واقف شدم /mæn vagef ʃodæm/ 'I understood' and من دارم / mæn daræm/ 'I have'.

The pronouns show the social stance between the participants and their positions i.e. there is an equal power relation. There is no superiority as clear in the sentence: در خانه دوستی بر وجه امانت بنهاد و برفت /dær xane e du:sti bær vædʒhe æmanæt benæhad væ beræft/ 'put his trusteeship to his friend and left'.

There is no cultural or ideological contested word or words but the structure of the story implies the cultural issues. The story is written in the third person narration and mentions that one could ignore the moralities and play trick when he is oppressed as in the sentence: بیرون رفت و پسری را ازان او ببرد... /bi:run ræft væ pesæri ra æz an e oʊ bebord/ 'he left and took his friend's son'.

The focus is on the swindling and revenge. The merchant's friend lied to his friend and cheated him as in the sentence: گفت: آهن در بیغوله خانه بنهاده بودم موش آن را تمام خورده بود /goft: ahæn dær beygule khane benæhade budæm mu:sh an ra tæmam xorde bud/ 'I put iron in the storehouse but mouse has had it all'. The message is that one should take revenge by any means when is cheated. The story resembles a native folktale.

English version

In the English version, the words such as 'lost, money, mice, iron, carry off and son' describes the situation of the story which is an issue of deception. The cohesion of the story is created using these words. The translator has assigned names to the characters such as Lakshman and Naduk which made the story to sound like an Indian story.

The merchant is a symbol of simpleton that has no understanding of the situation and Loyalman is a symbol for greed and trick. The story has used the re-wording strategy in such as "son, boy, and Money-God" the last one with the capital letter to refer to the importance of money for Lakshman. The translator added some verses (poems) which made the story long.

The politeness strategy of the agent (Naduk) is preserved in the sentence "Please send your boy Money-God with me, to carry my bathing things" and language is formal. There are three participants in the story as Naduk, Lakshman, and his son. The role of the language is advice giving as in the sentence: "Nothing in the universe has any permanence". The Naduk and Lakshman are in the same position and they are friends.

The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to Lakshman which is used to refer to honesty and rejecting the responsibility for loss of friend's son as in the sentence: "What am I to do? Before my eyes, a hawk carried him from the riverbank". The story tries to say that the trust is priceless and fake friends can achieve nothing by deception.

There is an ideological and cultural contested word which signifies the Indian culture such as "Lakshman". The fact is that the original Indian name "Lakshmana" is a Hindu and Indian name for boys. The name Lakshmana is of Indian, Sanskrit origins mean it has more than one root and is used mostly in Hindi speaking countries as well as other countries and languages of the world. The story sounds like an Indian story.

4.3.   The Heron that killed Crab-meat

Persian version:

...آورده اند که: ماهیخواری بر لب آبی وطن ساخته بود، و بقدر حاجت ماهی می گرفتی و روزگاری در خصب و نعمت می گذاشت ...

/…aværde ænd ke: mahixari bær læb e abi vætæn saxte bud, væ begædr e hadʒæt mahi migerefti væ ruzegari dær xosb væ ne'mæt migozæʃt ..../

English version:

The Heron that killed Crab-meat

There was once a heron in a certain place on the edge of a pond. Being old, he sought an easy way of catching fish on which to live...

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as اسباب قوت /æsbab e gu:t/ 'food'; پیری /piri/ 'senescence'; شکار /ʃekar/ 'prey'; مقاومت /mogavemæt/ 'persistence'; مشورت /mæʃværæt/ 'consult', نصیحت /næsihæt/ 'advice'; شهامت /ʃæhamæt/ 'brevity'; تدبیر /tædbir/ 'policy'; حیلت (hilæt) 'trick' and معیشت /mæ'ishæt/ 'life', shows playfulness and swindling. The cohesion is created using the recurrence of these words.

The heron is a symbol of resourcefulness, cunning, and trick. In the story, he has a hideous and repulsive character but displays friendly and sociable. The heron and crab are not in the same position.

There is no re-wording or over-wording strategy in the text and story is very simple in structure. The translator reproduced the story in a simple way and taught a social issue

in a way that the story resembles a native folktale. The sentence: عناد گشاده برفت /'enad goʃade beræft/ is a metaphor for 'passed quickly'; به زیارت مالک برفت /be ziaræt e malek beræft/ for 'was killed'; از قوت بازماندن /az gu:t bazmandæn/ 'was unable to find the food'; دل از جان برداشتن /del æz dʒan bærdashtæn/ for 'become hopeless' and در خون خویش سعی کردن /dær xu:n e xiʃ s'y kerdæn/ for 'ignoring one's life' are used to show the critical situation of the heron.

The politeness strategy of the heron is preserved in the sentences اشارتی نتوانم کرد /eʃaræti nætævanæm kærd/ 'I can say nothing', and تحویل توان کرد /tæhvil tævan kærd/ 'you can move to another place'. There are three participants in the story: a heron, a crab, and a fish. The interaction of hero and crab is dialogue. There is a conditional sentence اگرحال براین باشد... /ægær hal bær in bashæd/ 'if it is so...' which is used for showing the condition of fish.

The 2nd pronoun singular "you" is used to refer to "heron" and 1st pronoun plural "we" to refer to water dwellers. There is no 1st pronoun singular to refer to heron in the story. The lack of usage of clear agency in the form of 1st person singular pronoun contributes to hiding the responsibility of action. The unclear usage of the pronoun in the story reflects that the heron is not taking the responsibility of his action as in the sentence: آبگیری هست که اگر بدان تحویل توانید کرد /abgiri hast ke ægær bedan tæhvil tævanid kærd/ means: there is a lake if you could move there. These pronouns show the social stance between participants is equal.

The word مالک /malek/ is an ideologically contested word which displays the religious attitude i.e. Islamic. The name of the guardian of hell is "مالک" which is at the ascension, the Prophet Muhammad met him, and saw that he has an ugly face and unlike other angles never smiles, because he is able to see what God has prepared for sinners in hell. In another narration, the word "مالک" has not smiled since of the

moment that he has been given to guardian of hell, but he adds angry and wrath on the enemies of God and sinners.

The story is written in the third person and is based on what characters do and shows that one becomes villain and plots to achieve his evil goals when loses his power and hope. When crab becomes powerless to prey, decided to deceive fish as in the sentence: امروز بنای کار خود بر حیلت باید نهاد /emru:z bænay e kar e xod bær hilæt bayæd næhad/ 'today, I should play trick'. The story of the story is deception and tries to teach one can do in such a situation.

However, the story highlights the scarification which is obvious from the words: پیری /piri/ 'senescence'; شکار /ʃekar/ 'prey'; اسباب قوت /æsbab e gu:t/ 'food'; مقاومت /mogavemæt/ 'persistence'; مشورت /mæshværæt/ 'consulting', نصیحت /næsihæt/ 'advice'; شهامت /ʃæhamæt/ 'brevity'; تدبیر /tædbir/ 'policy'; حیلت (hilæt) 'trick' and معیشت /mæ'ishæt/ 'life', shows playfulness and deception. The cohesion is created using the recurrence of these words.

The story teaches that one must be smart to recognize the enemy even when he is displaying a fake sympathy for one's problem and should not trust to him as in the sentence: هر که به لاوه دشمن فریفته شود و و بدگوهر اعتماد روا دارد سزای او اینست /hær ke be lave e doshmæn færifte shævæd væ bædgohær e'temad ræva daræd sezay e oʊ inæst/ 'it is the punishment for who trusts the enemy and a bad natured-person'. It is clear that fish were unable to recognize the enemy and trusted him as in the sentence: "المستشار موتمن" (almostæʃar o motæmæn) means "the consultant is trusted". In fact, fish accepting the heron's plan to transfer them to another lake and competing to go first were welcoming the death.

English version

In the English version, the words such as "fish, crab, heron, tree, calamity and remedy" describes the situation of the problem. The cohesion of the story is created using these words. The heron based on the western myths is a sort of quarry for falcons. But the crab deals primarily with elements of water and carries themes of protection. Its protective characteristic is evident in the hard, spiny exoskeleton found with these creatures.

There is a re-wording strategy in the text and translator used the terms "Uncle, Friend, Unselfish and Thinker" with a capital letter to refer to the importance of the popularity of the crab. The translator added many verses which made the story long and complex.

The word "water-dwellers" is a metaphor for "fish". The politeness strategy of the crab is preserved as in the sentence: "I can transfer you…". This politeness strategy shows that the crab is responsible for his action as could be understood in the sentence "I transfer". Unlike Persian translation in which the crab's sentences were passive, in this version, the sentences are active which are used to show his responsibility as in "I overheard it", "I can do it", and "I transfer you".

There are three participants in the story: a heron, a crab, and some fish. However, the role of the language is a sort of reproduction of story. The heron and crab are friends and they are in the same position since the crab is called heron "uncle". The 3rd pronoun singular "I" which refers to the heron is used to show his power and to reflect authority over fish and crab. However, the role of the language is representing the sacrificing and saving the society.

There is culturally or ideologically contested word in which signifies the religious views such as "lotus-stalk". There are no ancient symbols, without a deep and philosophical meaning attached to them; their importance and significance increasing with their antiquity. Such is the Lotus. It is the flower sacred to nature and represents the abstract and the Concrete Universes, standing as the emblem of the productive powers of both spiritual and physical nature.

The Lotus flower represents holiness, good wishes, purity, and power of both spiritual and physical nature and positive energy. The flower is a symbol of the Christian religion. The archetypal flower symbolizes the purity and is associated with the Virgin Mary. In the Christian religion Gabriel, the Archangel, holding in his hand a spray of water lilies, appears to the Virgin Mary in every picture of the Annunciation which typifies fire and water, or the idea of creation and generation.

The story is about the fact that one should care about his friends and society but Persian version reminds us that the enemy should not be trusted under any circumstances and not be consulted. The story implies that if one sacrifice his life for friends, he will be a winner. The crab fights with the heron and sacrifice and took revenge. In the story, crab is a hero.

4.4.   A Remedy Worth than the Disease

Persian version:

... آورده اند که غوکی در جوار ماری وطن داشت، هرگاه که بچه کردی مار بخوردی، و او بر پنج پایکی دوستی داشت. بنزدیک او رفت...

/... aværde ænd ke ghuki dær dʒævar e mari vætæn dasht, hærgah ke bætʃe kærdi mar bexordi, væ oʊ bær pændʒ payæki du:sti dasht. Benæzdik e oʊ ræft…/

English version:

A Remedy Worth than the Disease

A flock of herons once had their nests on a fig tree in a part of a forest. In a hole in the tree lived a black snake that made a practice of eating the heron chicks before their wings sprouted…

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as توانا /tævana/ 'able'; خصم قوی /xæsm e gævi/ 'powerful enemy'; دشمن مستولی /doʃmæn e mostoli/ 'prevailed enemy'; خوکردگی /xukærdegi/ 'accustomed to' and مار بخوردی /mar bexordi/ 'snake eats' present the enmity and hostility. The cohesion of the story is created using these terms. Practically, the translator has used the words to teach that one should be clever and wily and not to trust foolish and silly.

The story is about enmity due to the word 'snake' is connected to death. The frog based on the mythology is a symbol of transition with the frog in its unique growth cycle. The frog undergoes incredible transformations to reach the destination of full

adulthood. In many cultures, the primary symbolic meaning of frogs deals with fertility as well as a symbol of abundance.

The politeness strategy is preserved in the sentences: نه با او مقاومت می توانم کردن /næ ba oʊ mogavemæt mitævanæm kærdæn/ 'it is not possible to fight with him' are used to show the critical situation of the frog. The language of the story is informal.

There are four participants in the story: a snake, a crab, a frog and a weasel. The interaction of participants is dialogue. There is a conditional sentence: چون به مار رسید با حیلت مار را هلاک کرد /tʃun be mar resid ba hilæt mar ra hælak kærd/ 'as soon as he reached the snake, killed him'. The frog is the addressee and subordinated for that the crab's statements are mostly imperative as in the sentence: با دشمن غالب جز به مکردست نتوان یافت /ba doshmæn e ghaleb dʒoz be mækr dæst nætævan yaft/ 'trick is the only way to kill the powerful enemy' which mentions that the deception and cunning are the only way to reach and kill an enemy. The role of the language is giving advice and better solution.

The 3ʳᵈ pronoun singular او /oʊ/ 'he' refers to "snake" and it is used to show that the frog and crab are insiders and the snake is an outsider. The frog treated the crab as superior with more respect as in the sentence: ای بذاذر کار مرا تدبیر کن /ey bæzazær, kar e mæra tædbir kon/ 'oh brother, solve my problem'.

It is written in the third person narration and is based on what characters do and say. The story enjoys the simplicity and sounds like a native folktale. The story presents that in trouble one must clever and deceitful and it is not wise to request help from the stupid friend or consult with him. The foolish friends could not be a counselor because consulting them bring unintended consequences. For this reason, frog and his children were killed by the weasel as in sentence: بار دیگر هم بطلب ماهی بر آن سمت می

204

رفت، ماهی نیافت، غوک را با بچگان جمله بخورد /bar e digær hæm betælæb e mahi bær an sæmt miræft, mahi næyaft, guk ra ba bætʃegan dʒomle bexord/ 'one more time in order to find fish went to that place, there were no fish, so eat the frog and her children'.

English version

The terms such as "herons, nests, black snake, the practice of eating, my babies, crab, have been eaten, killing and mongoose" describe the condition of a family. The story based on these words implies a sort of mortality and death.

The word "natural-born" is a metaphor for "snake". The synonym such as "villainous" is used to signify how the snake might be dangerous. Unlike Persian version, English translator assigned the black color to the snake which presents different meanings in a different culture.

The politeness strategy of the agent in the "My good friend," said the heron, "what am I to do?" and the formal politeness pattern is preserved throughout the story, but in a friendly way in order to establish successful cooperation and dialogue. The language of the story is formal.

There are four participants in the story: herons, a mongoose, a crab and a snake. The translator mistakenly translated the Sanskrit word 'मेढक' which means "frog" to the word 'heron'. In the story, mongoose eats the heron and her children. However, the role of the language is descriptive which tells a story. Unlike other stories of English version, in this story it is the male heron sacrifices himself for the family. The interaction of the participants is dialogue and there is no superiority and inferiority.

There is ideologically contested term "fate" which written with capital letter in the sentence: "Fate is against me" which refers to the "fatalism" which is a philosophical doctrine between 800 BCE and 200 CE stressing the subjugation of all events or actions to fate which was a system of ancient Indian philosophy is called 'Ajivika or Ajivaka', literally means 'living' in Sanskrit, and an ascetic movement of the Mahajanapada period. Ajivika followers believed that a cycle of reincarnation of the soul was determined by a precise and non-personal cosmic principle called "Niyati" (destiny or fate) that was completely independent of the person's actions. Fatalism generally believes that we are powerless to do anything other than what we actually do and man has no power to influence the future, or indeed, his own actions. This belief is very similar to predetermines.

The story emphasizes on the endurance in facing of some future events which are thought to be inevitable and the acceptance is appropriate, rather than resistance against inevitability. In the story, we see that heron put fish on the doorstep of weasel's home to stimulate him, following the line of fish and eating them, to reach the snake and kill him. The frog accustomed him to fish and the day he could not find fish, killed the frog and his children as in the sentence: "also ate at his leisure all the herons who made their home in the tree". The fatalism would say that it was written in our fate and it should happen.

4.5.   Numskull and the Rabbit

Persian version:

...آورده اند که: در مرغزاری که نسیم آن بوی آن بهشت را معطر کرده بود و برعکس آن روی فلک را منور گردانیده، از هر شاخی هزار ستاره تابان .....

/...æværde ænd ke: dær mærghzari ke næsim e an buy e beheʃt ra mo'ættær kærde bud væ bar 'ks e an ruy e fælæk ra monævvær gærdanide, æz hær ʃaxi hezar setare e taban ...../

English version:

Numskull and the Rabbit

In a part of a forest was a lion drunk with pride, and his name was Numskull. He slaughtered the animals without ceasing. If he saw an animal, he could not spare him...

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as جان مردار /dʒan e mordar/ 'corpse', جبار /dʒæbbar/ 'cruel', شکار /ʃekar/ 'prey, ملک /mælek/ 'king', وحوش (vuhu:ʃ) 'animals', جور /jor/ 'tyranny', خونخوار (xunxar) 'bloodthirsty', بلا (bæla) 'disaster', show the trouble and hardship. The cohesion of the story is created by these words which are used to emphasize that one must be playful and cunning to fight against a tyrant ruler for bringing him to the justice urge.

Rabbit in the Persian literature is a symbol of "negligence" and the lion is a symbol of "power".

The translator through few lines retold the story and added two verses which made the work more literary but the work sounds like a native folktale.

In order to establish an appropriate level of formality, the translator used politeness forms (positive) in the form of honorifics and specific forms of address in the words of rabbit to the lion. The politeness strategy of the rabbit in the sentence: تا شتافتم من ملک را خبر کنم /mæn ʃetaftæm ta mælek ra xæbær konæm/ 'I came hurriedly to inform the king' and in the sentence: این چاشت ملک است /in tʃaʃt e mælek æst/ 'it is king's meal' is preserved through the story. The strategy is deemed appropriate for playing a trick which the translator tries to imply that it is an acceptable social action.

There are three participants in the story as a lion, a rabbit, and some animals. The interaction of participants is a monolog which only lion's words are imperative. The rabbit is the addressee and subordinated for that the lion's statements are imperative as in the sentence: از کجا می آیی و حال وحوش چیست؟ /æz kodʒa miayi væ hale vuhuːʃ tʃist?/ 'where are come from and how are the animals?' and in the sentence: او … گفت: را به من نمای (goft: oʊ ra be mæn næmay) 'said: show him to me'.

The 2nd pronoun singular "you" is used to refer to "lion" and 1st pronoun plural "we" to refer to animals. These pronouns reveal the social distance between the lion and the animals and their social stance. In this regard, the lion as pronoun "you" shows is an outsider in the animals' society and rabbit as pronoun "we" shows is an insider.

The story presents that one can save his life by deception and cunning in a society in which all are devoted to serving a brutal sovereign as in the sentence: شکاری پیش ملک فرستیم /ʃekari piʃe mælek ferestim/ 'we send one animal as a meal to the king everyday'.

The rabbit's sentence such as اگر در فرستادن من توقفی نمایید… /gær dær ferestadæn e mæn tævæggofi næmaiːd/ 'if you take your time to send me to the king', and اگر ملک مرا

دربر گیرد /ægar mælek mæra dærbær giræd/ 'if the king take me beside himself', is used to stress that playful people never hurry and appear in a friendly manner.

However, the role of the language is giving advice and emphasizes that cunning people could save a society as in the sentence: تا شما را باز رهانم /ta ʃoma ra baz ræhanæm/ 'I will make you all free'. The rabbit as a deceitful character does not care about friends who were killed by lion until his turn comes. The story, implicitly mentions that tricky people care about themselves. The story presents a great social issue and the gives solution but in a very short and simple way.

English version

In the English version, the words such as "animals, lion, rabbit, slaughter, daily food, trickster's report and remedy" describes the situation which shows enmity. The cohesion of the story is created using the recurrence of the words such as "king of beast, lion, Numskull, rabbit, forest, slaughter, fear, loss of son and death".

There is a re-wording strategy in the text and translator used the word "Numskull" with a capital letter to refer to the lion. In fact, translator purposefully assigned a name to the lion and unlike the Persian version wich told the story through few lines, English version added many poems and materials which made the story long and as if it is written for children.

The word "reprobate" is used as a metaphor for "rabbit" and "Numskull" for "lion". The politeness strategy of the agent (rabbit) is preserved in the sentence: "… bowed and said: Master! Pray hear the cause".

There are six participants in the story as a deer, a boar, a buffalo, a rabbit and a lion. This participant addition turned the story into children literature. However, the role of

the language is fighting against a tyrant king as mentioned in "warriors fight for their country when they are insulted… ".

The symbolic rabbit meanings deal primarily with abundance, comfort, and vulnerability. Traditionally, rabbits are associated with fertility, sentiment, desire, and procreation. Moreover, rabbit meanings are closely linked to the seasons, the changes of Mother Earth, and specifically springtime.

The 3rd pronoun singular "I" lion is used to refer to power and to reflect authority over the rabbit and the animals. However, the role of the language is representing an ethical issue which one sacrifices himself for the society.

There is an ideologically contested word which is written in capital letter "Scripture which is related to the Christianity as translator mentions in the sentence: "… for the Scripture says". The Scripture with the capital letter refers to the holy book of Christians. In worship services and in public and private readings, Christians often turn to Scripture for guidance: to the stories of Abraham or Moses, to the Psalms, to the prophecies of Isaiah, to the life of Jesus, to the letters of Paul, to the vision of John.

The other ideological issue is the number 'five' (5) as mentions that "they dispatched me with five more other rabbits". The number "5" symbolizes God's grace, goodness and favor toward humans and is mentioned 318 times in Scripture. Five is the number of grace, and multiplied by itself, which is 25, is 'grace upon grace' (John 1:16). The "Ten Commandments" contains two sets of five commandments. The first five commandments are related to our treatment and relationship with God, and the last five concern our relationship with others humans.

The word "five" symbolizes the five wounds Christ suffered on the cross (hands, feet, and side), and by extension represents sacrifice. There are five books of God's Law

(Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy) commonly referred to as the Pentateuch (Penta means five). The apostle John wrote 5 books centered on the grace of God and eternal life (the gospel of John, 1John, 2John, 3John and Revelation). Jesus multiplied five loaves of barley to feed 5,000 (Matthew 14:17).

There are five books in the Bible that contain only one chapter (2John, 3John, Philemon, Jude, and Obadiah). Moses wrote five books, the most of any "Old Testament" writer. Another ideological issue that translator implies is the "eternity or afterlife" as in the sentence "it is hostile to happiness in the other world".

The story represents the upheaval as a social action which is the main concern of the elites of the society by which one could save friends and society. It inspires morality saying that elites should protest and change the social condition. The rabbit as an elite of the society is a hero who fights and kills the tyrant king and saves the society. The English version is similar to Persian translation but both translators focused on the different issue and treated the text differently.

4.6. The Plover Who Fought the Ocean

Persian version:

...آورده اند که: نواعی است از مرغان آب که آن را طیطوی خوانند، و یک جفت از ان در ساحلی بودندی....

/...aværde ænd ke: næva'i æst æz morghan e ab ke an ra tituy xanænd, væ yek dʒoft az an dær saheli budændi …/

English version:

The Plover Who Fought the Ocean

A plover and his wife once lived by the shore of the sea, the mighty sea that swarms with fish, crocodiles, turtles, sharks, porpoises, pearl oysters, shellfish, and other teeming life.

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as انتقام /entegam/ 'revenge', جرات /dʒor'æt/ 'daring', قوت /govvæt/ 'power', خشم /xæʃm/ 'anger', غفلت /gheflæt/ 'ignorance', درباید /dærrobayæd/ 'steal' and کینه /kine/ 'hatered' imply enmity, struggle and conflict.

The story presents a sort of taking revenge as it clear from the sentence: انصاف خود از وکیل دریا می ستانم /ensaf e xod æz vækil e dærya misetanæm/ 'I will take my right from wakil e darya'. The coherence in the story is created using the recurrence of the words such بچگان /bætʃegan/ 'children', سیمرغ /simorgh/ 'Simorgh', طیطوی /tituy/ 'Titibha', وکیل دریا /vækil e dærya/ 'a legendary bird' and صورت واقعه /suræt e vage'e/ 'event',

قول /gol/ 'promise'. The words are used to emphasize that the whole society must be united to fight against injustice and bringing the guilty to justice urge.

The word طیطوی /tituy/ 'Titibha' is a kind of duck which is entered into the Pahlavi Persian literature by Borzoi from the Sanskrit (टिट्टिभ, Titibha) and in the contemporary Persian literature reformed into "تیتو" (titu). The legend say that the sea with its might and power represents the power of illusion, ignorance and, prejudice or the general *Chitta* (चित्त, Citta), i.e. all aspects of human existence subject to change. The small *Tittibha* (टिट्टिभ, Ṭiṭṭibha)-bird stands for the effort of the yogi, an effort which seems ineffectual when compared with the challenge. But just as the little *Tittibha* (टिट्टिभ, Ṭiṭṭibha)-bird succeeds in spite of seeming superiority, the yogi can calm *Chitta* (चित्त, Citta) through practice and shatter illusion.

The word سیمرغ in Persian mythology (Simurgh سیمرغ, Middle Persian: senmurv and the Huma, Persian: هما, pronounced Homā, Avestan: Homāio) is a culturally contested word which signifies the Persian culture. In the Persian literature, Simurgh is sometimes compared to a phoenix but is also described (as with Pazuzu and Imdugud/Anzu) as a lion-bodied creature with wings and a bird's beak. The touch of the Simurgh, or one of its feathers, could heal a man instantly, and apparently, the Simurgh had knowledge of how to prepare a special restorative brew known as Houma.

According to Persian myth, the Simurgh lived in the Tree of Knowledge, again tying it to the myth of the Anzu, which made its nest in the Huluppu tree. When Simurgh took flight, it was said, its powerful ascent shook the tree's branches so violently that the seeds [from every plant that has ever existed] were scattered throughout the world, bringing a wealth of valuable plants to mankind. According to myth, the Simurgh

nested in seclusion on the sacred Persian mountain of البرز /ælborz/, far beyond the climbing abilities of any man." This ties the Simurgh to the creation of myth, similar to the story of Melek Ta'us breaking apart the cosmic egg to create the world and to the Watchers' eventual banishment to remote regions of the desert (or the sky) after their contact with mankind went awry.

There is no re-wording strategy and the story enjoys the simplicity but the story sounds like a native folktale. The translator through a few lines retells the story but he added few lines of a poem. The main theme of the story is theft and robbery as in the sentence...بچگان ایشان ببرد /bætʃegan e iʃan bebord/ 'he stole his children' and the story gives an advice to the issue.

The term وکیل دریا /vækil e dærya/ 'a legendary bird' is a metaphor for "sea owner" which physically does not exist. The politeness strategy of the Titibha in the sentence: من از عهده قول خویش بیرون می آیم /mæn æz 'ohde e gol xiʃ birun mi:ayæm/ 'I can keep my promise' and the sentence: انصاف خود از وکیل دریا می ستانم /ensaf e xod æz vækil dærya misetanæm/ 'I will consult with Simurgh' is preserved to present a patriarchal supremacy and makes the Titibha-hen subordinate.

There are four participants in the story: Titibha, Titibha-hen, a Simorgh and a legendary bird وکیل دریا /vækil e dærya/. The 1st pronoun singular "I" is used to refer to "Titibha" and 2nd pronoun singular "you" to refer to Titibha-hen. These pronouns social level of the Titibha and the Titibha-hen and the positions between them. The Titibha and his wife are not in the same position and their stance differ i.e. the Titibha-male superior since his statements are imperative as in the sentence: سخن بی مترس و جای نگاهدار جهت مگوی /soxæn bi dʒæhæt mæguy/ 'do not talk unduly' and /mætærs væ dʒay negæhdar/ 'don't worry and stay in this place'. The interaction of the participants (Titibha-male, Titibha-female) is monolog. They make the nest by the

ocean in spite of Titibha-female' disagreement which is the sign of patriarchal in which the females has no authority.

The story presents the importance of masculinity and Titibha who unifies the society as in the sentences: در حال بنزدیک مرغان رفت /dær hal benæzdik e morghan ræft/ 'immediately went to other birds'. The story implies that only men could protest, fight and make the condition better since Titibha with high confidence fights the legendary bird and takes his children back.

English Version

The words such as "plover, ocean, pregnant, home, lay eggs, sweetheart, and birds" shows a family issue. The cohesion of the story is created by the words such as "plover, ocean, pregnant, home, lay eggs, sweetheart, Garuda, king, and bird. The words are used to create the story in a format to mention the importance of battling being in a danger. In fact, one must fight and sacrifice himself when the family is in trouble.

The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to hen-plover is used to mark the power and to reflect authority over plover. However, the role of the language is signifying the role of woman in the family. There is no ethical issue in the story.

The politeness strategy of the agent (plover) in the "my dear" and "you will be a witness of my power" is preserved through the story. There is a re-wording strategy in the text and translator has used the terms "my dear" to refer to hen-plover and "my dear husband" to refer to plover.

There are four participants in the story: a plover, a hen-plover, an ocean (personified), and the Garuda (king of birds). However, the role of the language is not advice-giving but storytelling. The focus is mostly on family relation and female's role. The story

expresses that hen-plover is more logical in family issues as in the sentence: "said she: Here is the ocean near at hand…and lick away my babies" and encouraging her husband to fight against a tyrant king as in the sentence: "warriors fight for their country when they are insulted… ".

Unlike the Persian translation, English version focused on the family issue and lovely relationship between husband and wife as in the sentence: "the plover answered: Sweetheart". As it is obvious in the story there is no muscularity and superiority between family members. The translator shows that the unity and solidarity of family members are the only way to overcome the difficulties in hard times.

4.7.   Forethought, Readywit, and Fatalist

Persian version:

...آورده اند که در آبگیری از راه دور و از تعرض گذریان مصون سه ماهی بود، و دو حازم و یکی عاجز. از قضا روزی دو صیاد بر ان گذشتند...

/…aværde ænd ke dær abgiri æz rah e du:r væ az tæ'rroz e gozærian mæ'sun se mahi bud, væ do hazem væ yeki a'jez. æz gæza ruzi do sæyyad bær an gozæ∫tænd.../

English version:

Forethought, Readywit, and Fatalist

In a great lake lived three full-grown fish, whose names were Forethought, Readywit, and Fatalist. Now one day the fish named Forethought overheard passers-by on the bank and fishermen saying:

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as عاجز /'adʒez/ 'incapable', صیاد /sæyyad/ 'predator', حازم /hazem/ 'wise', حیلت /hilæt/ 'trick', جفا /dʒæfa/ 'unfaithfulness', and غفلت /gheflæt/ 'ignorance' express the death and challenge. The coherence in the story is created using the recurrence of the words such as سپهرغدار (sepehr e ghæddar) 'the cruel fate', زمانه جافی (zæmane e dʒafi) 'unfaithful life', صیاد /sæyyad/ 'predator', عاجز /'adʒez/ 'incapable', and حازم /hazem/ 'wise'. The terms are used to emphasize that one must care himself and save his own life when in trouble.

The translator retold the story so simply and concisely that sounds a native folktale. There is no re-wording strategy and the story is simple to understand and sounds like

a native folktale. The term شوخ چشم /ʃux tʃeʃm/ is a metaphor for 'cruel' and the term سپهر غدار /sepehr e ghæddar/ is a metaphor for 'tyrant and cruel fate' which is mentioned to show that life is cruel. However, the metaphors are ideologically or culturally loaded which transferring them into another language is a great task.

There are four participants in the story: three fish and the fishermen. The story is written in the third person. There is no dialogue in the story between participants. However, the role of the language is advice given.

The theme of the story is self-caring. As it is clear, a fish who hear the fisherman did not tell his friends and save his life as in the sentence: از آن جانب که آب درآمدی بر وفور بیرون رفت /æz an dʒaneb ke ab dæramædi bar vufur birun ræft/ 'from the entry part of the lake escaped'. In this regard, there is no ethical issue in the story. The story shows that one cannot and should not fight for the society and the best way is to care himself and save his life.

The story further expresses the role of cunning and deception in danger as the second fish with deception saved his life as in the sentence: خویشتن مرده ساخت ... صیاد او را بینداخت... (xiʃtæn morde saxt... sæyyad oʊ ra biændaxt…) means "pretended as dead …the fisherman dropped him".

English version

In English version words such as "full-grown, fish, pond, fisherman, protect, trouble, caught, help, and killed and lake" are created the cohesion describing a social issue. The words are used to express the importance of other caring and sacrificing and to say that morality is the elites' concern in the society.

There are four participants: Forethought, Readywit, Fatalist, and fishermen. The 3rd pronoun plural "we" refers to three fish which is used to mark the equity in social relation. The main theme of the story is others-caring in the sentence: "so, he called them and put the question".

There is an ideologically contested term "Fatalist", which is highlights the "Fatalism". Translator implies that anyone who believes in Fatalism, definitely condemn to death as in the sentence: "Fatalist stuck his nose into the meshes of the net, struggling until they pounded him repeatedly with clubs and so killed him". However, the point shows that Christianity refuses Fatalism saying that the Christians should not be a fatalist.

One of the biggest tragedies in the Christian church over the centuries has been this idea that whatever happens is God's will (determinism). According to this view, the statement that God works all things out according to the counsel of His will means that God has in fact set in motion a script which can only follow a course which God Himself has pre-ordained down to the last detail. The people who take the fatalistic view with regard to healing say that if we pray, and the person does not receive healing, it is because it was not God's will for the person to be healed. And no matter what rotten, horrible tragedy occurs, believers in "Christian fatalism" will proclaim that these events were somehow God's plan. It is believed that "Que sera" – whatever will be, will be. The "Christian fatalism" is attractive to many today.

The story, unlike the Persian version, presents sort of other caring and sacrificing for the society as it clear from the sentence: "Forethought reflected […] I will take Readywit and Fatalist and move to another lake whose waters are not troubled". In the story, the fish 'Forethought' as soon as hearing the fishermen went to his friends and try to save their lives first.

4.8.   The Weaver's Wife

Persian version:

از گزاف نگفته اند: "جزاء مقبل الاست الضراط" و زاهد این حال را مشاهدت می کرد. چندانکه صبح صادق عرصه گیتی را بجمال خویش منور گردانید...

/æz gæzaf nægofte ænd: ''dʒæza mogæbbæl ælæst ælzerrat'' væ zahed in hal ra moʃahedæt mikærd. tʃændan ke sobh e sadeg æ'rse e giti ra bejæmal e xish monævvær gærdanid.../

English version:

The Weaver's Wife

Now as he walked along, Godly spied a weaver who with his wife was on his way to a neighboring city for liquor to drink, and he called out: "Look here, my good fellow! I come to you a guest, brought by the evening sun.

Analysis:

Persian version

The cohesion of the story is created using the recurrence of the words such as زن کفشگر/zæn e kæfshgær/ 'shoemaker's wife', زن حجامی/zæn e hodʒami/ 'barber's wife', قاضی /gazi/ 'judge', کفشگر /kæfʃgær/ 'shoemaker', حجامی /hodʒami/ is a cultural-bounded word and has no equivalent in English but in some books it is translated into 'barber', زاهد (zahed) /eremite/, and دوست زن حجامی /dust e zan e hodʒami/ means "the lover of barber's wife". The words show the situation of women in the society and which social level they are from.

The translator has used the words to show the disloyalty, infidelity, and unlawfulness of women. The cohesion is created by the recurrence of these words which are used to express the main theme of the story. It is written in the third person which is based on what characters do and say and enjoys the conciseness and simplicity.

The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to weaver which is used to mark the power and reflect patriarchy. There is no politeness strategy in the weaver's words as in the expression: "you whore" to show the critical condition and could be a sign of masculine power.

There are seven participants in the story: the shoemaker's wife, the barber's wife, a judge, the shoemaker, the barber, an eremite" and the lover of barber's wife.

There is an ideologically contested sentence which is written in Arabic as " جزاء مقبل الاست الضراط". The Persian translator has used the Arabic phrase as proof to his words. It shows his ideological background. In the Islamic doctrine is considered as divine by the Muslims. The *'Quran'* is not simply a work of literature, but for faithful readers, it is a means by which one can learn more about God and Prophet's life and communicate with God in a personal way.

The main theme of the story is infidelity and unfaithfulness of women. In the story, the weaver's wife is a symbol of adultery and unfaithfulness. The story judges the women based on the evidence of their behavior and portrays them as a betrayer, cheater, untruthful, and blindly passionate. It mentions that how a female cheats her husband as in the sentence: زن حجام بدو پیغام داد که شوی من مهمان رفت تو برخیز و بیا چنانکه من دانم و تو /zæn e hodʒam bedu peygam dad ke ʃuye mæn mehman ræft to bærxiz væ bia tʃenanke mæn danæm væ to/ means "barber's wife send her lover a message that my husband went to a party, come to me secretly).

The story shows how men behave in patriarchal society as in the sentence: خشم کفشگر زیادت گشت /xæʃm e kæfʃgær ziadæt gæʃt/ 'shoemaker became very angry" and the sentence: بینی زن حجام ببرید /bini e zæn e hodʒam beborid/ 'cut the nose of barber's wife'.

The story sounds a native folktale but this story is not written in fable format and seems that is not translated from the *Panchatantra.* As mentioned earlier part of this diversity is the result of additions to the original Iranians book.

English version

In the English version, the words such as "a weaver, weaver' wife, a pregnant, a whore, a gossip, a drunken twaddle, barber's wife, an admirer, a villain, and a scolding" show the unfaithfulness of women. In this case, English version is similar to the Persian. The cohesion of the story is created using the recurrence of these words such as "Godly, whore, adorer, weaver's wife, weaver, barber, barber's wife, drunk, stumbling, win, judge, prison and impale".

There are seven participants in the story: a Godly, a weaver, weaver's wife, a barber, barber's wife, a judge and an admirer. The men are superior and women are subordinated since it is a patriarchal society. The role of the language is descriptive and storytelling which shows the critical condition of the women in the society in general.

The politeness strategy of the agent in the sentence: "the weaver said to his wife: "Go, my dear. Take this guest to the house" and the formal politeness pattern is preserved throughout the story to show the respect of women. The structure of the story is formal and the formality in weaver's words could be a sign of family love.

There is a culturally contested sentence, and based on the translator ideology towards the women, he tries to justify the unfaithfulness of the woman as he mentions to the drinking alcohol by her husband as he puts: "weaver who with his wife was on his way to a neighboring city for liquor to drink" and "He was reeling drunk". The sentences imply very delicately that any cheating and disloyalty on the part of women is because of their husbands. He endeavors to show that men fail to love their wives and the dislike, inattention, and beating are the only trait of men as in the sentence: "he beat her limp with a club".

The translator has used the terms such as "whore" and "wench" referring to the women. He is used such a word to show playfulness of women but at the end of the story he mentions the importance of women in society and how society respect them as in the sentence: "The legal penalty for assaulting a woman is death". Translator by adding such these sentences into his translation made it long and complicated. In fact, it is not clear that translator wishes to show women as cunning and guilty or innocent.

4.9. Shell-neck, Slim, and Grim

Persian version:

...آورده اند که در آب گیری دو بط و یکی باخه ساکن بودند و میان ایشان بحکم مجاورت دوستی و مصادقت افتاده...

/...aværde ænd ke dær abgiri do bæt væ yeki baxe saken budænd væ mian e iʃan behokm e modʒaveræt du:sti væ mosadegæt oftade.../

English version:

Shell-neck, Slim, and Grim

In a certain lake lived a turtle named Shell-Neck. He had as friend two ganders whose names were Slim and Grim. Now in the vicissitudes of time there came…

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as آب گیر /abgir/ 'lake', بط /bæt/ 'duck', وداع /veda'/ 'farewell', هجران /hedʒran/ /separation/, باخه /baxe/ 'turtle', and نقصان /nogsan/ 'depletion' describe the issue of true friendship. The cohesion of the story is created by these nouns. The story is simple and easy to understand. The translator has used the words to bring the integrity to the story revealing that morality is ignorable. The Arabic sentence: ان المنایا لا تطیش سهامها /en ælmænaya la tætiʃ sæhamæha/ is added by translator since the book is translated into in Persian.

The expression حیلتی ساختن /hilæti saxtæn/ is a metaphor for "making a solution" and "روزگار غدار" /ruzegar e gæddar/ is a metaphor for "cruel life".

224

The politeness of the agents is created by the formal structure of the sentence تو اشارت مشفقان و قول ناصحان را سبک داری ... /to eʃaræt e moʃfegan væ gol nasehan ra sæbok dari/ means "you ignored the words of advisers and sympathetic" to show the respect and friendly relation among the agents.

There are three participants in the story: a turtle and two ganders. The interaction of participants is dialogue but the gander gives friendly advice. The conditional sentence اگر خواهی که ترا ببریم... /ægær xahi ke tora bebarim.../ 'if you want us to take you…' signifies that true friend care about friends and to survive him they placed a condition.

The 2nd pronoun plural "you" refers to the turtle and "we" refers to ganders is used to refer to having natural differences and a different attitude. The pronoun plural "you" is used to show respect to turtle not excluding him (as it is discussed that plural pronouns are used for respect in Iranian culture).

It is written in the third person and is based on what characters do and say. The main theme of the story is about "fate and fortuity". The story tries to prove that illiterate people act not based on the logic and wise and they believe in Fate and fortune.

There is an ideologically contested word قضا /gæza/ 'fate' which mostly accompanied by قدر /gædr/ 'fortuity' as in the verse: روزی که قضا روا نیست از مرگ حذر کردن دو وقت روا نیست /æz mærg hæzær kærdæn do vægt ræva nist….ruzi ke gæza baʃæd væ ruzi ke gæza nist و روزی که قضا نیست باشد / 'to avoid the death is not logical in two times… it is the fate and it does happen and it is not the fate and it does not happen'. The word قضا /gæza/ 'fate' used in the *'Quran'*, have long been debated among experts in the field of religious issues which have been used in many verses of the *'Quran'*. They have

special meaning in terms of their position in *'Quran'* verses and it can be said that the meaning of "to end" lies in them.

Using the Holy *'Quran'* verses, the words of Islamic prophet's family and Islamic scholars the term "fortuity" is the status near God and its impact on the universe and human beings. On the other side, its nature and impact on the life and spirit of the humans have been carefully explored. There is a general agreement that the purpose of "fate" is God's knowledge that covers everything in the world and the purpose of "fortuity" is the realization of whatever exists by related reasons in the logical order determined in "fate and fortuity". Furthermore, the terms "fate and fortuity" means divine knowledge, and knowledge of God isn't a reason of an action as astronomer's knowledge doesn't lead to the eclipse of the sun, rather eclipse happens because it is supposed to occur. This issue is so predominant that is said humans are driven by destiny.

The story very clearly mentions that most of the lay people who are ignorant, incautious and thoughtless believe in "Determinism". It means, whatever happens in their life, is due to the fate.

English version

The terms such as "Shell-Neck, Slim, Grim, a twelve-year drought, farewell, water-dweller, device, and a stick of wood" shows issues such as ask for help and farewell. The cohesion is made by these words which are used to emphasize that the simple and naïve people must be supported and backed by friends.

The translator used the word "simpleton" as a metaphor for "turtle" to say that it is very simple and dupe person who trapped easily. The politeness strategy of the agent

is preserved in the sentence "we must first say farewell to Shell-Neck, our dear and long-proved friend" is preserved through the story.

There are three participants in the story: a turtle and two ganders. The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to "turtle" which is used to mention that he takes all the responsibility of the action for saving his life. It is clear that turtle and ganders are in the same position and they are friends.

There ideologically contested term "heaven" which signifies the religious view as in the sentence: "to last as long as we are in heaven". Generally, almost all religions have taught Heaven as the location of the throne of God as well as the holy angels though this is to varying degrees considered metaphorical. In traditional Christianity, it is considered a state or condition of existence and in most forms of Christianity, heaven is moreover understood as the abode of the righteous dead in the afterlife, usually a temporary stage before the resurrection of the dead and the saints' return to the New Earth. In the Christian Bible, concepts about the future "Kingdom of Heaven" are professed in several scriptural prophecies of the new (or renewed) Earth said to follow the resurrection of the dead—particularly the books of Isaiah and Revelation and other sources of Christian eschatology.

The story very clearly mentions that turtle is killed for his simplicity as in the sentence "turtle was enough to ask: what are these people chattering about?" Unlike the Persian version, the turtle died because he was just simple.

4.10. Right-mind and Wrong-mind

Persian version:

<div dir="rtl">

...آورده اند دو شریک بودند یکی دانا و دیگر نادان، و به بازارگانی می رفتند در راه بدره ای زر یافتند، گفتند بدین قناعت باید کرد و بازگشتند...

</div>

/...aværde ænd do ∫ærik budænd yeki dana væ digær nadan, væ be bazærgani miræftænd dær rah bædre ei zær yaftænd, goftænd: bedin gæna'æt bayæd kærd væ bazgæ∫tænd…/

English Version:

Right-mind and Wrong-mind

In a certain city lived two friends, sons of merchants, and their names were Right-Mind and Wrong-Mind. These two traveled to another country far away in order to earn money.

Analysis:

Persian version

The words such as دانا /dana/ 'wise', نادان /nadan/ 'ignorant', زر یافتند /zær yaftænd/ 'they found some gold' and چه قسمت کنیم؟ /t∫e gesmæt konim/ 'why should share?' imply cheating and deception. The cohesion is created using these words. The translator has used the words to show that money can change one's personality in a negative way and one cheat people for benefits.

There is no re-wording or over-wording strategy and the story is simple in structure. The word مغفل /mægfel/ is a metaphor for 'unwise and ignorant person'.

The term پیر /pir/ 'old and experienced' is a metaphor for "the wise's father" and "مغفل" (mæghfel) means "ignorant" is a metaphor for "the unwise people".

The politeness strategy of the agent (judge) in the sentence: بفرمود تا هیزم بسیار فراهم آوردند /befærmu:d ta hizom besiar færahæm aværdænd/ 'ordered to bring some wood' which is formal and formality in judge's words represents the social stance of the judges in the society.

There are three participants in the story: an ignorant man (merchant), a wise man (merchant), a judge and the Wiseman's father. The interaction of participants is dialogue. The ignorant man is a symbol of faithfulness and the Wiseman is a symbol of greed and deception. The translator expresses that faithful people win and are happy.

The 3ʳᵈ pronoun singular او /ou/ 'he' refers to "unwise-man". The pronoun reflects the responsibility of the unwise man as in the sentences او مرا محروم گردانیده /oʊ mæra mæhrum gærdanide/ 'he deprived me'. It is used to exclude the "ignorant".

The story is written in the third person and the main theme is about cheating friends. The story expresses that one could ignore the ethics and cheat people for money. The wise man does not care about friendship and cheats his old friend as in the sentence: آنکه بخرد موسوم و بکیاست منسوب بود بیرون رفت و زر ببرد /anke bexeræd mosum væ bekiasæt mænsu:b bud birun ræft væ zær bebord/ 'the wise went there and stole the gold'.

The main theme of the story is that when money is involved one always try to take advantageous of others and act unlike his religious and beliefs as in the sentence: پیر را شره مال در کار آورد، تا جانب دین و مروت مهمل گذاشت، و ارتکاب این محظور بخلاف شریعت و طریقت جایز شمرد /pir ra ʃorre e mal dær kar aværd ta janeb e din væ morovvæt mohmæl gozaʃt væ ertekab e in mæhfouz bær xelaf e shæri'æt væ tærigæt jayez ʃomord/ 'greed for

229

money is tempted the old man and did not care about religion and humanity, and unlike his beliefs, accepted to do the crime'.

The role of the language is advice giving saying. The story expresses implicitly that how the culture treats people: the faithful person is called نادان /nadan/ 'unwise and ignorant' who trusted his friend and the cheater is called دانا /dana/ 'wise'. The story sounds a native folktale.

English version

In the English version, the words such as "Right-Mind and Wrong-Mind, a thousand dinars, share, treasure, equally, judgment and magistrates" describes the cheating in the story and creates the cohesion and the theme of the story.

The "Wright-minded" is a symbol of trust and faithfulness and "Wrong-minded" is a symbol of greed and deception. The translator is made the story long and added a number of verses (poems). He expressed clearly the amount of money (600 Dinars) which is Arabic currency as well as the exact amount of money which two friends took at the first time and second time. It is very obvious that the story is not Indian folktale and may be taken from the Arabic classic work (One Thousand and One Night) which has very similarity to the *Panchatantra.*

The formal politeness pattern is preserved through the story as in the sentences: "magistrates learned the facts, they decreed an ordeal for each" and "For there is a further saying: To meanest witnesses, ordeals should never be preferred". This politeness strategy shows the social hierarchy and the way the people communicate in the society.

There are six participants in the story: Right-minded, Wrong-minded, Wrong-minded's father, Wrong-minded's father, magistrates and goddess of the wood. The

role of the language is story-telling and has not a real function. The story is written in the third person and is based on what characters do and say.

The 3rd pronoun singular "I" refers to Right-minded which have a sort of self-proudness. It is used to excluding himself from the friends, to show superiority as in the sentence: "I will bring you into court".

Translator added one character which is female. This character is a goddess who is going to make a judgment and save one's life as in the sentence: "I have a witness, the goddess of the wood. She will reveal to you which one of us is guilty, which not guilty". There is emphasize on a female and the translator added this participant to bold the role of the female in the story society. The female in this story is a goddess who is holy and her words are taken granted for everybody like Bible's word.

The role of the language is storytelling. The story expresses explicitly that how the culture treats the people: the faithful person is called the Right-minded who trusted his friend and the cheater is called the Wrong-minded.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

5. Chapter Five: Conclusions

Language, in general, speaks everything but the language is not just a few words regarding literature. The selection of words, grammar, and textual structure reveals the writer's intentions. Furthermore, changing one word could change the entire meaning of a literary work. So, the language could be a means of manipulation and the same could be regarded as true in the translation activities.

A number of scholars such as Herman (1985), Lefevere (1992), and Schaffner (2003) agree that translation cannot be innocent mainly due to the assumption that no language use is neutral and value-free. It is because ideology dictates and applies its manipulative power on language use in every social phenomenon and translation in particular.

The present study analyzed two translated versions of the *Panchatantra,* i.e. Persian and English translations based on the Fairclough's (1995) CDA approach, postulating that the ideology resides in texts and it is not possible to ignore it. Texts are open to diverse interpretations and ideology exists covertly behind any lexical and grammatical choices in translation.

Regarding the manipulative nature of ideology, the study aims at investigating ideological manipulations which manifest through words, grammar, textual structures and lead to different outcomes in different periods of time and culture. In this regard, the present study uses CDA to investigate the ideological views and manipulation of texts in both translations of the *Panchatantra,* i.e. Persian and English versions.

As mentioned earlier, the present study has three questions to answer the rough questions of the samples. The first question of the present study is: Whether a literary

work ideologically colored or not, if so, to what extent ideology manipulates the meaning and message of the source text in the translation process?

Concerning the first question, the Persian translation does not have titles and is framed and all stories begin with a conversation between two agents, i.e. Ray and Brahman whose interaction bring the stories into a political format since the Ray represents the state and Brahman represent the religion. How the conversation flows between Ray and Brahman, implies the ideological and power relations. The Persian translator explicitly addresses this point as in the sentence: بیان :رای هند فرمود برهمن را که از کن.../ray Hind farmud berahman ra ke: bayan kon…/ 'The Ray of India ordered the Brahman that tell....'

In fact, the book has been composed based on their interaction and one story comes from that story which itself comes from another story. In other words, Persian translation has a frame-story and other stories come in as a proof. The Persian translation is ideological in that sense that the Brahman teaches the Ray the rough stories how to rule the territory and control the society.

The various instances of foregrounding and backgrounding have been applied purposefully in both the translations. The words and grammatical choices presented in both the versions reflect the ideological orientation which results in partiality of translation on the part of the translator. One issue which is treated differently in both the translations is the issue of feminism and females. The Persian translation neglects women showing that women are ignorant, conspirators, and playful as well as unfaithful who do not follow the ethics of life as in the sentence زن حجام را بدو پیغام دادکه zæn e hodʒam bedu peygam dad ke تو... و دانم من چنانکه بیا و برخیز تو ، رفت مهمان من شوی /ʃuye mæn mehman ræft to bærxiz væ bia tʃenanke mæn danæm væ to/ means

"barber's wife send her lover a message that my husband went to a party, come to me secretly).

In the preface of the book, the translator puts women and animals in the same category as in the sentence پس از رنجانیدن جانوران و کشتن مردمان و از هوای زنان اعراض کلی کردم/pas æz rændʒandæn e dʒaneværan væ koʃtan e mærdoman, æz hævay e zænan e'raz kolli kærdæm/ 'after, I avoided suffering the animals and killing the people, I also totally ignored the women as well". The Persian translation portraits the patriarchal society in which men are superior to women. It mentions that one must not trust the women and they must be submissive in carrying the burden of the family on their shoulders.

The Persian translation judges women fanatically expressing that they are cunning and playful as in the sentence: " و ،حکما گویند بر سه کار اقدام ننماید مگر نادان :صحبت سلطان، چشیدن زهر بگمان و ، سر گفتن با زنان/hokæma gu:yænd bær se kar egdam nænæmayænd mægær nadan: sohbæte sultan, tʃeʃidæn e zæhr be goman væ serr goftæn ba zænan/ ne/ نه ازیشان وفا و مردمی چشم توان داشت و نه در ایشان حسن عهد صورت بندد:and in the sentence æz iʃan væfa væ mærdomi tʃeʃm tævan daʃt væ næ dær iʃan æhd suræt bændæd/ 'women are unfaithful, and no one should expect kindness from women and mostly they never keep their promises'.

Concerning the issue, the English translation differs from the Persian one. In the English version, the women play an important role in the family issues and they have equal rights as in the sentence: "So the crow and his wife straightway flew off at random, and the wife came upon a certain pond. As she looked about, she saw the…"

The idea that women play an important social role independently from men is mirrored by the translator on different occasions as in the sentences: "crow-hen seized

and started for the tree where she lived" and "crow-hen dropped the golden chain in the snake's hole". English translator is tried to show the issue of love and family intimacy repeatedly with phrases such as "my dear wife" "my love" and "sweetheart".

The second question is: Since the issue of patronage in translation has fundamental importance acts as a mediator among a foreign text, a translator, and TT audiences, should translator be faithful to the ethics of translation or to the patron and his ideology?

All translations, regardless of intention, manipulate the literature in order to function in a society. In the analysis phase, many pieces of evidence of ideological orientation are underlined in the Persian version as well as in the English one. It is noticed that the Christian and Islamic views are reflected and manifested on many occasions in both translations which can say each translator presented the ideology of their own or the patrons.

The Persian translator, Abu'l Ma'ali Nasr Allah Monshi (1121) explicitly reflected his ideological views or the dominant ideology of the time, by adding verses of the *'Quran'* and Hadith (Prophet's word) through the book such as "و اذا انتهيت الى السلامهٔ فى" "قال النبى صلى الله عليه و آله: زويت لى الارض فاريت مشارقها و مغاربها و سيبلغ" and "مداک فلا تجاوز ملک". All these additions are done purposefully and consciously since the translation was commissioned by Sultan Bahram and it made the translation ideological and political. In fact, the Persian translator has used these additions in order to show the dominance of the Islamic ideological views as in " صدق الله حين قال فَإِذَا جَاء أَجَلُهُمْ لاَ يَسْتَأْخِرُونَ سَاعَةً وَلاَ يَسْتَقْدِمُونَ" (الاعراف 34)

These religious beliefs or worldviews affect the translated texts. So, the Persian translation explicitly benefits from the verses from *the Quran* and Hadith (Prophet's

words) occasionally. The Persian translator purposefully has used the Quranic verses, poems, and aphorisms, to provide advice that fits the story, and to support his words which make the translation colored. Since the partiality of translated texts is often hidden. So, the translator remains to go unmentioned and transfer processes unnoticed and power can be efficiently exercised through translation.

Traditionally, translation is treated as a strict technique for transfer between languages and this attitude makes translation biased and places the translator in the dilemma of falsification, deletion, addition, concealing the original in order to satisfy the target readers. The English translator has put his ideological views overtly and covertly. Obviously, ideological views are reflected by the English translator through different words, poems, and structures which highlighted the doctrine of Christianity. Based on the evidence, the ideological orientation of the translator has affected the text.

The English translator inspires the reader indirectly in the sense that whatever the religion shows is correct and unquestionable as in the sentence: "For the Scripture says: …" Furthermore, the translator endeavors to prove that the faith to his religious is the only way to happiness. The words from Scripture obviously influence the reader deeply as in the sentences: "At holy shrines, some saints are found" and "The soul commits the sin; and late or soon, the soul must expire".

The third question of the study is: If the translator is obliged to translate a foreign work in the favor of ideological system of the receiving society, then to what extent the translator's ideology would be influential in the translation process?

Translated texts offer a capacity to being exploited for various interests of numerous agents or patrons which are commissioned to the translator, thus, the translator must

play a submissive role regarding the patron and patronage in translation. In this regard, both translators did their best to be submissive to their patron or patrons.

The English translator has added a number of poems and more than 200 stories which do not exist in other versions. In the English version, the translator endeavors to highlight morality on many occasions and to this end, he has added many participants and made the stories long. We face a number of ethical issues for different reasons as they are based on moralities such as forgiveness, sacrifice, courage, determination, consistency, tolerance, faithfulness, honesty, and friendship. The English translator insists on morality by repeating the moral values of events such as sacrificing in sentences: "She puts herself in trouble" and "I will take Readywit and Fatalist and move to another lake".

In the Persian version, translator added three more chapters as an introduction which could be regarded as an ideological act in translation since chapters are not related to the *Panchatantra.* The first chapter is dedicated to the king, Khosru Anushiravan I and the second chapter to the vazier Bozorjmehr and the third one is related to the Borzuy. It is because the king and vizier were the patrons and commissioned the translation.

The issues of morality, in the Persian translation, are treated differently. The Persian translator retells the story in a simple style structure in order to communicate the message and to give advice about the real social issues which one could face in real life. The Persian translation is an anecdote and the textual structure of the story seems very real which could be read from a different perspective. The theme of the Persian translation is loaded with strategic and political implications. These layers of superstructure and infrastructure are linked together in a way that created a work

which can hardly be distinguished from each other at the boundaries of ethics and politics as in the sentences: نظر بر پیرایه ای گشاده افگنی که ربودن آن میسر باشد. فرود آیی و آن را /næzær bær piraye ei goʃade æfkæni ke rubu:dæn e an moyæssær bashæd…furu:d ayi væ an ra bærdari/ 'fly in the sky to search a jewelry which stealing is easy…fly down and take it', and امروز بنای کار خود بر حیلت باید نهاد /emru:z bænay e kar e xod bær hilæt bayæd næhad/ 'today, I should play trick'.

Ethics has special features. But on one hand, in addition to various forms, morality consolidated with ethics; and on the other hand, the Persian translation tries to establish harmony between the two controversial and problematic categories, namely politics and morality. Furthermore, reflection and revision of the content of Persian version show that despite the initial impression, the historical struggle of ethics and politics in different parts of the work is underway and led to dominating the politics over morality. In other words, Persian translation ignores morality when it faces the politic.

Above all, in the Persian version, almost all characters are animals whereas the English translator assigned various human names to the animal characters in each story. In other words, English translation gave human names to animals to justify the ideological orientation in the story. Furthermore, he assigned a name to each story which makes the stories to stand independently whereas the Persian translation is framed in which these stories are told by Brahman as a support and proof for his words. These additions and alterations are ideological since animal behaves based on their own nature which is more natural than human. Furthermore, the English version did not consider the life as sharp, undeceived, and sentimental-free since the animals gained human characteristics.

From the discussion and samples analyzed, it could be claimed that translation not only is ideological but also is biased and partial in the cases of omission, deletion, addition, and change of meaning in the process of the transformation. Furthermore, the findings show how translators think and act under ideological norms and constraints of the receptor society and patrons providing the translation for the translator, control the process. Therefore, regarding the ideological references in different periods of time and their impact on translation, the literary translation merits re-examinations based on the various ideological views of different time era.

The findings prove the correctness of the hypothesis. That is to say, both translations were influenced by ideological transformation, in order to direct the target reader's worldview to a particular ideology and reshape their perception accordingly. The translators' lexical, structural and grammatical choices are governed by their views and obviously, it influenced not only what they said but how they said which created its own form of discourse. So, the ideological implications exist overtly and covertly in both the translations showing that all language uses are ideological and create their own discourses.

Consequently, the complexity of the ideologies stresses that in order to reveal the hidden ideological implications created by language and discourses, a translator should be familiar with different ideologies and their discourse. This ideological awareness enables the translators to manipulate, violate or falsify the ST message to fit for target audiences and gives translators a deeper insight towards subtle persuasive strategies which place readers in specific ideological positions.

References

References

Abrams, M. H. & Harpham, G. G. (2015). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (11th ed.). Stamford: Cengage Learning.

Adegbija, E. (2004). *Multilingualism: A Nigerian Case Study*. Nigeria: Africa World Press.

Alekseeva, I. S. (2001). Intertextuality Apotheosis: About Translation of the Poem. In: Klimovich, N. V. (2014). Phenomenon of Intertextuality in Translation. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* 2 (2014 7).

Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality.* London and New York: Routledge.

Allen, G. & Unwin, (1965). *The Panchatantra*. Translated in 1924 from the Sanskrit by Franklin Edgerton. London: General Reader.

Althusser, L. (1984). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In: *Essays on Ideology*. London: Verso.

Alvarez, R. & Vidal, C. (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon. Philadelphia. Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Amir-Arjomand, S. (1994). *Abd Allah ibn al-Muqaffa and the Abbasid Revolution*: Iranian Studies. Routledge.

Angelelli, C.V. (2014). *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting studies.* John Benjamins.

Arrojo, R. (1998). The Revision of the Traditional Gap between Theory and Practice and the Empowerment of Translation in Postmodern Times. In: *The Translator* 4(1).

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account: A Narrative Account*. London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. & Malmkjær, K. (2005). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Ball, A. & Freedman, W. S. (2004). *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, literacy, and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bassnett, S. (2005). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (1998). Translating Across Cultures. In: Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Batstone, R. (1995). Grammar in Discourse: Attitude and Deniability. In: Cook, G. & Seidlhofer, B. (2001). *Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baxter, J. (2010). Discourse Analytic Approach to Text and Talk. In: O'Brien, S & Saldanha, G. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bayar, M. (2007). *To Mean or Not to Mean: Kadmous Cultural Foundation* Damascus: Khatawat publishing and distribution.

Beaton, M. (2007). Interpreted Ideologies in Institutional Discourse. In: *The Translator*, vol. 13, Number 2, (2007).

Benjamin, W. (1992). *The Task of Translator*. London: Fontana.

Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Hodder.

Bradbury, M. (2001). Character and Characterisation. In: Bell & Magrs (ed.). *The Creative Writing Coursebook*. London: Macmillan.

Brown, K. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Boston: Elsevier.

Brown, W. N. (1919). The Panchatantra in Modern Indian Folklore. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 39.

Calzada-Pérez, M. (2003). *Apropos of Ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Catford, J. C. (1978). *A linguistic Theory of Translation: An essay in Applied Linguistics.* (5th ed.). London and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chandler, D. (2002). *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge.

Chen, Sh. (2008). Cultural Presupposition and Decision-Making in the Functional Approach to Translation. In: *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, No. 1.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Classe, O. (2000). *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English.* London: Routledge.

Cook, G. (2003). *Discourse and Literature: The Interplay of Form and Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Culler, J. (1976). *The Pursuit of Signs*. London and New York: Routledge.

Chung-ling, Sh. (2010). Ideological Interference in Translation: Strategies of Translating Cultural References. In: *Translation Journal*, Volume 14, No. 3. URL: http://translationjournal.net/journal/53culture.htm.

Darwish, A. (2010). *A Journalist's Guide to Live Direct and Unbiased News Translation.* Melbourne: Writescope.

Davies, E. E. (2003). Gender and Nation. London: Stage Publications. In Chung-ling, Sh. (ed.). Ideological Interference in Translation: Strategies of Translating Cultural References. *Translation Journal and the Author*, Volume 14, No. 3. URL: http://translationjournal.net/journal/53culture.htm.

de Blois, F. (1990). *Burzoy's Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book of Kalīlah wa Dimnah*. London: Routledge.

Denisova, G.V. (2003). *In the World of Intertext: Language, Memory, Translation*. Moscow: Academy of Sciences.

Disch, L. (1993). More Truth than Fact: Storytelling as Critical Understanding in the Writings of Hannah Arendt. In: *Political Theory*, 21 (4). http://philpapers.org/rec/DISMTT-2.

Dyson, K. K. (2009). *Translation: the Magical Bridge between Cultures*. Presentation at the University of Hyderabad on 28 January (2009), for the 9th Biennial International Conference of the Comparative Literature Association of India.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an Introduction*. London and New York: Verso.

Edgerton, F. (1924). *The Panchatantra Reconstructed.* vol. 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, Vol.2: Introduction and Translation), New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Series Volumes 2–3. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panchatantra#CITEREFEdgerton1924.

Ehrman, J. F. (1993). *Pragmatics and Translation: the Problem of Presupposition*. TTR: Translation, Terminologie, Redaction, 6 (1). Retrieved from http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/037142ar.

El-Gamal, A. (2001). Presupposition, Perceptional Relativity and Translation Theory. In: *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses,* 14 (2001).

Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. In: Venuti, L. (ed.). *Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Farahzad, F. (2009). Translation Criticism: A CDA Approach. In: *Translation Studies, Volume* 6, No. 24.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London and New York: Routledge

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). Media Discourse. London: Arnold. In: Richardson, J. (2007). *Analyzing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: McMillan.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse*. Discourse and Society 4 (2).

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol.2. Discourse as Social Interaction. London. Sage**.**

Fawcett, P., & Munday, J. (2009). Ideology. In: Baker & Saldanha (2nd ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Fischer.

Fawcett, P. (1998). Ideology and Translation". In: Baker & Saldanha (2nd ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Fawcett, P. (1995). Translation and Power Play. In: *The Translator* 1 (2). Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1995.10798956.

France, P. (2001). *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freeden, M. (2003). *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freeden, M. (1998). *Ideologies and Political Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gasparov, B. (2010). *Speech, Memory and Meaning: Intertextuality in Everyday Language*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation.* Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gentzler, E. (2004). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Gentzler, E. & Tymoczko, M. (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Gentzler, E. (2002). Translation, Poststructuralism, and Power. In: *Translation and Power*. Tymoczko & Gentzler (ed.). Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary Translation Studies*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Gorlee, D. (1994). *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

Ghosh, A. (2005). *Incendiary Circumstances: A Chronicle of the Turmoil of Our Times.* Boston and New York. Houghton Mifflin Company

Garbovsky, N.K. (2004). *Translation Theory*. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House.

Hall, S. (1996). The Problem of Ideology: Marxism without guarantees. In: Morley, D. & Chen, K. H. (eds.). *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hassan, B. A. (2011). *Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hansen, K. & Sperber, G. (1987). *Anthropological Studies of Culture*. Québec: de l'Université du Québec Presses.

Hatim, B. (2001). *Communication across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.

Hatim, B. & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation*: *An Advanced Resource Book*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translation*. London and New York: Longman.

Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hermans, T. (1991). Translating the Norms and Correct Translation. In: van Leuven, K. M. & Najeekens, T. (ed.), *Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Hermans, T. (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

Hertel, J. (1914). *The Panchatantra: Its History and Spread.* Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.

Hilali, A. (2015). *History of the Concept of Intertextuality. With an Example of a North African Novel. Retrieved from:* www.scm.unihalle.de/reporting_list/study_days/sektion1/230371.

Hongwei, C. (1999). Cultural Difference and Translation. In: *Meta*, 44(1): 121-132.

Honig, H. G. (1998). Positions, Power, and Practice: Functionalist Approaches and Translation Quality Assessment. In: Schaffner (ed.): *Translation and Quality*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Holz-Manttari, J. (1984). Translation Action Theory. In: Kuhiwczak, p. & Ltitau (ed.). *A companion to Translation Studies*. Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Hung, E. (2005). *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in History, Norms, and Image-projection*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jafa, M. (2004). *The Panchatantra World's Oldest Collection of Stories for Children*. http://docplayer.net/22477675-World-s-oldest-collection-of-stories-for children.html.

James, K. (2002). Cultural Implications for Translation. In *Translation journal*, volume 6, No. 4 October (2002). http://translationjournal.net/journal/22delight.htm.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool. In: *discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 18:3. Johannesburg: South Africa. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302.

Joseph, J. (1888). *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai*. London: Google Books.

Jiang, W. (2000). The Relationship between Culture and Language. In: *ELT Journal*, Volume 54/4 October 2000. Oxford University Press.

Juvan, M. (2009). *The Intertextuality of Genres and the Intertextual Genres.* Retrieved from: http://phantasma.lett.ubbcluj.ro/?p=1331&lang=en.

Kalogirou, T. & Economopoulou, V. (2012). *Building Bridges between Texts: From Intertextuality to Intertextual Reading and Learning. Theoretical Challenges and Classroom Resources.* Athens: University of Athens.

Karamanian, A. P. (2002). Translation and Culture. In: *Translation Journal and the Author*. Retrieved from URL:http://accurapid.com/journal/19culture2.htm.

Karoubi, B. (2005). *Ideology and Translation with a Concluding Point on Translation Teaching.* Retrieved from http://www.translationdirectory.com/article233.htm.

Kelly, D. (1998). *Ideological Implications of Translation Decisions: Positive Self-and Negative Other Presentation.* Universidad de Granada. Departamento de Traducción e Interpretación. Quaderns. Revista de traducció 1.

Klimovich, N. V. (2014). Phenomenon of Intertextuality in Translation. In: *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* 2 (2014 7).

Komissarov, V. (1991). Language and Culture in Translation: Competitors or Collaborators. In: *Traduction, Terminologia and Redaction.* Vol. 4, No. 1. Retrieved from: http://www.erudit.org/revue/TTR/1991/v4/n1/037080ar.pdf.

Kramsch, C. (2003). *Language and Culture: A Social Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice.* Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Kritzeck, J. (1964). *Anthology of Islamic Literature*. New York: New American Library.

Kuhiwczak, p. & Ltitau (2007). *A Companion to Translation Studies.* Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Kuzmina, N.A. (1999). *Intertext and Its Role in the Process of the Evolution of the Poetics Language*. Omsk: Omsk State University Publishing.

Lande, I. (2010). *The Role of Critical Discourse Analysis in the Translation of Political Texts*. (Aarhus University: Master's Thesis,).

Lambton, A. (2006). *State and Government in Medieval Islam*. London and New York: Routledge.

Larson, L. M. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation* (2nd ed.). Lanham, New York and Oxford: University Press of America.

Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, History, and Culture*. London and New York, Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literature Fame.* New York: Routledge.

Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lingam, R. (2012). *Is the Panchatantra Just a Bed Time Story?* http://www.indiasutra.co.nz/blog/is-the-panchatantra-just-bed-time-stories/.

London, J. (2008). How to Do Things with Fables: Ibn al-Muqaffa's Frank Speech in Stories from Kalila wa Dimna. History of Political Thought. *In History of Political Thought,* Volume 29, Number 2. Imprint Academic

Luke, A. (2002). *Beyond Science and Ideological Critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis.* Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053.

Macey, D. (2000). *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory.* Penguin Books.

Mahjoub, M. J. (2001). *About Panchatantra.* Tehran: Farhang Iran Zamin publication.

Meri, J. M. (2006). *Medieval Islamic Civilization: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge.

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault: Critical Thinker Essential Guides for Literary Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Minovi, M. (2010). *Kalileh ve Demneh*. Tehran: Sales Publication.

Mishra, R. K. (2012). An Study of Intertextuality: The Way of Reading and Writing. In *Primejournal*, Vol. 2(3). Retrieved from http://www.primejournal.org/PRE/pdf/2012/apr/Mishra.pdf.

Munday, J. (2008). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge

Munday, J. (2007). *Translation and Ideology: A Textual Approach*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2009.10524143.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge.

Nadwi, M. (2013). Panchatantra: Its Impact on Perso-Arabic Literature. In: *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Volume 12, Issue 3.

Num-Fung, Ch. (2005). *Yes Prime Manipulator: How a Chinese translation of British political humor came into being.* Honk Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Neubert, A. & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as Text Translation Studies*. Kent: Kent State University Press.

Nida, E. A. & Jin, D. (1984). *On Translation: With Special Reference to Chinese and English.* Beijing: Publish Corporation.

Nida, E. (1998). *Language, Culture, and Translation.* Foreign languages journal, 115(3).

Nida, E. & Taber, Ch. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: Brill

Niranjana, T. (1991). *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nord, C. (2003). Function and Loyalty in Bible Translation. In: M. Calzada-Pérez. (eds.), *Apropos of ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome

Nord, C. (1997). *Translating As a Purposeful Activity*: Functionalist Approaches Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Noyes, G. R. (1939). *Arthur William Ryder: Original Poems, Together With Translations from the Sanskrit*. California: University of California Press.

Olivelle, P. (2006). *The Five Discourses on Worldly Wisdom*. New York: New York University Press.

Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ostman, J. & Verschueren, J. (2005). *Handbook of Pragmatics*. University of Helsinki and University of Antwerp.

Oxford English Dictionary (*2nd edition*). (1997). Additions Series Vol. 3 (1997).

Panagiotidou, M. E. (2010). *Mapping Intertextuality: Towards A Cognitive Model*. Genova: The Language of Landscapes.

Pearson, A. M. (1996). *Because it Gives Me Peace of Mind: Ritual Fasts in the Religious Lives of Hindu Women*. Suny Press.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction.* Sydney, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Phillips, L. & Jorgensen, M. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London and New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Ping, K. (1999). Cultural Presuppositions and Misreadings. In: Meta: Translators' Journal, vol. 44, n1. Retrieved from http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/003296ar.

Plett, F. H. (1991). *Intertextuality: Research in Text Theory*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Pope, B. (2002). *The English Studies* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Porter, J.E. (1986). *Intertextuality and the Discourse Community.* Rhetoric Review, 5(1).

Potts, Ch. (2014). *Presupposition and Implicatures.* Stanford Linguistics.

Puurtinen, T. (2000). Translating Linguistic Markers of Ideology. In: Chesterman, A., Salvador, N. & Gambier, Y. (ed.). *Translation in Context*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pym, A. (1992). *Limits and Frustrations of Discourse Analysis in Translation Theory*. Revista de Filologia de la Universidad de La Láguna.

Pym, A. & Shlesinger, M. & Jettmarová, Z. (2006). *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Quine, W. V. (1960). *World and Object*. Cambridge University Press.

Ramsay, W. (2008). *Kalila and Dimna, Fables of Friendship and Betrayal.* Introduction by Doris Lessing. London: Saqi.

Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations*. Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Robertson, D. (2004). *The Routledge Dictionary of Politics* (3rd ed.). London. Routledge.

Robinson, D. (1997). *What is the Translation?: Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions.* Kent, Ohio, and London: Kent State University Press.

Rösler, B. (2009). *Lefevere's Undifferentiated Patronage in the Former East Germany*. New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Ferdowsi, A. (1985). *The Shāh Nãma: The Epic of the Kings* (ed.). Translated by Reuben Levy, revised by Amin Banani. Chapter XXXI (iii) How Borzuy brought the Kalila wa Demna from Hindustan. London.

Ryder, A. W. (1925). *The Panchatantra.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Republished in 1949 by Jaico Publishing House, Mumbai.

Saldanha, G. & O'Brien, S (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sapir, E. (1956). *Selected Writings in Language: Culture and Personality*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Schaffner, C. (2004). Political Discourse Analysis from the Point of View of Translation Studies. In Bassenett, S. & Bielsa, E. (ed.). *Translation in Global News.* London and New York: Routledge.

Schaffner, C. (2003). *Third Ways and New Centers: Ideological Unity or Difference?* In: M. Calzada-Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Schaffner, C. (2002). *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translation Training*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Sheyholislami, J. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from http://httpserver.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/CDA.htm.

Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Translation*. New York: Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1990). Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer? A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany. In: *Translation, History, and Culture*. Bassnett & Lefevere (ed.). London: Pinter.

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

Steiner, G. (1989). *Real Presences: Is There Anything in What We Say?* London: Faber and Faber.

Stoneman, P. & Sanchez-Arce, A. M. & Leighton, A. (2005). *European Intertext: Women's Writing in English in a European Context.* Bern: Peter Lange AG.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Suleman, F. (2006). Kalila wa Dimna. In: *Medieval Islamic Civilization an Encyclopedia.* Vol. II. Meri, J. W. (ed.). New York-London: Routledge.

Tahir-Gürçaglar, S. (2003). *The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol*. In M. Caldaza-Perez (ed.). *Apropos of Ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Thomas, S. (1998). Translating as Intercultural Conflict. In: S. Hunston (ed.) *Language at Work: British Studies in Applied Linguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Thriveni, C. (2001). Cultural Elements in Translation: The Indian Perspective. In: *Translation Journal*. Retrieved from: http://accurapid.com/journal/19culture.htm.

Toury, G. (1999). A Handful of Paragraphs on Translation and Norms. In: C. Schaffner (ed.) *Translation and norms*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Trivedi, H. (2005). Translating Culture vs. Cultural Translation. In: St-Pierre, P. and Prafulla C. Kar. (ed.). *In Translation, Reflections, Refractions, Transformations.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tymoczko, M. (2007). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester and Kinderhook: St. Jerome.

Tymoczko, M. (2003). Translation, Ideology, and Creativity. In: *Linguistic Anterpiensia.* Vol.2. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts. Retrieved from: https://lans-tts.uantwerpen.be/index.php/LANS-TTS/article/view/74/30.

Tymoczko, M & Gentzler, E. (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Tymoczko, M. (2000). *Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, social change and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts.* Routledge. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799054.

Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. (2nd ed.). New York and London Routledge.

Valdeon, A. R. (2007). *Ideological Independence or Negative Mediation*. Retrieved from:

http://www.academia.edu/1450945/Ideological_Independence_or_Negative_Mediation_BBC_Mundo_and_CN.

van Leeuwen, T. (2006). Critical Discourse Analysis. In K, Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Boston: Elsevier.

van Dijk, T. (2003). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.

van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Tannen, D. Schiffrin, D. & Hamilton, H. (ed.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. In: Bell, Allan & Peter Garrett (ed.), *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993b). Discourse, Power, and Access. In: C.R. Caldas (ed.), *Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Differences*. New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Waghmare, R. (2011). Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogism and Intertextuality: A Perspective. In: *Indian Streams Research Journal,* Vol. I. Retrieved from http://isrj.org/UploadedData/161.pdf.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weiss, G., & R. Wodak (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity.* London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Widdowson, H. (1998). The Theory and Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. In: *Applied Linguistics*, 19.1.

Williams, R. (1983). *A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford.

Williams, J. & Chesterman, A. (2002). *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Wyndham, L. (1962). Folktales of India. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. In: Wong, Sh. & Hines, N. A. (ed.). *Asian and Asia-American Traditions in Language Arts*. Retrieved from: http://www.pps.k12.or.us/depts-c/mc-me/be-as-la.pdf.

Wodak, R. (1997). Disorders of Discourse. London: Longman. In: Richardson, J. (ed.). *Analyzing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage.

Wong, Sh. & Hines, N. A. (2001). *Asian and Asia-American Traditions in Language Arts.* Retrieved from: http://www.pps.k12.or.us/depts-c/mc-me/be-as-la.pdf.

Yan. X. J. (2007). On the Role of Ideology in Translation Practice. In: *US-China Foreign Language.* USA. Volume 5. No.4.

Yang, H. (2008). Study On the Ideology-Influenced Translation: Based on Rickshaw boy by Evan King. In: *English Teaching* 5(4).

Zakhir, M. (2009). *Equivalence in Translation.* Morocco: University of Sultan Moulay Slimane. Retrieved from: http://www.translationdirectory.com/article31.htm.

Zizek, S. (2001). Why The Law Does Need An Obscene Supplement?. In: Goodrich, P. & Carlson, D. G. (ed.). *Low and the Postmodern Mind: Essays on Psychoanalysis and Jurisprudence.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Appendices

Appendices

Story 1.

Persian Version

...آورده اند که زاغی در کوه بر بالای درختی خانه داشت ، و در آن حوالی سوراخ ماری بود ، هرگاه که زاغ بچه بیرون آوردی مار بخوردی . چون از حد بگذشت و زاغ درماند شکایت بر آن شگال که دوست وی بود بکرد گفت :می اندیشم که خود را از بلای این ظالم جان شکر باز رهانم . شگال پرسید که :بچه طریق قدم در این کارخواهی نهاد؟ گفت :می خواهم که چون مار در خواب شود ناگاه چشمهای جهان بینش برکنم ، تا در مستقبل نودیده و مطوه دل من از قصد او و ایمن گردد . شگال گفت :این تدبیر بابت خردمندان نیست ، چه خردمند قصد دشمن بر وجهی کند که در ان خطر نباشد.

لکن من ترا وجهی نمایم که اگر بر آن کار توانا گردی سبب بقای تو و موجب هلاک مار باشد. زاغ گفت: از اشارت دوستان نتوان گذشت و رای خردمند را خلاف نتوان کرد. شگال گفت: صواب آن می نمایم که در اوج هوا پرواز کنی و در بامها و صحراها چشم می اندازی تا نظر بر پیرایه ای گشاده افگنی که ربودن آن میسر باشد. فرود آیی و آن را برداری و هموارتر می روی چنانکه از چشم مردمان غایب نگردی. چون نزدیک مار رسی بروی اندازی تا مردمان که در طلب پیرایه آمده باشند نخست ترا برهانند آنگاه پیرایه بردارند.

زاغ روی به آبادانی نهاد زنی را دید پیرایه برگوشه بام نهاده و خود بطهارت مشغول گشته ؛ در ربود و بر آن ترتیب که گفته بود بر مار انداخت. مردمان که در پی زاغ بودند در حال سر مار بکوفتند و زاغ باز رست.

English Version

HOW THE CROW-HEN KILLED THE BLACK SNAKE

In a certain region grew a great banyan tree. In it lived a crow and his wife, occupying the nest which they had built. But a black snake crawled through the hollow trunk and ate their chicks as fast as they were born, even before baptism. Yet for all his sorrow over this violence, the poor crow could not desert the old familiar banyan and seek another tree. For

> Three cannot be induced to go
>
> The deer, the cowardly man, the crow:
>
> Three go when insult makes them pant
>
> The lion, hero, elephant

At last, the crow-hen fell at her husband's feet and said: "My dear lord, a great many children of mine have been eaten by that awful snake. And grief for my loved and lost haunts me until I think of moving. Let us make our home in some other tree. For

> No friend like health abounding;
>
> And like disease, no foe;

<blockquote>
No love like love of children;

Like hunger-pangs, no woe
</blockquote>

And again:

<blockquote>
With fields overhanging rivers,

With wife on flirting bent,

Or in a house with serpents,

No man can be content.

We are living in deadly peril."
</blockquote>

At this, the crow was dreadfully depressed, and he said: "We have lived in this tree a long time, my dear. We cannot desert it. For

<blockquote>
Where water may be sipped, and grass

Be cropped, a deer might live content;

Yet insult will not drive him from

The wood where all his life was spent
</blockquote>

Moreover, by some shrewd device, I will bring death upon this villainous and mighty foe." "But," said his wife, "this is a terribly venomous snake. How will you hurt him?" And he replied: "My dear, even if I have not the power to hurt him, still I have friends who possess learning, who have mastered the works on ethics. I will go and get from them some shrewd device of such nature that the villain curses him! will soon meet his doom."

After this indignant speech, he went at once to another tree, under which lived a dear friend, a jackal. He courteously called the jackal forth, related all his sorrow, then said: "My friend, what do you consider opportune under the circumstances? The killing of our children is sheer death to my wife and me."

"My friend," said the jackal, "I have thought the matter through. You need not put yourself out. That villainous black snake is near his doom by reason of his heartless cruelty. For

<blockquote>
Of means to injure brutal foes

You do not need to think,

Since of themselves they fall, like trees

Upon the river's brink
</blockquote>

And there is a story:

<blockquote>
A heron ate what fish he could,

The bad, indifferent, and good;

His greed was never satisfied
</blockquote>

266

Till, strangled by a crab, he died."

"How was that?" asked the crow. And the jackal told the story "My friend," said the crow, "tell me how this villainous snake is to meet his doom." And the jackal answered: "Go to some spot frequented by a great monarch. There seize a golden chain or a necklace from some wealthy man who guards it carelessly. Deposit this in such a place that when it is recovered, the snake may be killed."

So the crow and his wife straightway flew off at random, and the wife came upon a certain pond. As she looked about, she saw the women of a king's court playing in the water, and on the bank, they had laid golden chains, pearl necklaces, garments, and gems. One chain of gold the crow-hen seized and started for the tree where she lived.

But when the chamberlains and the eunuchs saw the theft, they picked up clubs and ran in pursuit. Meanwhile, the crow-hen dropped the golden chain in the snake's hole and waited at a safe distance.

Now when the king's men climbed the tree, they found a hole and in it a black snake with swelling hood. So they killed him with their clubs, recovered the golden chain, and went their way. Thereafter the crow and his wife lived in peace.

"And that is why I say: In cases where brute force would fail and the rest of it. Furthermore:

Some men permit a petty foe

Through purblind heedlessness to grow,

Till he who played a petty role

Grows, like disease, beyond control

Indeed, there is nothing in the world that the intelligent cannot control. As the saying goes:

Intelligence is power. But where

Could power and folly make a pair?

The rabbit played upon his pride

To fool him; and the lion died."

Story 2.

Persian Version

... آورده اند که بازرگانی اندک مال بود و می خواست که سفری رود. صد من آهن داشت، در خانه دوستی بر وجه امانت بنهاد و برفت . چون بازآمد امین ، ودیعت فروخته بود و بها خرج کرده . بازرگان روزی بطلب آهن بنزدیک او رفت. مرد گفت: آهن در پیغوله خانه بنهاده بودم و دران احتیاطی نکرده ، تا من واقف شدم موش آن را تمام خورده بود.

بازرگان گفت: آری ، موش آهن را نیک دوست دارد و دندان او برخائیدن آن قادر باشد. امین راست کار شاد گشت یعنی بازرگان نرم شد و دل ازآن برداشت.

گفت: امروز مهمان من باش. گفت: فردا باز آیم. بیرون رفت و پسری را ازان او ببرد. چون بطلبیدند و ندا در شهر افتاد. بازرگان گفت: من بازی را دیدم کودکی را می برد. امین فریاد برآورد که: محال چرا می گویی؟ باز کودک را چگونه برگیرد؟ بازرگان بخندید و گفت: دل تنگ چرا می کنی؟ در شهری که موش آن صد من آهن بتواند خورد آخر باز کودکی را هم برتواند داشت. امین دانست که حال چیست، گفت:آهن موش نخورد، من دارم، پسر بازده و آهن بستان...

English Version

The Mice that ate the Iron

In a certain town lived a merchant named Naduk, who lost his money and determined to travel abroad. For

> The meanest of mankind is he
>
> Who, having lost his money, can
>
> Inhabit lands or towns where once
>
> He spent it like a gentleman.

And again:

> The neighbor gossips blame
>
> His poverty as shame
>
> Who long was wont to play
>
> I Among them, proud and gay.

In his house was an iron balance-beam inherited from his ancestors, and it weighed a thousand pals. This he put in pawn with Merchant Lakshman before he departed for foreign countries.

Now after he had long traveled wherever business led him through foreign lands, he returned to his native city and said to Merchant Lakshman: "Friend Lakshman, return my deposit, the balance-beam." And Lakshman said: "Friend Naduk, your balance beam has been eaten by mice."

To this Naduk replied: "Lakshman, you are in no way to blame, if it has been eaten by mice. Such is life. Nothing in the universe has any permanence. However, I am going to the river for a bath. Please send your boy Money-God with me, to carry my bathing things."

Since Lakshman was conscience-stricken at his own theft, he said to his son Money-God: "My dear boy, let me introduce Uncle Naduk, who is going to the river to bathe. You must go with him and carry his bathing things." Ah, there is too much truth in the saying:

> There is no purely loving deed
>
> Without a pinch of fear or greed
>
> Or service of a selfish need.

And again:

> Wherever there is fond attention
>
> That does not seek a service pension,
>
> Was there no timid apprehension?

So Lakshman's son took the bathing things and delightedly accompanied Naduk to the river. After Naduk had taken his bath, he thrust Lakshman's son Money-God into a mountain cave, blocked the entrance with a great rock, and returned to Lakshman's house. And when Lakshman said: "Friend Naduk, tell me what has become of my son Money-God who went with you," Naduk answered: "My good Lakshman, a hawk carried him off from the river-bank."

"Oh, Naduk!" cried Lakshman. "You liar! How could a hawk possibly carry off a big boy like Money-God?" "But, Lakshman," retorted Naduk, "the mice could eat a balance-beam made of iron. Give me my balance-beam, if you want your son."

Finally, they carried their dispute to the palace gate, where Lakshman cried in a piercing tone: "Help! Help! A ghastly deed! This Naduk person has carried off my son his name is Money-God."

Thereupon the magistrates said to Naduk: "Sir, restore the boy to Lakshman." But Naduk pleaded: "What am I to do? Before my eyes a hawk carried him from the river-bank." "Come, Naduk!" said they, "you are not telling the truth. How can a hawk carry off a fifteen-year-old boy?" Then Naduk laughed outright and said: "Gentlemen, listen to my words.

> Where mice eat balance-beams of iron

A thousand pals in weight,

A hawk might steal an elephant;

A boy is trifling freight."

"How was that?" they asked, and Naduk told them the story of the balance-beam. At this they laughed and caused the restoration of balance-beam and boy to the respective owners.

"And that is why I say: Where mice eat balance-beams of iron…

Story 3.

Persian Version

آورده اند که ماهیخواری بر لب آبی وطن ساخته بود، و بقدر حاجت ماهی می گرفتی و روزگاری در خصب و نعمت می گذاشت. چون ضعف پیری بدو راه یافت از شکار باز ماند با خود گفت: دریغا عمر که عناد گشاده رفت و از وی جز تجربت و ممارست عوضی بدست نیامد که در وقت پیری پای مردی یا دست گیری تواند بود. امروز بنای کار خود، چون از قوت بازمانده ام، بر حیلت باید نهاد واسباب قوت که قوام معیشت است از این وجه باید ساخت. پس چون اندوهناکی بر کنار آب بنشست پنج پایک از دور او را بدید، پیشتر آمد و گفت: تو را غمناک می بینم گفت: چگونه غمناک نباشم، که مادت معیشت من آن بود که هر روز یگان دوگان ماهی می گرفتمی و بدان روزگار کرانه می کرد، و مرا بدان سد رمقی حاصل می بود و در ماهی نقصان بیشتر نمی افتاد؟ و امروز دو صیاد از اینجا می گذشتند و با یک دیگر می گفت که "در این آب گیر ماهی بسیار است، تدبیر ایشان بباید کرد" یکی از ایشان گفت:" فلان جای بیشتر است چون ازیشان بپردازیم روی بدین ها آریم". و اگر حال بر این باشد مرا دل از جان برباید داشت و بر رنج گرسنگی بل تلخی مرگ دل بنهاد.

پنج پایک برفت و ماهیان را خبر کرد و جمله نزدیک او آمدند و او را گفتند: المستشار موتمن، و ما با تو مشورت می کنیم و خردمند درمشورت اگر از دشمن چیزی پرسد شرط نصیحت فرو نگذارد خاصه در کاری که نفع آن بدو بازگردد و بقای ذات تو بدوام تناسل ما متعلق است. در کار ما چه صواب بینی؟

ماهی خوار گفت: با صیاد مقاومت صورت نبندد، و من دران اشارتی نتوانم کرد. لکن در این نزدیکی آب گیری می دانم که آبش بصفا پرده درتر از گریه عاشق است و غمازتر از صبح صادق، دانه ریگ در قعر آن بتوان شمرد و بیضه ماهی از فراز آن بتوان دید. اگر بدان تحویل توانید کرد در امن و راحت و خصب و فراغت افتید.

گفتند: نیکو راییست. لکن نقل بی معونت ومظاهرت تو ممکن نیست.

گفت: دریغ ندارم مدت گیرد و ساعت تا ساعت صیادان بیایند و فرصت فایت شود. بسیار تضرع نمودند منتها تحمل کردند تا بران قرارداد تا هر روز چند ماهی ببردی و بر بالایی که در آن حوالی بود بخوردی و دیگران در آن تحویل تعجیل و مسارعت می نمودند و با یک دیگر پیش دستی و مسابقت می کردند، و خود بچشم عبرت در سهو و غفلت ایشان می نگریست وبزبان عظت می گفت که: هر که به لاوه دشمن فریفته شود و بر لئیم ظفر و بدگوهر اعتماد روا دارد سزای او اینس چون روزها برآن گذشت پنج پایک هم خواست که تحویل کند. ماهی خوار او را برپشت گرفت و روی بدان بالا نهاد که خوابگاه ماهیان بود. چون پنج پایک از دور استخوان ماهی دید بسیار، دانست که حال چیست. اندیشید که خردمند چون دشمن را در مقام خطر بدید و قصد او در جان خود مشاهدت کرد اگر کوشش فروگذارد در خون خویش سعی کرده باشد؛ و چون بکوشید اگر پیروز آید نام گیرد، و اگر بخلاف آن کاری اتفاق افتد باری کرم وحمیت و مردانگی و شهامت او مطعون نگردد، و با سعادت شهادت او را ثواب مجاهدت فراهم آید. پس خویشتن برگردن ماهی خوار افگند و حلق او محکم بفشرد چنانکه بیهوش از هوا درآمد و یکسر به زیارت مالک رفت. پنج پایک سرخویش گرفت و پای در راه نهاد تا به نزدیک بقیت ماهیان آمد، و تعزیت یاران گذشته و تهنیت حیات ایشان بگفت و از صورت حال اعلام داد. همگنان شاد گشتند و وفات ماهی خوار را عمر تازه شمردند.

<div align="center">

مرا شربتی از پس بد سگال   بودخوشتر از عمر هفتاد سال

</div>

THE HERON THAT LIKED CRAB-MEAT

There was once a heron in a certain place on the edge of a pond. Being old, he sought an easy way of catching fish on which to live. He began by lingering at the edge of his pond, pretending to be quite irresolute, not eating even the fish within his reach.

Now among the fish lived a crab. He drew near and said: "Uncle, why do you neglect today your usual meals and amusements?" And the heron replied: "So long as I kept fat a flourishing by eating fish, I spent my time pleasantly, enjoying the taste of you. But a great disaster will soon befall you. And as I am old, this will cut short the pleasant course of my life. For this reason, I feel depressed."

"Uncle," said the crab, "of what nature is the disaster?" And the heron continued: "today I overheard the talk of a number of fishermen as they passed near the pond'. This is a big pond,' they were saying, 'full of fish. We will try a cast of the net tomorrow or the day after. But today we will go to the lake near the city/ this being so, you are lost, my food supply is cut off, I too am lost, and in grief at the thought, I am indifferent to food today."

Now when the water-dwellers heard the trickster's report, they all feared for their lives and implored the heron, saying: "Uncle! Father! Brother! Friend! Thinker! Since you are informed of the calamity you also know the remedy. Pray save us from the jaws of this death."

Then the heron said: "I am a bird, not competent to contend with men. This, however, I can do. I can transfer you from this pond to another, a bottomless one." By this artful speech, they were so led astray that they said: "Uncle! Friend! Unselfish kinsman! Take me first! Me first! Did you never hear this?

<center>

Stout hearts delight to pay the price

Of merciful self-sacrifice,

Count life as nothing, if it ends

In gentle service to a friend

</center>

Then the old rascal laughed in his heart and took counsel with his mind, thus: "My shrewdness has brought these fish into my power. They ought to be eaten very comfortably." Having thus thought it through, he promised what the thronging fish implored, lifted some in his bill, carried them a certain distance to a slab of stone, and ate them there. Day after day he made the trip with supreme delight and satisfaction, and meeting the fish, kept their confidence by ever new inventions.

One day the crab, disturbed by the fear of death, importuned him with the words: "Uncle, pray save me, too, from the jaws of death." And the heron reflected: "I am quite tired of this unvarying fish diet. I should like to taste him. He is different, and choice." So he picked up the crab and flew through the air.

But since he avoided all bodies of water and seemed planning to alight on the sun-scorched rock, the crab asked him: "Uncle, where is that pond without any bottom?"

And the heron laughed and said: "Do you see that broad, sun-scorched rock? All the water-dwellers have found repose there. Your turn has now come to find repose."

Then the crab looked down and saw a great rock of sacrifice, made horrible by heaps of fish-skeletons.

> And he thought: "Ah me!
>
> Friends are foes and foes are friends
>
> As they mar or serve your ends;
>
> Few discern where profit tends

Again:

> If you will, with serpents play;
>
> Dwell with foemen who betray:
>
> Shun your false and foolish friends,
>
> Fickle, seeking vicious ends

Why, he has already eaten these fish whose skeletons are scattered in heaps. So what might be an opportune course of action for me? Yet why do I need to consider?

> Man is bidden to chastise
>
> Even elders who devise
>
> Devious courses, arrogant,
>
> Of their duty ignorant

Again:

> Fear fearful things, while yet
>
> No fearful thing appears;
>
> When danger must be met,
>
> Strike, and forget your fears.

So, before he drops me there, I will catch his neck with all four claws."

When he did so, the heron tried to escape, but being a fool, he found no parry to the grip of the crab's nippers and had his head cut off.

Then the crab painfully made his way back to the pond, dragging the heron's neck as if it had been a lotus-stalk. And when he came to the fish, they said: "Brother, why come back?" Thereupon he showed the head as his credentials and said: "He enticed the water-dwellers from every quarter, deceived them with his prevarications, dropped them on a slab of rock not far away, and ate them. But I further life being predestined

perceived that he destroyed the trustful, and I have brought back his neck. Forget your worries. All the water-dwellers shall live in peace."

Story 4.

Persian Version

... آورده اند که غوکی در جوار ماری وطن داشت، هرگاه که بچه کردی مار بخوردی، و او بر پنج پایکی دوستی داشت. بنزدیک او رفت و گفت: ای بذاذر، کار مرا تدبیر کن که مرا خصم قوی و دشمن مستولی پیدا آمده ست، نه با او مقاومت می توانم کردن و نه از اینجا تحویل، که موضع خوش و بقعت نزه است، صحن آن مرصع بزمرد و

میناو مکدل ببسد و کهربا

آب روی آب زمزم و کوثر

خاک وی خاک عنبر و کافور

شکل وی ناپسوده دست صبا

شبه وی ناسپرده پای دبور

پنج پایک گفت: با دشمن غالب توانا جزبمکردست نتوان یافت، و فلان جای یکی راسوست؛ یکی ماهی چند بگیرو بکش و پیش سوراخ راسو تا جایگاه مار می افگن ، تا راسو یگان یگان می خورد ، چون بمار رسید ترا از جور او باز رهاند. غوک بدین حیلت مار را هلاک کرد. روزی چند بران گذشت. راسو را عادت باز خواست، که خوکردگی بتر از عاشقی است. بار دیگر هم بطلب ماهی بر آن سمت می رفت، ماهی نیافت، غوک را با بچگان جمله بخورد.

English version

A Remedy worth than the Disease

A flock of herons once had their nests on a fig tree in a part of a forest. In a hole in the tree lived a black snake who made a practice of eating the heron chicks before their wings sprouted.

At last one heron, in utter woe at seeing the young ones eaten by a snake, went to the shore of the pond, shed a flood of tears, and stood with downcast face. And a crab who noticed him in this attitude, said: "Uncle, why are you so tearful today?" "My good friend," said the heron, "what am I to do? Fate is against me. My babies and the youngsters belonging to my relatives have been eaten by a snake that lives in a hole in the fig tree. Grieved at their grief, I weep. Tell me, is there any possible device for killing him?"

On hearing this, the crab reflected: "After all, he is a natural-born enemy of my race. I will give him such advice a kind of true lie that other herons may also perish. For the proverb says:

Let your speech like butter be;

Steel your heart remorselessly:

Stir an enemy to action

275

That destroys him with his faction."

And he said aloud: "Uncle, conditions being as they are, scatter bits of fish all the way from the mongoose burrow to the snake's hole. The mongoose will follow that trail and will destroy the villainous snake."

When this had been done, the mongoose followed the bits of fish, killed the villainous snake, and also ate at his leisure all the herons who made their home in the tree.

Story 5.

Persian Version

آورده اند که در مرغزاری که نسیم آن بوی بهشت را معطر کرده بود و برعکس آن روی فلک را منور...
گردانیده، از هر شاخی هزار ستاره تابان و در هر ستاره هزار سپهر حیران

سحاب گویی یاقوت ریخت برمینا

نسیم گویی شنگرف بیخت برزنگار

بخار چشم هوا و بخور روی زمین

ز چشم دایه باغ است و روی بچه خار

وحوش بسیار بود که همه بسبب چراخور و آب در خصب و راحت بودند ، لکن بمجاورت شیر آن همه منغص بودئ روزی فراهم آمدند و جمله نزدیک شیر رفتند و گفتند: تو هر روز پس از رنج بسیار و مشقت فراوان از ما یکی شکار می توانی شکست و ما پیوسته در بلا و تو در تگاپوی و طلب. اکنون چیزی اندیشیده ایم که ترا دران فراغت و ما را امن و راحت باشد. اگر تعرض خویش از ما زایل کنی هر روز موظف یکی شکاری پیش ملک فرستیم. شیر بدان رضا داد و مدتی بران برآمد. یک روز قرعه بر خرگوش آمد. یاران را گفت: اگر در فرستادن من توقفی کنید من شما را از جور این جبار خون خوار باز رهانم.

گفتند: مضایقتی نیست. او ساعتی توقف کرد و اوقات چاشت شیر بگذشت، پس آهسته نرم نرم روی بسوی شیر نهاد. شیر را دل تنگ یافت آتش گرسنگی او را بر باد تند نشانده بود و فروغ خشم در حرکات و سکنات وی پدید آمده، چنانکه آب دهان او خشک ایستاده بود و نقض عهد را در خاک می جست.

خرگوش را بدید، آواز داد که: از کجا می آیی و حال وحوش چیست؟ گفت: در صحبت من خرگوشی فرستاده بودند، در راه شیری از من بستد، من گفتم: « این چاشت ملک است » و این التفات ننمود و جفاها راند و گفت: "شکارگاه و صید آن بمن اولی تر، که قوت شوکت من زیادت است" من شتافتم تا ملک را خبر کنم. شیر برخاست و گفت: او را بمن نمای. خرگوش پیش ایستاد و او را بسر چاهی بزرگ برد که صفای آن چون آینه ای شک و یقین صورتها بنمودی و اوصاف چهره هر یک بر شمردی و گفت: در این چاهست و من از وی می ترسم، اگر ملک مرا در برگیرد، او را نمایم .شیر او را در برگرفت و بچاه فرونگریست، خیال خود و ازان خرگوش بدید، او را بگذاشت و خود را در چاه افگند و غوطی خورد و نفس خون خوار و جان مردار بمالک سپرد.

خرگوش بسلامت باز رفت. وحوش از صورت حال و کیفیت کار شیر پرسیدند، گفت: او را غوطی دادم که چون گنج قارون خاک خورد شد. همه بر مرکب شادمانگی سوار گشتند و در مرغزار امن و راحت جولانی نمودند، و این بیت را ورد ساختند.

English Version

Numskull and Rabbit

In a part of a forest was a lion drunk with pride, and his name was Numskull. He slaughtered the animals without ceasing. If he saw an animal, he could not spare him.

So all the natives of the forest deer, boars, buffaloes, wild oxen, rabbits, and others came together, and with woe-begone countenances, bowed heads, and knees clinging to the ground, they undertook to beseech obsequiously the king of beasts: "Have done, O King, with this merciless, meaningless slaughter of all creatures. It is hostile to happiness in the other world. For the Scripture says:

> A thousand future lives
>
> Will pass in wretchedness
>
> For sins a fool commits
>
> His present life to bless

Again:

> What wisdom in a deed
>
> That brings dishonor fell,
>
> That causes loss of trust,
>
> That paves the way to hell?

And yet again:

> The ungrateful body, frail
>
> And rank with filth within,
>
> Is such that only fools
>
> For its sake sink in sin

"Consider these facts, and cease, we pray, to slaughter our generations. For if the master will remain at home we will of our own motion send him each day for his daily food one animal of the forest. In this way neither the royal sustenance nor our families will be cut short. In this way let the king's duty be performed. For the proverb says:

> The king who tastes his kingdom like
>
> Elixir, bit by bit,
>
> Who does not overtax its life,
>
> Will fully relish it

The king who madly butchers men,
Their lives as little reckoned
As lives of goats, has one square meal,
But never has a second.

A king desiring profit, guards
His world from evil chance;
With gifts and honors waters it
As florists water plants.

Guard subjects like a cow, nor ask
For milk each passing hour:
A vine must first be sprinkled, then
It ripens fruit and flower

The monarch-lamp from subjects draws
Tax-oil to keep it bright:
Has any ever noticed kings
That shone by inner light?

A seedling is a tender thing,
And yet, if not neglected,
It comes in time to bearing fruit:
So subjects well protected

Their subjects form the only source
From which accrue to kings
Their gold, grain, gems, and varied drinks,
And many other things

The kings who serve the common weal,
Luxuriantly sprout;

<div align="center">The common loss is kingly loss,</div>

<div align="center">Without a shade of doubt."</div>

After listening to this address, Numskull said: "Well, gentlemen, you are quite convincing. But if an animal does not come to me every day as I sit here, I promise you I will eat you all." To this they assented with much relief, and fearlessly roamed the wood. Each day at noon one of them appeared as his dinner, each species taking its turn and providing an individual grown old, or religious, or grief-smitten, or fearful of the loss of son or wife.

One day a rabbit's turn came, it being rabbit-day. And when all the thronging animals had given him directions, he reflected: "How is it possible to kill this lion curse him! Yet after all,

<div align="center">In what can wisdom not prevail?</div>

<div align="center">In what can resolution fail?</div>

<div align="center">What cannot flattery subdue?</div>

<div align="center">What cannot enterprise put through?</div>

<div align="center">I can kill even a lion"</div>

So he went very slowly, planning to arrive tardily, and meditating with troubled spirit on a means of killing him. Late in the day, he came into the presence of the lion, whose throat was pinched by hunger in consequence of the delay, and who angrily thought as he licked his chops: "Aha! I must kill all the animals the first thing in the morning."

While he was thinking, the rabbit slowly drew near, bowed low, and stood before him. But when the lion saw that he was tardy and too small at that for a meal, his soul flamed with wrath, and he taunted the rabbit, saying: "You reprobate! First, you are too small for a meal. Second, you are tardy. Because of this wickedness, I am going to kill you, and tomorrow morning I shall extirpate every species of animal."

Then the rabbit bowed low and said with deference: "Master, the wickedness is not mine, nor the other animals*. Pray hear the cause of it." And the lion answered: "Well, tell it quickly before you are between my fangs."

"Master," said the rabbit, "all the animals recognized today that the rabbits' turn had come, and because I was quite small, they dispatched me with five other rabbits. But in mid-journey there issued from a great hole in the ground a lion who said: 'Where are you bound? Pray to your favorite god/Then I said: 'We are traveling as the dinner of lion Numskull, our master, according to agreement/ 'Is that so?' said he. 'This forest belongs to me. So all the animals, without exception, must deal with me according to an agreement. This Numskull is a sneak thief. Call him out and bring him here at once. Then whichever of us proves stronger, shall be king and shall eat all these animals/ At his command, master, I have come to you. This is the cause of my tardiness. For the rest, my master is the sole judge."

<div align="center">279</div>

After listening to this, Numskull said: "Well, well, my good fellow, show me that sneak thief of a lion, and be quick about it. I cannot find peace of mind until I have vented on him my anger against the animals. He should have remembered the saying:

Land and friends and gold at most

Have been won when battles cease;

If but one of these should fail,

Do not think of breaking peace.

Where no great reward is won,

Where defeat is nearly sure,

Never stir a quarrel, but

Find it wiser to endure."

"Quite so, master," said the rabbit. "Warriors

fight for their country when they are insulted. But

this fellow skulks in a fortress. You know he came

out of a fortress when he held us up. And an enemy

in a fortress is hard to handle. As the saying goes:

A single royal fortress adds

More military force

Than do a thousand elephants,

A hundred thousand horse.

A single archer from a wall

A hundred foes forfends;

And so the military art

A fortress recommends.

God Indra used the wit and skill

Of gods in days of old,

When Devil Gold-mat plagued the world,

To build a fortress-hold. And he decreed that any king

Who built a fortress sound,

Should conquer foemen. This is why

Such fortresses abound."

When he heard this, Numskull said: "My good fellow, show me that thief. Even if he is hiding in a fortress, I will kill him. For the proverb says:

The strongest man who fails to crush

At birth, disease or foe,

Will later be destroyed by that

Which he permits to grow.

And again:

The man who reckons well his power,

Nor pride nor vigor lacks,

May single-handed smite his foes

Like Rama-with-the-axe."

"Very true," said the rabbit. "But after all it was a mighty lion that I saw. So the master should not set out without realizing the enemy's capacity. As the saying runs:

A warrior failing to compare

Two hosts, in mad desire

For battle, plunges like a moth

Headforemost into fire.

And again:

The weak who challenge mighty foes

A battle to abide,

Like elephants with broken tusks,

Return with drooping pride."

But Numskull said: "What business is it of yours? Show him to me, even in his fortress." "Very well," said the rabbit. "Follow me, master." And he led the way to a well, where he said to the lion: "Master, who can endure your majesty? The moment he saw you, that thief crawled clear into his hole. Come, I will show him to you." "Be quick about it, my good fellow," said Numskull.

So the rabbit showed him the well. And the lion, being a dreadful fool, saw his own reflection in the water, and gave voice to a great roar. Then from the well issued a roar twice as loud, because of the echo. This the lion heard, decided that his rival was very powerful, hurled himself down, and met his death. Thereupon the rabbit cheerfully carried the glad news to all the animals, received their compliments, and lived there contentedly in the forest.

"And that is why I say: Intelligence is power………

Story 6.

Persian Version

...آورده اند که نواعی است از مرغان آب که آن را طیطوی خوانند ، و یک جفت ازان در ساحلی بودندی.چون وقت بیضه فراز آمد ماده گفت :در این سخن جای تامل است ، اگر دریا در موج آید و بچگان را درر باید آن را چه حیلت توان کرد ؟ نر گفت:گمان نبرم که وکیل دریا این دلیری کند و جانب مرا فروگذارد ، واگر بی حرمتی اندیشد انصاف از وی بتوان ستد.

ماده گفت:خویشتن شناسی نیکو باشد.بچه قوت و عدت وکیل دریا را بانتقام خود تهدید می کنی ؟ از این استبداد درگذر، و برای بیضه جای حصین گزین ، چه هرکه سخن ناصحان نشنود بدو آن رسد که بباخه رسید.

طیطوی نر گفت:شنودم این مثل ، ولکن مترس و جای نگاه دار.ماده بیضه بنهاد.وکیل دریا این مفاوضت بشنود ، از بزرگ منشی و رعنایی طیطوی در خشم شد و دریا در موج آمد و بچگان ایشان را ببرد. ماده چون آن بدید اضطراب کرد و گفت:من میدانستم که با آب بازی نیست ، و تو بنادانی بچگانن باد دادی و آتش بر من بباریدی ، ای خاکسار باری تدبیری اندیش.

طیطوی نر جواب داد که: سخن بجهت گوی ، و من از عهده قول خویش بیرون می آیم و انصاف خود از وکیل دریا می ستانم. در حال بنزدیک دیگر مرغان رفت و مقدمان هر صنف را فراهم آورد و حال باز گفت ، و در اثنای آن یاد کرد که:اگر همگنان دست در دست ندهید و در تدارک این کار پشت در پشت نه ایستد وکیل دریا را جرات افزاید ، و هرگاه که این رسم مستمر گَشت همگنان در سر این غفلت شوید . مرغان جمله بنزدیک سیمرغ رفتند ، و صورت واقعه با او بگفتند و آینه فرا روی او داشتند که اگر در این انتقام جد ننماید بیش شاه مرغان نتواند بود. سیمرغ اهتزاز نمود و قدم بنشاط در کار نهاد.مرغان بمعونت و مظاهرت او قوی دل گشتند و عزیمت بر کین توختن مصمم گردانیدند.وکیل دریا قوت سیمرغ و دیگر مرغان شناخته بود بضرورت بچگان طیطوی باز داد.

English Version

The Plover who fought the Ocean

A plover and his wife once lived by the shore of the sea, the mighty sea that swarms with fish, crocodiles, turtles, sharks, porpoises, pearl oysters, shellfish, and other teeming life. The plover was called Sprawl, and his wife's name was Constance.

In due time she became pregnant and was ready to lay her eggs. So she said to her husband: "Please find a spot where I may lay my eggs." "Why," said he, "this home of ours, inherited from our ancestors, promises progress. Lay your eggs here." "Oh," said she, "don't mention this dreadful place. Here is the ocean near at hand. His tide might someday make a long reach and lick away my babies."

But the plover answered: "Sweetheart, he knows me, he knows Sprawl. Surely the great ocean cannot show such enmity to me. Did you never hear this?

What man is rash enough to take?
<div align="center">

The gleaming crest-jewel from a snake?

Or stirs the wrath of one so dread

His glance may strike his victim dead?

However summer heat distresses

</div>

> In wild and treeless wildernesses,
> Who, after all, would seek the shade
> By some rogue elephant's body made?

And again:

> When morning's chilly breezes blow
> With whirling particles of snow,
> What man with sense of value sure,
> Employs for cold the water cure?
> To visit Death what man desires,
> So wakes the lion's sleeping fires,
> Who, tired from slaying elephants,
> Lies in a temporary trance?
> Who dares to visit and defy
> The death-god? Dares the fearless cry
> I challenge you to single strife;
> If power be yours, pray take my life?
> What son of man, with simple wit,
> Defies the fire, and enters it
> The smokeless flame that terrifies,
> Whose tongues by hundreds lick the skies?"

But even as he spoke, his wife laughed outright, since she knew the full measure of his capacity, and she said: "Very fine, indeed. There is plenty more where that came from. O king of birds,

> Your heavy boastings startle, shock,
> And make of you a laughingstock:
> One marvels if the rabbit plants
> A dung-pile like the elephant's.

How can you fail to appreciate your own strength and weakness? There is a saying:

> To know one's self is hard, to know
> Wise effort, effort vain;
> But accurate self-critics are
> Secure in times of strain.
> This much of effort brings success;
> I have the power; I can:
> So think, then act, and reap the fruit
> Of your judicious plan.
> And there is sound sense in this:
> To take advice from kindly friends
> Be ever satisfied:
> The stupid turtle lost his grip
>
> Upon the stick, and died.

Story 7.

Persian Version

...آورده اند که در آبگیری از راه دور و از تعرض گذریان مصون سه ماهی بود ، و دو حازم و یکی عاجز.از قضا روزی دو صیاد بران گذشتند با یک دیگر میعاد: نهادند که جال بیارند و هر سه ماهی بگیرند.ماهیان این سخن بشنودند . آنکه حزم زیادت داشت و بارها دستبرد زمانه جافی دیده بود و شوخ چشمی سپهر غدار معاینه کرده و بر بساط خرد و تجربت ثابت قدم شده ، سبک ، روی بکار آورد و از آن جانب که آب درآمدی برفور بیرون رفت . در این میان صیادان برسیدند و هر دو جحانب آب گیر محکم ببستند.

دیگری هم غوری داست ، نه از پیرایه خرد عاطل بود ونه از ذخیرت تجربت بی بهر. هرچند تدبیر در هنگام بلافایده بیشتر ندهد ، و از ثمرات رای در وقت آفت تمتع زیادت نتوان یافت . و با این همه عاقل از منافع دانش هرگز نومید نگردد و در دفع مکاید دشمن تاخیر صواب نبیند . وقت ثبات مردان و روز مکر خردمندانست. پس خویشتن مرده ساخت و بر روی آب ستان می رفت. صیاد او را برداشت و چون صورت شد که مرده است بینداخت. بحیلت خویشتن در جوی انداخت و جان بسلامت ببرد.

و آنکه غفلت بر احوال وی غالب و عجز در افعال وی ظاهر بود حیران و سرگردان و مدهوش و پای کشان ، چپ و راست می رفت و در فراز و نشیب می دوید تا گرفتار شد ...

English Version

FORETHOUGHT, READYWIT, AND FATALIST

In a great lake lived three full-grown fish, whose names were Forethought, Readywit, and Fatalist. Now one day the fish named Forethought overheard passers-by on the bank and fishermen saying: "There are plenty of fish in this pond. Tomorrow we go fishing."

On hearing this, Forethought reflected: "This looks bad. Tomorrow or the day after they will be sure to come here. I will take Readywit and Fatalist and move to another lake whose waters are not troubled. So he called them and put the question.

Thereupon Readywit said: "I have lived long in this lake and cannot move in such a hurry. If fishermen come here, then I will protect myself by some means devised for the occasion."

But poor, doomed Fatalist said: "There are sizable lakes elsewhere. Who knows whether they will come here or not? One should not abandon the lake of his birth merely because of such small gossip. And the proverb says:

> Since scamp and sneak and snake
>
> So often undertake
>
> A plan that does not thrive,
>
> The world wags on, alive.

Therefore I am determined not to go." And when Forethought realized that their minds were made up, he went to another body of water.

On the next day, when he had gone, the fishermen with their boys beset the inner pool, cast a net, and caught all the fish without exception. Under these circumstances Readywit, while still in the water, played dead. And since they thought: "This big fellow died without help," they drew him from the net and laid him on the bank, from which he wriggled back to safety in the water. But Fatalist stuck his nose into the meshes of the net, struggling until they pounded him repeatedly with clubs and so killed him.

"And that is why I say:

Forethought and Readywit thrive;

Fatalist can't keep alive."

"My dear," said the plover, "why do you think me like Fatalist?

Horses, elephants, and iron,

Water, woman, man,

Sticks and stones and clothes are built

On a different plan.

Feel no anxiety. Who can bring humiliation upon you while my arms protect you?"

So Constance laid her eggs, but the ocean, who had listened to the previous conversation, thought: "Well, well! There is sense in the saying:

Of self-conceit, all creatures show

An adequate supply:

The plover lies with claws upstretched

To prop the falling sky.

I will just put his power to the test."

So the next day, when the two plovers had gone foraging, he made a long reach with his wave-hands and eagerly seized the eggs. Then when the hen-plover returned and found the nursery empty, she said to her husband: "See what has happened to poor me. The ocean seized my eggs today. I told you more than once that we should move, but you were stupid as Fatalist and would not go. Now I am so sad at the loss of my children that I have decided to burn myself."

"My dear," said the plover, "wait until you witness my power, until I dry up that rascally ocean with my bill." But she replied: "My dear husband, how can you fight the ocean? Furthermore,

Gay simpletons who fight,

Not estimating right

<p style="text-align:center">The foe's power and their own,</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Like moths in flame atone."</p>

"My dear," said the plover, "you should not say such things.

<p style="text-align:center">The sun's new-risen beams</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Upon the mountains fall:</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Where glory is cognate,</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Age matters not at all.</p>

With this bill I shall dry up the water to the last drop, and turn the sea into dry land." "Darling," said his wife, "with a bill that holds one drop how will you dry up the ocean, into which pour without ceasing the Ganges and the Indus, bearing the water of nine times nine hundred tributary streams? Why talk nonsense?" But the plover said:

<p style="text-align:center">Success is rooted in the will;</p>

<p style="text-align:center">And I possess an iron-strong bill;</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Long days and nights before me lie:</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Why should not ocean's flood go dry?</p>

<p style="text-align:center">The highest glory to attain</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Asks enterprise and manly strain:</p>

<p style="text-align:center">The sun must first to Libra climb</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Before he routs the cloudy time.</p>

"Well/* said his wife, "if you feel that you must make war on the ocean, at least call other birds to your aid before you begin. For the proverb says:

<p style="text-align:center">A host where each is weak</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Brings victory to pass:</p>

<p style="text-align:center">The elephant is bound</p>

<p style="text-align:center">By woven ropes of grass.</p>

And again:

<p style="text-align:center">Woodpecker and sparrow</p>

<p style="text-align:center">With froggy and gnat,</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Attacking en masse, laid</p>

<p style="text-align:center">The elephant flat.</p>

Story 8.
Persian Version

از گزاف نگفته اند: "جزاء مقبل الاست الضراط" و زاهد این حال را مشاهدت می کرد. چندانکه صبح صادق عرصه گیتی را بجمال خویش منور گردانید زاهد خود را ظلمت فسق و فساد آن جماعت باز رهانید و منزلی دیگر طلبید . کفشگری بدو تبرک نمود و او را بخانه خویش مهمان کرد ، و قوم را در معنی نیک داشت او وصایت کرد و خود بضیافت بعضی از دوستان رفت. و قوم او دوستی داشت ، و سفیر میان ایشان زن حجامی بود . زن حجام را بدو پیغام دادکه شوی او مهمان رفت ، تو برخیز و بیا چنانکه من دانم و تو .

مرد شبانگاه حاضر شده بود . کفشگر مست باز رسید ، او را بر در خانه دید و پیش ازان بدگمانی داشته بود ف بخشم در خانه آمد و زن را نیک بزد و محکم بر ستون بست وبخفت . چندانکه خلق بیارامید زن حجام بیامد و گفت: مرد را چندین منتظر چرا می داری ؟ اگر بیرون خواهی رفت زودتر باش و اگر نه خبر کن تا باز گردد. گفت: ای خواهر اگر شفقتی خواهی کرد زودتر مرا بگشای و دستوری ده تا ترا بدل خویش ببندم و دوست خویش ر ا عذری خواهم و در حال بازآیم ، موقع منت اندران هرچه مشکورتر باشد. زن حجام بگشادن او و بستن خود تن در داد و او را بیرون فرستاد .در این میان کفشگر بیدار شد و زن را بانگ کرد زن حجام از بیم جواب نداد که او را بشناسد ، بکرات خواند هیچ نیارست گفتن.خشم کفشگر زیادت گشت و نشگرده برداشت پیش ستون آمد . و بینی زن حجام ببرید و در دست او داد که : بنزدیک معشوق تحفه فرست چون زن کفشگر باز رسید خواهر خوانده را بینی بریده یافت ، تنگ دل شد و عذرها خواست و او را بگشاد و خود را بر ستون بست ، و او بینی در دست بخانه رفت . و این همه را زاهد می دید و می شنود . زن کفشگر ساعتی بیارامید و دست بدعا برداشت و در مناجات آمد و گفت : ای خداوند ، اگر می دانی که شوی با من ظلم کرده است وتهمت نهاده ست تو بفضل خویش ببخشای و بینی بمن باز ده.کفشگر گفت: ای نابکار جادو این چه سخن است ؟ جواب داد گفت : برخیز ای ظالم و بنگر تا عدل و رحمت آفریدگار عز اسمه بینی در مقابله جور و تهور خویش که چون براءت ساحت من ظاهر بود ایزد تعالی بینی بمن باز داد و مرا میان خلق مثله و رسوا نگذاشت . مرد برخاست و چراغ بیفروخت زن را بسلامت دطد و بینی برقرار . در حال باعتذار مشغول گشت و بگناه اعتراف نمود و از قوم بلطف هرچه تمامتر بحلی خواست و توبه کرد که بی وضوح بنیتی و ظهور حجتی بر امثال این کار اقدام ننماید و بگفتار نمام دیو مردم و چربک شریر فتنه انگیز زن پارسا و عیال نهفته را نیازارد ، و بخلاف رضای این مستوره که دعای او را البته حجابی نیست کاری نپیوندد و زن حجام بینی در دست بخانه آمد ، در کار خویش حیران و وجه حیلت مشتبه ، که بنزدیک شوهر و همسرایگان این معنی را چه عذر گوید ، و اگر سوال کنند چه جواب دهد . در این میان حجام از خواب درآمد و آواز داد ودست افزار خواست و بخانه محتشمی خواست رفت . زن دیری توقف کرد و ستره تنها بدو داد . حجام در تاریکی شب از خشم بینداخت . زن خویشتن از پای درافکند و فریاد برآورد که بینی بینی حجام متحیر گشت و همسرایگان درآمدند و او را ملامت کردند.

چون صبح جهان افروز مشاطه وار کله ظلمانی را از پیش برداشت و جمال روز روشن را بر اهل عالم جلوه رد اقربای زن جمله شدند و حجام را پیش قاضی بردند و قاضی پرسید که: بی گناه ظاهر و جرم معلوم مثله کردن این عورت چرا روا داشتی؟ حجام متحیر گشت و در تقریر حجت عاجز شد . قاضی بقصاص و عقوبت او حکم کرد زاهد برخاست گفت : قاضی را در این باب تامل واجب است ، که دزد جامه من نبرد و روباه را نخجیران نکشتند ، وزن بدکار را ز هر هلاک نکرد ، و حجام بینی قوم نبرید ، بلکه ما این همه بلاها بنفس خویش کشیدیم . قاضی دست از حجام بداشت و روی ب زاهد آورد تا بیان آن نکت بشنود . زاهد گفت : اگر مرا آرزوی مرید بسیار و تبع انبوه نبودی و بترهات دزد فریفته نگشتمی آن فرصت نیافتمی ؛ و اگر روباه در حرص و شره مبالغت بترهات دزد فریفته نگشتمی آن فرصت نیافتی ؛ و اگر روباه در حرص و شره مبالغت ننمودی و خون فرو گذاشتی آسیب نخجیران بدو نرسیدی ؛ و اگر زن بدکار قصد جوان غافل نکردی جان شیرین بباد نداد ؛ و اگر زن حجام برناشایست تحریض و در فساد موافقت روا نداشتی مثله نشدی .....

English version

THE WEAVER'S WIFE

Now as he walked along, Godly spied a weaver who with his wife was on his way to a neighboring city for liquor to drink, and he called out: "Look here, my good fellow! I come to you a guest, brought by the evening sun. I do not know a soul in the village. Let me receive the treatment due a guest. For the proverb says:

On hearing this, the weaver said to his wife: "Go, my dear. Take this guest to the house. Treat him hospitably, giving him water for the feet, food, a bed, and so on. And stay in the house yourself. I will bring plenty of win and meat for you." With this he went farther.

So the wife started home with Godly, and she showed a laughing countenance, for she was a whore and had a certain swain in mind. Indeed, there is sense in the verse:

Then she went home, offered Godly a rickety cot and said: "My holy sir, a woman friend has come from the village and I must speak to her. I will be back directly. Meanwhile, you may stay in our house. But please be careful." With this she put on her best things and started to find her swain.

At this moment she ran into her husband, clasping a jug of win. He was reeling drunk, his hair was toweled, and he stumbled at every step. She ran when she saw him, entered the house, took off her finery, and appeared as usual.

Now the weaver had seen her flee, had observed the finery, and since he had previously heard the gossip that went the rounds about her, his heart was troubled and anger overcame him. So he entered the house and said: "You wench! You whore! Where were you going?"

And she replied: "I have not been out since I left you. What is this drunken twaddle? There is sense in the proverb:

When he had taken the scolding and had noticed her change of dress, he said: "Whore! I have heard gossip about you for a long time. Today I have seen the proof. I am going to give you what you deserve." So he beat her limp with a club, tied her firmly to a post, and fell into a drunken slumber,

At this juncture her friend, the barber's wife, learning that the weaver was asleep, came in and said: "My dear, he is waiting for you over there you know who. Go at once." But the weaver's wife replied: "Just see what a fix I am in. How can I go? You must return and tell my adorer that I cannot possibly meet him there at this moment."

"My dear," said the barber's wife, "do not say things like that. For a wench of spirit this is no way to behave. As the saying goes:

"Very fine indeed," said the weaver's wife. "But tell me how I am to go when I am tied fast. And here lies my husband the brute!" "My dear," said the barber's wife, "he is helpless with drink and will not wake until the sun's rays reach him. I will set you free and take your place myself. But you must hurry back when you have entertained your admirer."

This she did, and a moment later the weaver rose a little mollified, and said drunkenly: "Come, you nagger! If you will stay at home after today and stop nagging, I will set you free." The barber's wife said nothing, fearing that her voice would betray

her. Even when he repeated his offer, she made no answer. Then he became angry and cut off her nose with a sharp knife. And he said: "Whore! Now you can stay there. I shall not be nice to you again." So he fell asleep, muttering. Now Godly, having lost his money, was so tormented by hunger that he could not sleep, and was a witness of all that the women did.

Presently the weaver's wife, after enjoying the full delight of love with her swain, came home and said to the barber's wife: "Well, are you all right? I hope that brute did not get up while I was gone." And the barber's wife answered: "The rest of me is all right. But I've lost my nose. Set me free quick, before he wakes up. I want to go home. If not, he will do something worse next time, cut off ears and things."

So the wench freed the barber's wife, took her former position, and cried reproachfully: "Oh, you dreadful simpleton! I am a true wife, a model of faithfulness. What man is able to violate or disfigure me? Listen, ye guardian deities of the world!

So, if I am a faithful wife, may these gods make my nose grow again as it was before. More than that, if I have had so much as a secret desire for a strange man, may they reduce me to ashes." After this explosion, she said to him directly: "Look, you villain! By virtue of my faithfulness my nose has grown as it was before." And when he took a torch and examined her, he found her nose as it was originally, and a great pool of blood on the floor. At this he was amazed, released her from the cords, and flattered her with a hundred wheedling endearments. Now Godly had seen the whole business. And he was amazed and said:

In these meditations the night dragged drearily for the holy man. Meanwhile the go-between went home with her nose cut off, and reflected: "What is to be done now? How is this great deficiency to be concealed?"

The night during which she pondered thus, her husband spent in the king's palace, practicing his trade. At dawn he came home and, being eager to begin his thriving business with the townspeople, he stopped at the door and called to her: "My dear, bring me my razor-case at once. The townspeople need my services."

Hereupon an idea occurred to the noseless woman. She remained in the house, but sent him a single razor. And the barber, angry because the entire case had not been delivered, flung the razor in her direction. This gave the wench her opportunity. Lifting her hands to heaven, she dashed from the house, screaming with all her might: "Oh, oh, oh! Theruffian! I was always a faithful wife. Look! He cut off my nose. Save me, save me!"

Hereupon the police arrived, thrashed the barber limp, tied him fast, and took him to court with his wife whose nose was gone. And the judges asked him: "Why did you do this ghastly thing to your wife?" Then, his wits being so addled by astonishment that he could give no answer, the jurymen quoted law: The prisoner is obviously guilty. The legal penalty for assaulting a woman is death. Let him be impaled."

Story 9.

Persian Version

...آورده اند که در آب گیری دو بط و یکی باخه ساکن بودند و میان ایشان بحکم مجاورت دوستی و مصادقت افتاده ناگاه دست روزگار غدار رخسار حال ایشان بخراشید و سپهر آینه فام صورت مفارقت بدیشان نمود، و در آن آب که مایه حیات ایشان بود نقصان فاحش پیدا آمد.بطان چون آن بدیدند بنزدیک باخه رفتند و گفت: بوداع آمده ایم، پدرود باش ای دوست گرامی و رفیق موافق باخه از درد فرقت و سوز هجرت بنالید و از اشک بسی در و گهربارید و گفت: ای دوستان و یاران، مضرت نقصان آب د رحق من زیادت است که معیشت من بی ازان ممکن نگردد واکنون حکم مروت و قضیت کرم عهد آنست که بردن مرا وجهی اندیشید و حیلتی سازید.

گفتند :رنج هجران تومارا بیش است ، و هرکجا رویم اگر چه در خصب و نعمت باشیم بی دیدار تو ازان تمتع و لذت نیایم، اما تو اشارت مشفقان و قول ناصحان را سبک داری، و بر آنچه بمصلحت حال و مآل تو پیوندد ثبات نکنی و اگر خواهی که ترا ببریم شرط آنست که چون ترا برداشتیم و در هوا رفت چندانکه مردمان را چشم بر ما افتد هرچیز گویند راه جدل بربندی و البته لب نگشایی.

گفت: فرمان بردارم، و آنچه برشما از روی مروت واجب بود بجای آوردید، و من هم می پذیرم که دم طرقم و دل در سنگ شکنم.

بطان چوبی بیاوردند و باخه میان آن بدندان بگرفت محکم، و بطان هر دو جانب چوب را بدهان برداشتند و او را می بردند. چون باوج هوا رسیدند مردمان را از ایشان شگفت آمد و از چپ و راست بانگ بخاست که "بطان باخه می برند "

باخه ساعتی خویشتن نگاه داشت، آخر بی طاقت گشت وگفت "تا کور شوید" دهان گشاد بود و از بالا در گشتن. بطان آواز دادند که: بر دوستان نصیحت باشد:

نیک خواهان دهند پند ولیک   نیک بختان بوند پند پذیر

باخه گفت: این همه سودا است، چون طبع اجل صفرا تیز کرد و دیوانه وار روی به کسی آورد. از زنجیر گسستن فایده حاصل نیاید و هیج عاقل دل در دفع آن نبندد: ان المنایا لا تطیش سهامها

از مرگ حذر کردن دو وقت روا نیست   روزی که قضا باشد و روزی که قضا

English version
SHELL-NECK, SLIM, AND GRIM

In a certain lake lived a turtle named Shell-Neck. He had as friends two ganders whose names were Slim and Grim. Now in the vicissitudes of time there came a twelve-year drought, which begot ideas of this nature in the two ganders: "This Lake has gone dry. Let us seek another body of water. However, we must first say farewell to Shell-Neck, our dear and long-proved friend."

When they did so, the turtle said: "Why do you bid me farewell? I am a water-dweller, and here I should perish very quickly from the scant supply of water and from grief at loss of you. Therefore, if you feel any affection for me, please rescue me from the

jaws of this death. Besides, as the water dries in this lake, you two suffer nothing beyond a restricted diet, while to me it means immediate death. Consider which is more serious, loss of food or loss of life."

But they replied: "We are unable to take you with us since you are a water-creature without wings." Yet the turtle continued: "There is a possible device. Bring a stick of wood." This they did, whereupon the turtle gripped the middle of the stick between his teeth, and said: "Now take firm hold with your bills, one on each side, fly up, and travel with even flight through the sky, until we discover another desirable body of water."

But they objected: "There is a hitch in this fine plan. If you happen to indulge in the smallest conversation, then you will lose your hold on the stick, will fall from a great height, and will be dashed to bits."

"Oh," said the turtle, "from this moment I take a vow of silence, to last as long as we are in heaven."

So they carried out the plan, but while the two ganders were painfully carrying the turtle over a neighboring city, the people below noticed the spectacle, and there arose a confused buzz of talk as they asked: "What is this cart-like object that two birds are carrying through the atmosphere?"

Hearing this, the doomed turtle was heedless enough to ask: "What are these people chattering about?" The moment he spoke, the poor simpleton lost his grip and fell to the ground. And persons who wanted meat cut him to bits in a moment with sharp knives.

Story 10.
Persian Version

...آورده اند دو شریک بودند یکی دانا و دیگر نادان، و ببازرگانی می رفتند در راه بدره ای زر یافتند، گفتند: سود ناکرده در جهان بسیار است ، بدین قناعت باید کرد و بازگشت چون نزدیک شهر رسیدند خواستند که قسمت کنند ، آنکه دعوی زیرکی کردی گفت:چه قسمت کنیم؟ آن قدر که برای خرج بدان حاجت باشد برگیریم، و باقی را باحتیاط بجایی بنهیم، و هر یکچندی می آییم و بمقدار حاجت می بریم برین قرار دادند و نقدی سره برداشتند و باقی در زیر درختی باتقان بنهادند و در شهر رفتند.

دیگر روز آنکه بخرد موسوم و بکیاست منسوب بود بیرون رفت وزر ببرد: و روزها بران گذشت و مغفل گذشت و مغفل را بسیم حاجت افتاد.بنزدیک شریک آمد و گفت: بیا تا از آن دفینه چیزی برگیریم که من محتاجم هر دو بهم آمدند و زر نیافتند، عجب بردند. زیرک در فریاد و نفیر آمد و دست در گریبان غافل درمانده زد که: زر تو برده ای و کسی دیگر: خبر نداشتست.بیچاره سوگند می خورد که: نبرده ام . البته فایده نداشت .تا او را بدر سرای حکم آورد و زر دعوی کرد و قصه باز گفت.

قاضی پرسید که: گواهی یا حجتی داری؟ گفت: درخت که در زیر آن مدفون بوده است گواهی دهد که این خائن بی انصاف برده است و مرا محروم گردانیده. قاضی را از این سخن گفت آمد و پس از مجادله بسیار میعاد معین گشت که دیگر روز قاضی بیرون رود و زیر درخت دعوی بشنود و بگواهی درخت حکم کند.

آن مغرور بخانه رفت و پدر را گفت که: کار زر بیک شفقت و ایستادگی تو باز بستست و من باعتماد تو تعلق بگواهی درخت کرده ام . اگر موافقت نمایی زر ببریم و همچندان دیگر بستانیم . گفت: چیست آنچه بمن راست می شود؟ گفت: میان درخت گشاده است چنانکه اگر یک دو کس دران پنهان شود نتوان دید. امشب بباید رفت و در میان آن ببود و فردا چون قاضی بیاید گواهی چنانکه باید بداد. پیر گفت: ای پسر ، بسا حیلتا که بر محتال وبال گردد.و مباد که مکر تو چون مکر غوک باشد. گفت: چگونه؟

گفت: ای پدر کوتاه کن و درازکشی در توقف دار، که این کار اندک موونت بسیار منفعت است. پیر را شره مال و دوستی فرزند در کار آورد، تا جانب دین و مروت مهمل گذاشت، و ارتکاب این محفظور بخلاف شریعت و طریقت جایز شمرد، و برحسب اشارت پسر رفت.دیگر روز قاضی بیرون رفت و خلق انبوه بنظاره بیستادند.قاضی روی بدرخت آورد و از حال زر بپرسید .آوازی شنود که: مغفل برده ست. قاضی متحیر گشت و گرد درخت برآمد ، دانست که در میان آن کسی باشد ـ که بدالت خیانت منزلت کرامت کم توان یافت. بفرمود تا هیزم بسیار فراهم آوردند و در حوالی درخت بنهادند و آتش اندران زد . پیر ساعتی صبر کرد ، چون کار بجان رسید زینهار خواست. قاضی فرمود تا او فرو آوردند و استمالت نمود .راستی حال قاضی را معلوم گردانید چنانکه کوتاه دستی و امانت مغفل معلوم گشت و خیانت پسرش از ضمن آن مقرر گشت. و پیر از این جهان فانی بدار نعیم گریخت با درجت شهادت و سعادت مغفرت و پسرشپس از آنکه ادب بلیغ دیده بود و شرایط تعریک و تعزیز در باب وی تقدیم افتاده ، پدر را مرده بر پشت بخانه برد و مغفل ببرکت راستی و امانت یمن صدق و دیانت زر بستد و بازگشت.

English Version

RIGHT-MIND AND WRONG-MIND

In a certain city lived two friends, sons of merchants, and their names were Right-Mind andWrong-Mind. These two traveled to another country far away in order to earn money. There the one named Right-Mind, as a consequence of favoring fortune, found a pot containing a thousand dinars, which had been hidden long before by a holy man. He debated the matter with Wrong-Mind, and they decided to go home, since their object was attained. So they returned together.

When they drew near their native city, Right- Mind said: "My good friend, a half of this falls to your share. Pray take it, so that, now that we are at home, we may cut a brilliant figure before our friends and those less friendly."

But Wrong-Mind, with a sneaking thought of his own advantage, said to the other: "My good friend, so long as we two hold this treasure in common, so long will our virtuous friendship suffer no interruption. Let us each take a hundred dinars, and go to our homes after burying the remainder. The decrease or increase of this treasure will serve as a test of our virtue."

Now Right-Mind, in the nobility of his nature, did not comprehend the hidden duplicity of his friend, and agreed to the proposal. Each then took a certain sum of money. They carefully hid the residue in the ground, and made their entrance into the city. Before long, Wrong-Mind exhausted his preliminary portion because he practiced the vice of unwise expenditure and because his predetermined fate offered vulnerable points. He therefore made a second division with Right-Mind, each taking a second hundred. Within a year this, too, had slipped in the same way through Wrong-Mind's fingers. As a result, his thoughts took this form: "Suppose I divide another two hundred with him, then what is the good of the remainder, a paltry four hundred, even if I steal it? I think I prefer to steal a round six hundred." After this meditation, he went alone, removed the treasure, and leveled the ground.

A mere month later, he took the initiative, going to Right-Mind and saying: "My good friend, let us divide the rest of the money equally." So he and Right-Mind visited the spot and began to dig. When the excavation failed to reveal any treasure, that impudent Wrong-Mind first of all smote his own head with the empty pot, then shouted: "What became of that good lucre? Surely, Right-Mind, you must have stolen it. Give me my half. If you don't, I will bring you into court."

"Be silent, villain!" said the other. "My name is Right-Mind. Such thefts are not in my line. You know the verse:

> A man right-minded sees but trash,
> Mere clods of earth, in others' cash;
> A mother in his neighbor's wife;
> In all that lives, his own dear life."

So together they carried their dispute to court and related the theft of the money. And when the magistrates learned the facts, they decreed an ordeal for each. But Wrong-Mind said: "Come! This judgment is not proper. For the legal dictum runs:

> Best evidence is written word;
> Next, witnesses who saw and heard;
> Then only let ordeals prevail
> When witnesses completely fail.

In the present case, I have a witness, the goddess of the wood. She will reveal to you which one of us is guilty, which not guilty. And they replied: "You are quite right, sir. For there is a further saying: To meanest witnesses, ordeals should never be preferred; of course much less, if you possess a forest goddess' word.

Now we also feel a great interest in the case. You two must accompany us tomorrow morning to that part of the forest." With this they accepted bail from each and sent them home.

Then Wrong-Mind went home and asked his father's help. "Father dear," said he, "the dinars are in my hand. They only require one little word from you. This very night I am going to hide you out of sight in a hole in the mimosa tree that grows near the spot where I dug out the treasure before. In the morning you must be my witness in the presence of the magistrates."

"Oh, my son," said the father, "we are both lost. This is no kind of a scheme. There is wisdom in the old story:

<div align="center">

The good and bad of given schemes
Wise thought must first reveal:
The stupid heron saw his chicks
Provide a mungoose meal."

</div>

"How was that?" asked Wrong-Mind. And his father told the story….

But Wrong-Mind disdained the paternal warning, and during the night he hid his father out of sight in the hole in the tree. When morning came, the scamp took a bath, put on clean garments, and followed Right-Mind and the magistrates to the mimosa tree, where he cried in piercing tones:

<div align="center">

"Earth, heaven, and death, the feeling mind,
Sun, moon, and water, fire and the wind,
Both twilights, justice, day and night
Discern man's conduct, wrong or right.

</div>

O blessed goddess of the wood, which of us two is the thief? Speak."

Then Wrong-Mind's father spoke from his hole in the mimosa: "Gentlemen, Right-Mind took that money/' And when all the king's men heard this statement, their eyes blossomed with astonishment, and they searched their minds to discover the appropriate legal penalty for stealing money, in order to visit it on Right-Mind.

Meanwhile, Right-Mind heaped inflammable matter about the hole in the mimosa and set fire to it. As the mimosa burned, Wrong-Mind's father issued from the hole with a pitiful wail, his body scorched and his eyes popping out. And they all asked: "Why, sir! What does this mean?"

"It is all Wrong-Mind's doing," he replied. Whereupon the king's men hanged Wrong-Mind to a branch of the mimosa, while they commended Right- Mind and caused him satisfaction by conferring upon him the king's favor and other things.