



Application of Hatim & Mason's Ideological Analysis on Two Persian Translations of "the Catcher in the Rye"

AilarMoghaddam Jahangiri (Corresponding Author)

Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht Branch, Marvdasht, Fars, Iran

E-mail: ailarmoghaddam@gmail.com

Mohammad Ali Ayatollahi

Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht Branch, Marvdasht, Fars, Iran

E-mail: ayatollahi1345@gmail.com

Received: 18-04- 2015

Accepted: 02-07- 2015

Advance Access Published: August 2015

Published: 01-11- 2015

doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.6p.106

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.6p.106>

Abstract

Ideology plays an important role in our life. Translation and language are always sites of ideological encounters. Translation is represented through a dominant ideology of any society. If translation theories and ideology put under scrutiny, evidences regarding the influence of cultural conflicts will be found in them. This paper is firstly aimed at investigating the analytical framework proposed by Hatim & Mason (1990, 1991, and 1997) to study and analyze the issues of Genre, discourse and text; and then for the purpose of studying the issue of ideology and its angles in translations. The focus of this study is the application of Hatim & Mason's analytical framework on J. D. Salinger's "The Catcher in the Rye" and its two Persian translations by Ahmad Karimi and Mohammad Najafi. From the ideological standpoint which affects the process of translation, enough probing has again been carried out into the very same work of literature. Worthy of mention would be that in the present study, the differences between the source text and the target texts have been studied separately in terms of lexical choices, nominalizations and from the standpoint of discursal constrains.

Keywords: Ideology, Analytical framework, Genre, Discursal constraints, Lexical choices, Nominalization

1. Introduction

In today's world, translation is deemed as one of the most critical jobs. Translation binds the whole globe together through sharing information and improving communication since there has always been a constant demand and an unprecedented need for translation to transfer ideas from one language to another. Translation is a targeted and oriented activity which is done based on needs, beliefs and perceptions of one's society and the target culture.

For centuries, translation has been carried out based on the stylistic criteria or methods used in translation, i.e. free or literal. The debate on the translation method has to do with the dichotomy between the literal translation, and free translation (Melis & Albir, 2001). Moreover, there has been other terms which put translation in a binary division including "dynamic equivalence vs. formal equivalence", "communicative vs. semantic" and so forth.

Hatim & Mason (1997), however, believe that if the matter is taken into account from an inclusive approach, the translator's choices can frequently be analyzed and explained in the process of translation from his/her ideological perspective framework (Ghazanfary, 2006). According to Venuti (1995), the translator cannot avoid a fundamental ideological choice. In this regard, Venuti has distinguished between two types of translation: "Domestication" and "Foreignization" (Hatim & Mason, 1997).

From Venuti's point of view, the translator's strategies applied in the process of transferring the source text to the target text are due to his/her ideological perspectives so that his work would bring its ideological outcomes for the target culture. Therefore, translation, in the light of this standpoint, is, by itself, an ideological activity (Ghazanfari, 2006).

The emergence of ideology in the process of translation has become an important issue in translation studies. Ideology – in its very innocent meaning and by its general definition—is synonym with culture. According to the Webster's third new international dictionary's (1993) definition, ideology is, thus, "a systematic scheme or coordinated body of ideas or concepts, especially about human life and culture, a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group or culture".

In this research the influence of the translator's ideology in two translations of *The Catcher in the Rye* translated by Ahmad Karimi and Mohammad Najafi will be investigated based on Hatim & Mason's (1990, 1991, 1997) ideological framework to study and analyze the issues of genre, discourse and text; for the purpose of studying the issue of ideology and its angles in translations.

In this study, the researcher aimed to analyze whether the translator's ideology was influential in the process of

translating the novel or not; moreover, the application of the Hatim & Mason's model will be studied here to find its appropriateness for analyzing the ideologies of a literary text and the influence of the translator's ideology in translating *The Catcher in the Rye* and the translators' operation of each process.

Ideology in its literal and rhetorical sense is the science of ideas and notions (Soroush, 2005). The concept of ideology was from the very beginning accompanied by invectives, hence it was difficult to determine the precise meaning; yet where did the term comes from?

The term "ideology" was first coined by a French philosopher of the age of enlightenment "Antoine Destutt de Tracy" in 1796 (Boudon, 1999). He applied the term ideology as "science of ideas". However, Destutt de Tracy cannot be considered as an initiator of ideology, since there was no beginning for anything during the course of history. There was always continuation or repetition, transformation, and imitation which are all over again established based on the previous documentaries. Therefore, the theory of ideology like any other theories has its background.

Ideology has been used within the Marxist tradition. Marx, before anyone else, has entered the word "ideology" into the science of society and politics and discussed all its important angles (Plamenatz, 1994: 65). Marx called ideology a "false consciousness" and believed that the bourgeoisie ideas about the government are an instance of false consciousness (Cronin, 2009: 22). The Marxist tradition has less unity toward the issue of ideology than any other tradition. The term ideology as an implication of the ideas and attitudes of a special group has relatively a new origin. It is to be mentioned that ideology has been used in Marx and Engels' works with the same concept (Lukács, 2002). The most comprehensive form of ideology is called worldview which is the calque of the German word *weltanschauung* as cited by some American and English writers (Plamenatz, 1994). The very concept of ideology as *weltanschauung* is defined at two levels: trimmed and untrimmed. Trimmed refers to the ideology of a specific group of the society while untrimmed refers to the communal contribution of all the individuals to the overall ideology of the society.

The Neo-Marxist philosophers such as Lukács, Gramsci, and Althusser take a different approach. Lukács as discussed the differences between the class consciousness of the subservient social classes and the bourgeoisie's ideology. He believed that the ideology of bourgeoisie has ruined the life of the working class (Lukács, 1998). Gramsci has developed the theory of hegemony which, as he stated, is an ideological dominance of power structures on society (Gramsci, 2009). Althusser argued that ideology is an integral part of the relationship between the individual and the society (Ferretter, 2008). He introduced ideology as a set of semiotics which has given a society a historical role and nature.

Among Non-Marxist philosophers, Aron and Pareto's opinions is worthy of mention. Aron believes that "political ideologies describe a perspective of world which directly deals with right and wrong and even do not belong to the preferences and the belief system" (Aron, 2008, p.18). Unlike the followers of Marx who spoke of ideology, Pareto (1966) has thought of "derivatives". He stated that the "derivatives theory" is accepted by people. Non-Marxist sociologists refused to use the term ideology due to the difference between their thought and the Marxist opinions. For the American political theorist, Edward Shils, "ideologies are explicit, closed, and resistant to innovation, promoted with high degree of affectivity and need full obedience by their devotees" (Eagleton, 1993, p.32).

The Marxist and Non-Marxist theories can be generally summarized as follows:

Table 1. Various definitions of ideology (Cited from Boudon, 1999, p. 42)

Tradition	Concerning the criterion of right and wrong	Without reference to the criterion of right and wrong
Marxist Tradition	Marx: Ideology as false consciousness	Lenin: Ideology as a weapon for class struggle Althusser: Ideology: Living space
Non-Marxist Tradition	Aron: Ideology does not directly deal with right and wrong; yet it indirectly refers to this criteria. Parsons: ideology as a diversion of scientific objectivity	Geertz: Ideology as a type of symbolic action. Shils: Ideology as a special kind of belief system.

After the collapse of communism, a new critical attitude was formed toward the concept of ideology. Cultural studies can be mentioned as an example of this new attitude which had a positive and constructive view toward ideology rather than having a humiliating and degrading interpretation.

As and when one starts to delve into various facets of ideological dimensions within a certain rendering, some prescience is of vital importance to act as somewhat of a prerequisite for ideological "processing": a minimal degree of pre-knowledge of the text having actually come up to the level of textuality. Without the piece of writing (rendering) achieving the criterion of textuality, almost any talk appears nonsensical regarding how, where and why the renderer's ideological imposition has been exerted into the (target) text (Hatim & Mason, 1997).

According to some of the most recent cognitive science's achievements (Gorniak & Roy, 2010), there can hardly appear any piece of communicated language without some sort of value having been burdened on the typology of

meaning digested either by the producer or by the receiver (Hatim & Mason, 1997).

Not only this, but that the value-meaning load on various parts of translation works gets narrowed down into translators' minds (Sanguinetti, Bosco & Lesmo, 2013) according to their personal idiosyncratic take of what their meaning load turns out to be (Hatim & Mason, 1996).

The above mentioned assertion seems so inevitably widespread that any language production act cannot possibly distance itself from the (individual/collective) process of inference-drawing (A. Duff, 2002).

Very many different instances of translation works done by a variety of translators, not of the same nationality and the same language, give enough proof of the fact that sometimes some background meaning-based/value-laden undertone has been magnified to such a degree as to actually turn it into "overtone" and vice versa (Androutsopoulos, 2001).

Far from being rare, the examples of the above mentioned phenomenon (in various forms and to differing degrees) could—for example—be seen in Bruno Bettelheim's (1983) fascinating work of translation criticism who gives relatively ample elucidation of how English translators of Freud distorted the great psychiatrist's language and the meaning when they applied a systematic lexical culling selection into the original German text which led to the distortion of the main ideas of "Ego", "Id", and "Superego". Another critique on the same example of "Freud's distortion" is Joyce Crick's (1989) words expressing his qualm as to how, in his own phraseology, Freud's original state of being a doctor of souls has been converted into his being an anatomist/atomizer of people's minds. The situation is not that different when Sian Reynolds (1991) relates the parallel controversy raging on in the French version of Freud. Whereas Jean Laplanche (1992) talks of "restoring Freud to Freud" through putting away all accretions obfuscating the original German, there are others who feel sorrow that the translation into French should possibly be divested of all explanatory terminology (Baker, 2009).

The controversial translation of the Old Testament, with all its various versions, has not ceased to be a continual source of debate as far as ideological facets of translation are focused on. From the ancient times down to the present era of ours, reciprocal accusation and retorts (and, of course, acknowledgement and praise) have been exchanged when readers and experts in exegesis have failed that this or that part of the Old Testament has not well been brought out into the target language (A. Lyons & A. Tooman, 2003). Venuti (1995) speaks of the fact that it is not always facile to detect all and every one of the "familiarized" idioms by means of the Authorized Version (Venuti, 1995).

One of the freelance interpreters working at League of Nations conferences was Paul Schmidt, a graduate in languages from Berlin, who was to become one of Germany's most famous, or infamous, interpreters. In the late 1930s, Schmidt was the interpreter in Hitler's talks with British representatives such as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain (Schmidt 1949: 401-414). Surprisingly, there was no counterpart on the British side, and Schmidt was apparently fully trusted and held in high esteem by either party to the talks. In a book published in 1940, British Ambassador Sir Neville Henderson spoke of "the reliable interpreter, Dr. Paul Schmidt" (Henderson 1940, cited in Feldweg 1996: 15). Considering the momentous issues dealt with in those high-level talks, the fact that there should have been only one interpreter, appointed by one side, is highly unusual. Nowadays, even talks between the French and German leaders are often conducted in the presence of an interpreter for each side, and the same applies to diplomatic talks with leaders of China, as illustrated repeatedly in news magazines like *The Economist* (Pochhacker, 2006).

This practice suggests that interpreters in these diplomatic settings work not so much 'between' as 'for' one side or another as members of a given delegation or party. This was indeed the case also with Paul Schmidt. From his autobiographical account, with strong apologetic overtones, we learn that he was also doing clerical work and was a trusted member of the team at headquarters until the final stages of the war. He also tells us that he was required to wear an SS uniform and sometimes used Göring's private plane, but that he joined the party only in 1943. To all appearances, then, a member of the Nazi regime. Not so, as he was to protest in the post-war epoch, when he was banned from exercising his profession for several years. As one of the most experienced interpreters of the day, Schmidt managed an impressive comeback in the 1950s as co-founder and director of an interpreter training school, the *Sprachen & DolmetscherInstitut*, in Munich. Apparently untainted by his Nazi past, he became an inspiring teacher to many who would later enter the conference interpreting profession in Germany (Pochhacker, 2006).

2. Methodology

Genre, discourse, and text are the main points of departure for marking out the remit where the application of Hatim & Mason's analytical framework can be the rule. The separate entities: genre, discourse, and text are in themselves objects of research and investigation not only in translation theory studies, but also in the wider realm of linguistics.

However, the way they are related to translation ideological appraisal is to be defined through lexical choices, nominalizations, and the discursal constraints, i.e. such angles of view as lexical cohesion, transitivity, and theme-rheme organization. The text used for such a purpose has been the original novel: "the Catcher in the Rye", though the ideological transfer backlash into Persian has been made lucid through two different translations from the English by Ahmad Karimi and Mohammad Najafi. As for the question whether the investigation has been of qualitative or quantitative nature.

3. Data Collection Procedures

The "Catcher in the Rye", written by J. D. Salinger, the famous American writer, was first published in 1951. It has been translated into almost all of the world's major languages. This novel has been among the 100 best English-language novels written since 1923 and the best English-language novels of the 20th century. The story plot deals with

issues of identity crises, belonging, connection, and alienation. "The Catcher in the Rye" means a safeguard for the garden, croft, or farm. It has been written in a subjective style as the forerunners stated and from their view point. It mirrors the teenage colloquial speech style of its own time.

This book has been translated two times in Persian; the first one was done by Ahmad Karimi in 1966 and the second one has been brought out by Mohammad Najafi in 1998.

In this study the two Persian translations of "the Catcher in the Rye" have been studied in Hatim & Mason's analytical framework (which was mentioned above) in the realm of ideology – in comparative study – between the original text and the translated texts. Worthy of mention would be that in the present comparative work, the differences between the source text and the target texts were investigated separately in terms of lexical choices, nominalizations, and the discursal constraints, i.e. such angles of view as lexical cohesion, transitivity, and theme-rheme organization.

Hence, in this investigation, first, the original text was read thoroughly and then the ST was compared to its' two translated texts to find ideological traces in the translation. Hatim & Mason's ideological framework was applied in the following steps:

- i. Reading the entire translations of "the Catcher in the Rye"
- ii. Selecting some paragraphs randomly and then going through sentences with a difference ideological themes
- iii. Subdividing the chosen sentences into the three categories of constraints of Hatim & Mason's: genre, text, and discourse
- iv. Comparing & contrasting the two Persian translations according to the analytical framework of Hatim & Mason
- v. Finding the different ideological themes on both translations
- vi. Providing a statement of quality with reference to the translations' result

Here, samples of the source text and the target texts were selected randomly and they were put into investigation using Hatim & Mason's analytical framework.

Transitivity Shift

Transitivity shifts can be placed in several different categories like expansion, contraction, materialization, voice shift (passive to active and vice versa) and nominalization.

Expansion

By the term "expansion" are meant all items of conversion whereby a translator embarks upon rendering an utterance [without verbs] inside the mold of a sentence or a quasi-sentence, leading to distinct SUBJECT and OBJECT: something not already present in the original text. Commonly, whenever we come across adding on to the number of procedures and processes, we consider these to be instances of "expansion" (Gibova, 2001).

(1)I hate saying corny things like "traveling incognito". But when I'm with somebody that's corny, I always act corny too (The Catcher in the Rye (1951), Chapter 9, p. 60).

1. من از گفتن حرفهای مزخرفی مثل "مسافرت به طور ناشناس" بی اندازه متنفرم، اما وقتی که سر و کار آدم با اشخاص مزخرف می افتد، باید هم مزخرف گفت، و مزخرف رفتار کرد (ناطور دشت، 1345: فصل 9، ص 95).

Contraction

Contraction comprises some conversion opposite to what happens in "expansion": that is to say, the translator reduces down to a phrase minus its process the sentence or quasi-sentence that might originally have (or have at least as an adjunct) that very process (Ghazanfari, 2006). The phraseology coming out of the change of "contraction" can potentially circumscribe a nominalized element [from the original], an adverb of time, an adverbial of place, an adverb of quality, and the like...(Gibova, 2001).

(2)Then it's a game, all right – *I'll admit that* (Chapter 2, p. 8).

2. باز یک چیزی می شه گفت که مسابقه س..... (فصل 2، ص 12).

The sentence *I'll admit that* has not been rendered into the Persian.

Materialization

Within the boundaries of "materialization", a sentence of the **immaterial** type converts into something of material processing, thence developing the action itself into the conduct carried out by nearly volitional human will. The **immaterial** genus of the sentence process might well be of some mental, imaginary, verbal, value-judgment, etc. nature to be taken around reversely into material objectivity (Gibova, 2002).

(1) He said that because Jesus *picked* the Disciples, *you* were supposed to like them (Chapter 14: p. 99).

1. می گفت چون حضرت عیسی حواریون را از بین مردم *پیک* کرده است، □ باید آنها را دوست داشته باشیم (فصل 14: ص 161).

Voice Shifts

From the standpoint of a relatively large number of literary critics, it would transfer some hidden semantics into the mentality of the target language's readership in case a **passive** construct is applied: especially under the circumstances where its frequency within the text increases up to the level not generally observed in the language (Toadvine, Brizee &

Angeli, 2012).

(1) The first thing you'll probably want to know is where *I was born*....(Chapter 1: p. 1).

1. اولین چیزی که می خواهید بدانید این است که من کجا بدنیا آمدم....(فصل 1: ص 1)

Nominalization

Conditioned a verbal process in addition to its participants, mostly expressed in chains or chainlets of "subject-verb", is rendered in a rather more compact format as a nominal grouping, then the final lingual process production would normally be called "Nominalization"(Ghazanfari, 2006). This generally leads to a sort of ellipsis of human will and agency from the background of the piece of language under scrutiny (Kies, 1992).

(1) I don't feel like going into it, if you want to know the truth. In the first place, that stuff *bores me*... (Chapter 1, p. 1).

1. من میل ندارم وارد این موضوع ها بشوم. چونکه او *لاذخه ای ای بی* را ندارم (احمد کریمی، فصل 1، ص 1).

Theme/rheme Arrangements

If we take the clause as a message through which we communicate, this message consists of a theme and a rheme. In linguistics, the topic, or theme, of a sentence is what is being talked about, and the comment (rheme or focus) is what is being said about the topic (Hatim & Mason, 1990). Rheme constitutes the most important part of the sentence; since it is the purpose of an utterance and include the information the writer/speaker intend to transfer to the reader/audience (Baker, 1999).

(1)You were supposed to commit suicide or something if old Pencey didn't win (Chapter 1: P.2).

1. گویا اگر پنسی بازنده می شد می بایست خودکشی کرد (فصل 1: ص 3).

Lexical Connection Transference Quality

In view of the fact that the recurrence of some words signifies the specificity of the writer's intentionality concerning a special topic, it would not seem totally "natural" on the part of the translator to (try to) translate the very same words into various (shades) forms of other words. If he/she does so, the peculiar tone within the original text might very easily be lost to the readers in the target language: contrary to the translator's purpose – that is to say, producing a more vivid, heterogeneous, not-repetitive rendering.

(1) I don't think I'll ever forgive him for reading me that *crap out loud*. I *wouldn't have read* it *out loud* to him if he'd written it – I really *wouldn't* (Chapter 2: P.12).

1. من گمان نمی کنم یک روزی بتوانم او را به علت خواندن آن مزخرفات *عنه ای ای بی* ببخشم. اگر او آن یادداشت را نوشته بود من هیچ وقت آن را *عنه ای ای بی* برایش *عنه ای ای بی*، جدا *عنه ای ای بی* (فصل 2: ص. 18).

Domestication

Any sort of change whereby the cultural background plays a significant role might be deemed "domestication" so that the target-language audience would normally get the sense much more readily.

(1) He started getting serious *as hell* (Chapter 2: p.8).

1. اسپنسر شروع کرد به قیافه ی جدی گرفتن(فصل 2: ص 11).

4. Discussions

There are many different interpretations regarding the theme of the story. Some scholars including Bruce Brooks (2004) believe that the main character's attitude did not change at the end of the story, while we expect maturation, and integrity. Therefore, this makes the novel different from young adult fiction. In contrast, Louis Menand (2001) contends that the novel teaches adolescent readers that alienation is just a phase in this period of age, hence the novel has optimistic ending. Brooks hold the opinion that Holden acts his age, while Menand claimed that Holden thinks as an adult, the one who has an ability to understand people and their motives accurately. Others like Katrina and Graham (2008) highlight the dilemma of Holden's state, in between adolescence and adulthood. Holden is quick to become emotional. "I felt sorry as hell for..." is a phrase he often uses.

Peter Beidler (2011), in his A Reader's Companion to J. D. Salinger's "The Catcher in the Rye", identifies the movie that the prostitute "Sunny" refers to. In chapter 13 she "Sunny" says that in the movie a boy falls off a boat. The movie is Captains Courageous, starring Spencer Tracy. Sunny believes that Holden looks like the boy who fell off the boat.

Each member of Caulfield family have their own character: D. B. writes screenplays in Hollywood; Holden admires D. B. for his writing skill, but he also hates Hollywood industry-based movies, considering them the ultimate in "phony" as the writer has no space for his own imagination, and describes D. B.'s move to Hollywood to write for films as "prostituting himself"; Allie wrote poetry on his baseball glove; and Phoebe is a diarist. This novel "The Catcher in the Rye" and the main character of the story "Holden" try to find attributes in adults like innocence, kindness, spontaneity, and generosity. Falling off the cliff could be a progression into the adult world that surrounds him and that he strongly criticizes. Later, Phoebe and Holden exchange roles as the "catcher" and the "fallen"; he gives her his hunting hat, the catcher's symbol, and becomes the fallen as Phoebe becomes the catcher.

Regarding the ideology of both translations and the influence of Hatim & Mason's framework, first the two translator's ideology has been investigated. In other words, the style of Mohammad Najafi & Ahmad Karimi should have been

investigated in translation. Both translators have their own individual styles which can be seen in their own renderings. If we take a look at the above examples and the table of frequency of each process used by each translator, it can be clearly found that the process of expansion has the highest frequency in Ahmad Karimi while Mohammad Najafi took advantage of the contraction process more than he did. The process of materialization was highly used in both translations, since both translators tried to make the target text tangible for the target reader. Idiomatic translation is another factor which should be taken into consideration. Beekman & Callow (1974) and also Larson (1984) show this kind of translation as a strategy through which a natural target text can be achieved. Ahmad Karimi & Mohammad Najafi both tried to use idiomatic expressions to naturalize the source text for the target reader. For example the phrase "I knew right away" has been translated to *فوری شستم خیردار شد* in Mohammad Najafi's translation or the phrase "Just to show us what a regular guy he was" to *فقط برای اینکه به ما ثابت کنه چه شخص شخیصی است* in Ahmad Karimi's translation. The processes of voice shift, recurrence, nominalization, and finally the process of agency shift have respectively the highest to the lowest frequency in both translations.

The style of each translator could change the ideology of the source text. It seems that Mohammad Najafi manipulates the ideological meaning of the original text more than Ahmad Karimi did since he overtly used the strategy of domestication and the informal style in his own translation. This led to the fact that the main themes of the story which includes capitalism, alienation, and innocence have been changed by using an informal style into capitalism, alienation and rebellion. However, most literary critics believe that "innocence" is one of the main themes of the story, which is obviously illustrated from the title of the book itself. Although the main conflict of the story is individual versus society, the protagonist reaction is isolating himself which can be found from his desired job, i.e. the catcher in the rye. However, the style and the register used by Mohammad Najafi highlighted the rebellion side of the main character. Thus, it distorted the ideological orientations of the original text.

Table 2. Comparing & Contrasting the Themes in the ST and in the TTs

ST	TT1 (Mohammad Najafi)	TT2 (Ahmad Karimi)
Capitalism	Capitalism	Capitalism
Alienation	Alienation	Alienation
Innocence	Rebellion	Innocence

5. Conclusion

Ideology manipulation is a function of the translator's contribution to the translation. Venuti (2007) distinguishes domestication from foreignization as dominant translation strategy. In domestication, the translator can be endowed with the power to include his/her own interpretation in the translation in such a way that the translated version would sound like an original text. On the other hand, a translator can be very restricted in their translation that certain words and concepts should be retained, mainly because it refers to a specific concept in the original text e.g. cultural concept or concepts pertaining to particular ideology (Machali, 2013).

Therefore, the translator can contribute or not contribute to the translation, e.g. in domestication s/he can go out of the boundary of the text and as such creates 'translation acts'. In this way s/he becomes 'invisible', since the translation would sound like an original text. However, a translator may also choose to be visible in the translation, for example when s/he employs foreignization by retaining the foreign words as they are used in the original text.

The opposing view is that a translation should be like a glass; one might notice "it's there when there are little imperfections" (Venuti, 2008, p. 1). This saying indicates that readers should never notice that they are reading a translation because this recognition is due to these "imperfections". However, a translation without such imperfections results in the invisibility of the translation and the translator (Venuti, 2007). To find a way to solve this problem, Venuti proposes a foreignizing approach to make the translator visible.

Venuti (2007, 2008), however, does not specify how the translator's contribution could distort the ideological meaning of the original text. This study revealed in fiction it is the theme or themes of the literary work that bear this distortion. The theme of fiction emerge evolve gradually as the result of factors such as the writer's choice of style (e.g. formal v.s. informal), register (e.g. archaic v.s. modern) inter alia. As such, any changes in one of these dimensions would have a bearing on the themes that emerge and evolve naturally throughout the fiction.

The present study concluded that the model introduced by Hatim & Mason is a coherent framework to analyze translation and to investigate the translator's ideological orientations. While this research has been conducted on a literary text, it was found that the said framework has the required potential to critically study the ideological sides of a literary text. Ghazanfari (2004) investigated the translation of *The Blind Owl* written by Sadegh Hedayat and its English translation by Costello based on Hatim & Mason's model (1990, 1991 & 1997) in his doctoral dissertation entitled "Reflection of Ideological Orientations in Literary Translation and its Implications for Teaching" found that the mentioned model failed to justify some ideological inductions used by the translator in the translation. With regard to the fact that Ghazanfari had chosen a short story, *The Blind Owl*, which was translated from Persian into English, in this research, attempt has been made to investigate the Hatim & Mason's ideological framework more broadly by changing the direction of the translation – from English into Persian – and a short story to a novel.

References

- Albeir, H., & Melis, N. M. (2001). Assessment in translation studies: research studies. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs*, 272-287.
- Baker, M. (2010). *Critical reading in translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: a course book on translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Boudon, R. (1989). *The analysis of ideology*. Chicago: Polity Press.
- Duff, P. A. (2006). Beyond generalizability: contextualization, complexity, and credibility in applied linguistics research. In Chalhoub, M. & Chapelle, C. A. & Duff, P. A. (Eds.), *Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: multiple perspectives* (65-95). Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Ghazanfari, M. (2006). Charchoop-e tahlil-e naghdeh ideologic dar tarjomeh. *Olom-e Ejtemaee va Ensani Daneshgah Shiraz*, 2-3.
- Klaudia, G. (2014). Some thoughts on translation procedures as employed in acquis communautaire documents. *Academia*, 78-80.
- Hatim, B. (1991). Coping with ideology in professional translating. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23-32.
- Plamenatz, J. (1973). *Ideology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kies, D. (1992). The uses of passivity: suppressing agency in nineteen eighty-four. *Pinter Publishers*, 229-250.
- Luke, F. (2006). *Louis Althusser*. London: Routledge.
- Mason, I. & Hatim, B. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Tooman, W. A. & Lyons, M. A. (2003). Three recent Bible translation: an old testament perspective. *Jets*, 497-520.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility*. London: Routledge.