RESEARCH ARTICLE

Domesticating/Foreignizing Strategies in Translating the Persian Writer's Style: Two Voices of a *Blind Owl*

Abolfazl Horri[1] (iD)

Abstract: This paper investigates the Persian writer's style through domesticating/foreignizing strategies used in two English translations of Hedayat's *The Blind Owl*. As the 'thumbprint', style is concerned with some recurring patterns of linguistic habits of any writer; hence, any translator. As proposed by Venuti, these strategies may result from various shifts made by translators in transferring the ST style into the TT one. The question is raised: Is there any relationship between the translator's style and the used strategies by the translators? Having reviewed the main literature and strategies, this paper puts into practice the main used strategies in 200 sentences chosen randomly from each English translation of the novel, related to the given categories of domestication and foreignization. The results showed that Costello's translation was dominated by such domesticating strategies as borrowing and extra-lingual gloss; Bashiri's with foreignizing ones. In both translations, the dominant domesticating strategies are deletion, approximation, and paraphrasing. However, regarding the macro-level structure, keeping or losing the original author's style has nothing to do with domesticating/foreignizing strategies. In conclusion, it seems perplexing to apply such strategies to the texts translated from non-hegemonic languages such as Persian into hegemonic languages such as English.

Keywords: Domestication; Foreignization; Persian Translation; Strategies; Writer's style.

Introduction

Interestingly enough, the style has been such an intriguing concept that has attracted the attention of different literary schools from ancient times to the modern era. However, as tempting as it is, it has been such a challenging and intriguing term that it has appeared resistant to translation. Depending on different criteria, the style has been defined in various ways. However, all definitions, in one way or another, relate 'style' to the way (s) to use 'language', as a God-given gift to the 'talking animal'. As a gift, 'language' is used by different human beings in a completely idiosyncratic way. The human being is not the same in the way he treats and uses language. The way and the manner to use language by an 'individual' brings about some habits and behaviors that, although they have commonalities with other 'individuals', yield an 'idiosyncrasy' completely distinguishable from other language users. These linguistic habits, whether expressed in written, oral, or performed medium, are meant 'style'. The way and the manner to use linguistic habits have been so 'idiosyncratic' for the human being that style, in one ever-quoted saying,

has been labeled "the man himself" (Buffon, 1753). Still, the style has been an elusive term that escapes being limited to just one definition. Depending on different criteria, there have appeared some metaphors, based on which, style can be defined: style as a choice; style as an ornament; style as deviance, foregrounding, and prominence; style as form; and style as expressive features, among other metaphors. As various yet related as these metaphors, the problem is popped up when the style is translated from one language into another. For instance, taking "style as the man himself" as a yardstick, the problem is how it is possible to translate one 'individual' into another 'individual', i.e., how to translate the individual linguistic habits of the writers while keeping and retaining the idiosyncrasies of those writers in the target language?

Called the 'thumbprint' (Baker, 2000: 254), style is concerned with some recurring patterns of linguistic habits of any writer, which can be obtained consciously or unconsciously, i.e., whether the writer uses these patterns in or out of his conscious control. In the like manner, the way that any

individual writer uses this recurring pattern may be completely different from the way another writer uses the same. This can be one reason why style is called the man himself since different writers employ their linguistic habits differently and specifically. Concerning translation, the style becomes a bit problematic since the 'agent' so-called 'the translator', is obliged not only to keep the authenticity of the original writer but as an individual, has his recurring patterns of linguistic habits, making him distinguishable from other agents-translators. Hence, the translator's style, as his characteristic use of linguistic patterns, can be compared to that of other translators' patterning of linguistic habits. In a nutshell, the point is to see, as Baker (2000) puts it: if individual translators show some patterns for using the specific "lexical items, syntactic patterns, cohesive devices or style of punctuation where other options may be equally available in the language", yet he has not employed for one thing or another. Keeping this in mind, there have been various methods to detect such (un) conscious linguistic habits in translation. The method can be done manually or

electronically. Baker, for instance, is interested in using a computer-assisted corpus-based study to investigate those linguistic habits beyond the conscious control of the translators, mainly made by the changes, called 'shifts', they do in the process of translation. Or else, Baker (1993; 1996) has come to show how it is possible to determine the translators' style through the Universals of Translation. Anyway, the changes that the translators make via shifts may result in different kinds of translation. As basically proposed and formulated by Venuti (1965), domesticating/foreignizing translation may have been yielded from the choices made by the translator out of his repertoire of linguistic habits at the micro-level structure of the translated text. If these choices at the micro-level get frequent in the process of translation, the results may affect the overall style of the translation at the macro-level. In this sense, domestication/foreignization may help us investigate whether the translators have kept the authenticity and the thumbprint of the original writer (foreignized translation) and, or changed the thumbprint at both micro-/macro-levels of the translated text

(domesticated translation). Basically, as of two strategies, domestication and foreignization may result from various shifts made by the translators in transferring the style of the source text (ST) into the target text (TT).

However, the problem remained yet. Taken as strategies, domesticating/ foreignizing translation may bring with it what Venuti has designated as '(in) visibility'. Domesticating translation yields a translation in which the translator is obliged to be more invisible than visible; in the latter, completely another way around. If the translator is invisible, what happens to his discursive presence (Hermans 1996), voice, and style in the translated text? If visible, what happens to the idiosyncrasy of the original author? In addition, as conceptualized by Venuti, in/visibility has been related to the hegemony and minority/majority. It is argued that domestication is the basic strategy of communities that have no hegemonic language. In this sense, is Persian a hegemonic or hegemonized language?

Also, fiction writing, including novels and short stories, has been considered a souvenir from the West for the traditional Iranian narrative fiction, having its distinctive features, to large extent, different from the traditional fiction writing in Iran. Hedayat's *The Blind Owl* (1315/1936) can be regarded as one of the earliest instances of modern novel writing in Iran. As a pioneer in novel writing, *The Blind Owl* has been designated by some critics (Beard 1990) as more a 'Western novel' (1990: 6) than a Persian literary work. As an individual writer, Sadegh Hedayat (1903-1951) has his linguistic habits in using the Persian language to convey whatsoever he has got in his mind to his audience: "I am writing only for my shadow, which is now stretched across the wall in the light of the lamp. I must make myself known to him" (Hedayat's *The Blind Owl*, Costello's translation, p. 1). This novel has been translated by two translators, D. P. Costello (1959), an English native speaker, and Iraj Bashiri (1975; 1984; 2013), a Persian native speaker. All in all, the main question is how two translators have preserved the Persian writer's style through domesticating/foreignizing translation. Better, how translator's style can be justified through the way they have domesticated/foreignized their English translations of *The Blind owl*?

Or else, is there any significant relationship between the translator's style and domesticating/foreignizing strategies used by the translators?

Literature Review

More has been said regarding Venuti's terminologies, domestication/foreignization, and visibility/invisibility, along with other keywords such as 'resistance, minoritization', and the like. And much more has been said regarding Hedayat's literary works (Shamisa 1372), among others. However, less has been inked concerning the translator's style, save for what Horri (2007; 2009) has said, among others. Few studies have taken Hedayat's original and its two English translations into scrutiny. Michael Beard (1990) has written the only monograph on this novel, entitled *Hedayat's Blind* Owl as a Western Novel. Emami (1381) has stated that Michael Beard, an American author, and scholar who has written a review book on *The Blind Owl*, has sent a message to him about Costello's translation quality of *The Blind Owl* in which he "wished he {Costello} had done other translations from Persian." Ghazanfari (2006)

has suggested that maybe *The Blind Owl* owes its universal popularity to some extent to the translation that Costello has made of it into English.

Baker (1998) has provided needed information about the history, definition, and theorists of foreignization and domestication strategies. Munday (2001) and Venuti (1995) also have provided detailed information about these two strategies. Ghazanfari (2005: 28) discussed domestication and investigated some examples in Costello's translation to show that the translator has used this strategy because English "as a 'dominant' language, associated primarily with a dominant culture (Le. Anglo-American culture)". Also, Ghazanfari (2006) put Costello's translation in the analytical framework of Hatim and Mason, and come to the dominant strategies in his English translation accompanying the percentage of each one. He has concluded that over-translation is the main strategy used in this translation. Yet, Ghazanfari has not studied Bashiri's translation. Montakhab & Mollanazar (2006) have discussed and classified domestication strategies into some groups: idiomatic translation, approximation,

and cultural equivalent, deletion, replacing a coined SL item with a familiar TL item, synonymy, coinage, and use of superordinate terms. Emami (1381) has discussed the identity of Costello, and the acceptability of his translation. He shows the respectability of Costello's translation by the direct message of Michael Beard:

It is a free translation, but a graceful one (even the first sentence is a fascinating transposition), and his decisions on individual phrases, wherever I checked, seemed to have a visible logic behind them. (Even when I didn't agree or wouldn't have done it that way, I always respected his choices.) I always wished he had done other translations from Persian (translation added).

Also, Hassanzadeh Amin (1393) has tried to provide a framework for translation quality assessment by applying Fairclough's CDA model to two English translations of Hedayat's novel, coming to some interesting results. In addition, Mosavat (2018) has studied the stylistic features of three excerpts from Hedayat's novel and how these features have been reflected in two English translations, concluding that the two translators have changed some stylistic features of this novel. Also, Sadeghi (2020) has analyzed the English translations of Hedayat's novel based on systematic functional grammar (SFG). As opposed to Ghazanfari (2005), who has related the popularity of Costello's translation to the point that he has been a native English speaker, Sadeghi has found that Bashiri, as a native speaker of Persian, has provided a more accurate translation according to the selected parameters in SFG. As far as it was concerned, The International Journal of Humanities has published some articles on the different aspects of translation and especially, literary translation (See Letafati, 2005; Aghagolzadeh & et.al, 2015; Arjmandi, 2016).

So far, all these articles and research have paid attention to the theoretical aspects of foreignization and domestication strategies. In a few of them, the English Translation of Hedayat's *The Blind Owl* has been investigated. Although extensive research has been carried out on Venuti's terminologies as well as Hedayat's literary works, Costello's translation has not been compared to Bashiri's

translation of the same novel to investigate the amount and the degree of domestication and foreignization, especially regarding the translator's style. This indicates a need to investigate the translator's style through the terminology Venuti has suggested. However, what is not clear yet is the relationship between the translator's style and the domesticated/foreignized translation about which this paper has been written.

Theoretical Framework

As two main translation strategies, domestication and foreignization have long been discussed in translation studies under various guises. It was German philosopher, Schleiermacher, who made a mention of it for the first time: "There are only two: either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (Baker, 1998: 241-242). After mentioning Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture on the different translation methods, Venuti comes to define his two newly coined terminologies. According to Venuti,

domestication refers to "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home", and foreignization is "an ethnic-deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (p. 20). In this sense, domestication aims to keep at a minimum the strangeness of the ST for the target readership while foreignization helps preserve something of the foreignness of the original. According to Venuti, foreignization "is specific to certain European countries at the particular historical moment" (ibid.). The question remains whether it is the case with the Persian language at the crossroad of modernization at the beginning of the 20th century.

Methodology

As a pair of dichotomies, domestication/foreignization has close affinities with other dichotomies proposed by different scholars: literal/non-literal, formal/dynamic (Nida), semantic/communicative (Newmark), direct/indirect (Vinay and Darbelnet),

overt/covert (House), among others. All these dichotomies have resulted from different shifts the translators have made in the process of translation. Having reviewed the main strategies put forward by different scholars, Montakhab & Mollanazar (2006) have tried to propose a newly devised model, yielding from various strategies. They have divided different strategies of domestication and foreignization into two main categories, putting them in the following table:

Table 1. A new combinatory model

Domestication	Foreignization
Idiomatic translation	Literal translation
Approximation	Borrowing
Cultural equivalence	Extra-lingual gloss
Deletion	Calque
Replacing a coined SL item with a familiar TL item	
Use of superordinate terms	
Paraphrase	
Modulation	
Expansion	

Data Collection

The research model developed by Montakhab & Mollanazar (2006) has been adopted here, out of which 13 procedures are used in this paper, shown in the above table. After comparing the samples, they are arranged in these 13 categories appropriately. The samples which reveal no shift are put in a different category as 'no shift'.

As for data collection, 100 samples from each English translation (a total of 200) are randomly collected. The ST sentences are presented accompanying two translations, and a comparison is made between the ST and the TT sentences. The first English sample is extracted from Costello's translation and the second one from Bashiri's translation. The English translation of *The Blind Owl* by Costello has gained noticeable acceptability among American readers and other readers elsewhere. As Ghazanfari (2005) suggested, maybe *The Blind Owl* owes its universal popularity to some extent to the translation that Costello made of it into English. However, Sadeghi has found that Bashiri's translation has been closer to the original writer's style. Also, Emami (1381) has stated

that Michael Beard, an American author, and scholar who has written a review book on *The Blind Owl*, has sent a message to him about Costello's translation quality as follows:

It is a free translation, but a graceful one (even the first sentence is a fascinating transposition), and his decisions on individual phrases, wherever I checked, seemed to have a visible logic behind them. (Even when I didn't agree or wouldn't have done it that way, I always respected his choices.) I always wished he had done other translations from Persian.

As Emami has discovered, with the help of Mr. Geoffry Roper, Desmond Patrick Costello (1912-1964) has been a professor of Russian language and literature at Manchester University. He also points out that: Professor Beard, who had rejected the idea that Costello has used the French translation of Lescot as his source of translation, and had suggested that his source has been the Russian translation of Komissarov, later in the years following the publication of his book about *The Blind Owl* doubted his idea that Costello's source has been the Russian translation of Komissarov based on some reasons. … Beard's following research about

Costello convinced him that Costello truly knew Persian.

As for Bashiri's translation, there is no evidence available of the approval and popularity of his translation (of course, there is no evidence of its rejection too). Bashiri (1975) published his first edition of the translation as "a literal translation" (p. v), with the motivation that "Costello had not adhered to the exact text of Hedayat" (ibid.). Bashiri has published his revised translation in 1984, as "the final version" (p. vi) of the translation. However, upon receiving a letter asking him to give "a sentence-by-sentence literal translation" (ibid.) of the novel, he decides to publish his new, final version in 2013: "The format was a presentation in which a sentence from the novella on the left side had the literal translation of it in English on the right side" (ibid.). Although it has been said that Bashiri's translation, compared to Costello's translation, has not successfully attracted the target language readers (Beard 1990; Ghazanfari 2005), Sadeghi (2020) has found that Bashiri's translation has kept the original

style of the Persian novel. Here are some sample sentences from both translations:

١) در زندگی زخم‌هایی هست که مثل خوره روح را آهسته در انزوا می‌خورد و می‌تراشد.

1) Dar zendegi zakhm-hāyi hast keh mesl-e khoreh ruh rā dar enzevā mikhorad va mitarāshad.

1a) There are sores which {that}slowly erode the mind in solitude like a kind of canker.

The expressions در زندگی (Dar zendegi) and می‌تراشد (mitarāshad) don't have any equivalence in the translation and have been omitted (deletion). As Emami indicates:

روح (ruh) is not the same as 'mind' and its usual equivalence is 'soul' or 'spirit'. In addition, خوره (khoreh) is not also the same as 'canker'. خوره (khoreh) is the colloquial name of جذام (jozām) whose exact English equivalence is 'leprosy'. As you can see in the Oxford English Dictionary, 'canker' (which is cancer's cognate and once has been its synonym) is not exactly 'leprosy', but refers to any vague and mysterious disease which eats away the meat like leprosy.

So, this sentence appears to be domesticated using approximation (and by the use of 'mind' especially seems more English) and more fluent to the TL readers.

1b) In life there are certain sores that, like a canker, gnaw at the soul in solitude and diminish it.

Here, 'canker' has been used too (approximation). But this translation has the same words and order as the original one and is a literal translation. Although, as Emami believes, "these kinds of exact translations repel the American or English reader".

٢) برای اوست که می‌خواهم آزمایشی بکنم، ببینم شاید بتوانیم یکدیگر را بهتر بشناسیم.

2) Barāy-e ust keh mikhāham azmāyeshi bokonam, bebinam shāyad betavānim yekdigar rā behtar beshenāsim.

2a) It is for his sake that I wish to make the attempt. Who knows? We may perhaps come to know each other better.

Here, in the case of 'who knows?' there is a cultural substitution. The rest of the sentence reveals no shift.

2b) It is for him that I want to do an experiment to see if we can know each other better.

Again, we are faced with a literal translation. Just 'if' has a different sense from شاید (shāyad) and it is not the same (modulation).

۳) من فقط برای سایة خودم می‌نویسم که جلوی چراغ به دیوار افتاده است، باید خودم را بهش معرفی بکنم.

3) Man faqat barāy-e sāye-ye khodam minevisam keh jolo-ye cherāgh beh divār oftādeh ast, bāyad khodam rā behesh mo'refi konam.

3a) I am writing only for my shadow, which is now stretched across the wall in the light of the lamp. I must make myself known to him.

No shift is seen.

3b) I write only for my shadow which is cast on the wall in front of the light. I must introduce myself to it.

As it is clear, it is a literal translation.

۴) نه، اسم او را نباید آلوده به چیزهای زمینی بکنم.

4) Na, esm-eh u rā nabāyad āludeh beh chizhā-ye zamini bokonam.

4a) No, I must not defile her name by contact with earthly things.

Here, the translator has expanded the meaning using the phrase 'by contact'.

4b) No, I should not disgrace her name with earthly things.

Here, 'disgrace' has not exactly had the meaning of defiling which Costello has used appropriately (approximation).

۵) نمی‌دانم این خانه را کدام مجنون یا کج‌سلیقه در عهد دقیانوس ساخته، چشمم را که می‌بندم نه‌فقط همة سوراخ‌سنبه‌هایش پیش چشمم مجسم می‌شود، بلکه فشار آنها را روی دوش خودم حس می‌کنم.

5) Nemidānam in khāneh rā kodām majnun yā kaj-saliqeh dar 'hd-eh daqyānus sākhteh, cheshmam rā keh mibandam na-faqat hame-ye surākh-sonbehā-yash pish-e cheshmam mojassam mishavad, balkeh feshār-e ānhā rā ruy-e dush-e khodam ehsās mikonam.

5a) They must have been built by some fool or madman heaven knows how long ago. When I shut my eyes not only can I see every detail of their structure but I seem to feel the weight of them pressing on my shoulders.

The first part of the sentence has been translated in another way (modulation). Also, نمی‌دانم (nemidānam) has been omitted (deletion). The pronoun 'they' reveals a misinterpretation of the referent, because the narrator is talking about his own house, not the other surrounding houses. کج‌سلیقه (kaj-saliqeh) has not any equivalence in the translation (deletion) and عهد دقیانوس ('hd-eh daqyānus) has been paraphrased into 'heaven knows how long ago. Also سوراخ‌سُنبه‌هایش (surākh-sonbehā-yash) has been paraphrased.

> 5b) I do not know which madman or which ill-disposed architect built this house in forgotten times, but when I close my eyes, not only do all its nooks and crannies materialize before my eyes but I feel its pressure on my shoulders.

Here, too, عهد دقیانوس ('hd-eh daqyānus) has been paraphrased into forgotten times'.

> ۶) روبه‌روی او دختری با لباس سیاه بلند، خم شده، به او گل نیلوفر تعارف می‌کرد؛ چون میان آنها یک جوی آب فاصله داشت.

> 6) Ru-be-ru-ye u dokhtari bā lebās-e siyāh-e boland, kham shodeh, beh u gol-e nilufar t'arof mikard; chon miyan-e ānhā yek joy-e āb fāseleh dāsht.

> 6a) Before him stood a girl in a long black dress, leaning towards him and offering him a flower of morning glory. Between them

> ran a little stream.

The word, چون (chon) has been omitted (deletion).

> 6b) Opposite him a girl, wearing a long, black dress, was bending to offer him a lily. She was bending because a brook intervened between them.

'She was bending' has added extra explanation (expansion). Also, 'lily' is not exactly نیلوفر (nilufar) and its equivalence is morning glory (approximation).

The translator has borrowed the name 'Nouruz' and has explained it in a footnote (extra-lingual gloss): "The national festival of Iran. It begins on 21 March and lasts for thirteen days. It is the custom to spend the last day of Nouruz picnicking in the country".

> ۷) سیزده نوروز بود.

> 7) Sizdah-e Nouruz bud.

> 7a) It was the thirteenth day of Nouruz.*

7b) It was the thirteenth day of Farvardin.

Here 'Farvardin' has been replaced with 'Nouruz' (use of superordinate terms).

۸) به هر حال، عمویم پیرمردی بود قوزکرده که شالمهٔ هندی دور سرش بسته بود، عبای زرد پاره‌ای روی دوشش بود و سر و رویش را با شال‌گردن پیچیده بود، یخه‌اش باز و سینهٔ پشم‌آلودش دیده می‌شد.

8) Beh har hāl, amuyam piremardi bud quz-kardeh keh shālmeh-ye hendi dor-e sarash basteh bud, 'bā-ye zard-e pāreh-ie ru-ye dushash bud va sar-o-ruyash rā bā shāl-gardan pichideh bud, yakheh-ash bāz va sineh-ye pashm-āludash dideh mishod.

8a) At all events my uncle was a bent old man with an Indian turban on his head and a ragged yellow cloak on his back; his face was partly concealed by a scarf wrapped around his neck; his shirt was open and revealed a hairy chest.

Here, the word 'shirt' has been used instead of a collar for یخه (yakheh) which is a subordinate of the 'shirt'.

8b) In any case, my uncle was a stooped old man who wore an Indian shalma around his head and a yellow torn cloak on his shoulders. He had covered his head and face with a scarf. His collar was open and his hairy chest could be seen.

The word شالمه (shālmeh) has been borrowed.

۹) هیچ‌وقت من به این صرافت نیفتاده بودم؛ اصلاً به‌کلی یادم رفته بود که چنین چیزی در خانه هست.

9) Hich-vaqt man beh in serāfat nayoftādeh budam; aslan beh-kolli yādam rafteh bud keh chonin chizi dar khāneh hast.

9a) I had never so much as given it a thought and had quite forgotten there was such a thing in the house.

No shift is seen.

9b) I had never thought of this wine before. I had forgotten that such a thing existed in the house.

No shift is seen.

۱۰) چشم‌های مورب ترکمنی که یک فروغ ماورای طبیعی و مست‌کننده داشت، در عین حال می‌ترسانید و جذب می‌کرد، مثل این‌که با چشم‌هایش مناظر ترسناک و ماورای طبیعی دیده بود که هرکسی نمی‌توانست ببیند.

10) Cheshmhā-ye movarab-e torkamani keh yek forogh-e māvarā-ye tabi'i va mast-konandeh dāsht, dar 'yn-e hāl mitarsānid va jazb mikard, mesl-e in-keh bā cheshmhāyash manāzer-e tarsnāk va māvarā-ye tabi'I dideh bud keh har-kasi nemitavānest bebinad.

10a) They were slanting, Turkoman eyes of supernatural, intoxicating radiance which at once frightened and attracted, as though they had looked upon terrible, transcendental things which it was given to no one but her to see.

No shift is seen.

10b) Her curved Turkmen eyes with their intoxicating supernatural beam frightened as well as attracted. She seemed to have witnessed, with those eyes, supernatural happenings beyond those any mortal could witness.

The last part of the sentence has been presented in another way.

Data Analysis

The found strategies (domestication or foreignization) are put in related categories, as can be seen from the table (below). From the total 100 samples, 14 samples contain 'no shift' in Costello's translation. In the rest of the samples, 86 shifts (domestication or foreignization) were found in the related categories.

From the total 100 samples, 35 samples contain 'no shift' in Bashiri's translation. In the rest of the samples, 65 shifts (domestication or foreignization) were found in the related categories.

	item	
	Use of superordinate terms	4
	Modulation	4
	Expansion	11
Total		74
Foreignization	Literal translation	1
	Borrowing	4
	Extra-lingual gloss	4
	Calque	3
Total		12

Table 2. Shifts in Costello's translation

Domestication	Idiomatic translation	5
	Deletion	18
	Cultural equivalence	4
	Approximation	14
	Paraphrase	13
	Replacing a coined SL item with a familiar TL	1

Table 3. Shifts in Bashiri's translation

Domestication	Idiomatic translation	1
	Deletion	12
	Cultural equivalence	1
	Approximation	10
	Paraphrase	9

	Replacing a coined SL item with a familiar TL item	0
	Use of superordinate terms	2
	Modulation	3
	Expansion	6
Total		**44**
Foreignization	Literal translation	8
	Borrowing	5
	Extra-lingual gloss	0
	Calque	8
Total		**21**

As the tables show, domestication strategies are dominant in both translations, but the considerable difference between the numbers of them in each translation signals a probable reason for Costello's success in attracting target readers.

Domestication is dominant in the shifts that existed in Costello's translation. Therefore, its success might be attributed to the way he has used this strategy, as 74 shifts out of 86 shifts belong to domestication strategies. Of course, it should be noticed that almost 14 out of the

100 samples contain no shift. In the course of investigating the samples of translation, one who reads Costello's translation will be faced with a delicate and musical literary translation that gives them pleasure reading it, so Ghazanfari (2006) has suggested, maybe *The Blind Owl* owes its universal popularity to some extent to the translation which Costello made of it into English.

As for Bashiri's translation, 44 shifts out of 65 found shifts belong to domestication strategies. Here also, we can say that domestication is dominant, but compared to the number of domestication shifts in Costello's translation, this number is low. The dominant strategies of foreignization in Bashiri's translation are literal translation and calque. This is in line with what Bashiri has claimed about his overall approach to translating this novel. Probably the lack of success of his translation lies in this matter, though there is no clear-cut reason for such a claim, and it is left unproved. However, it can be argued that 'literal translation' (and in some cases 'extremely literal renderings') repels the readers and sacrifices the meaning in some cases and delicacy and aesthetic

features in most cases. Calques, although saving the meaning, have the same effect when they are used frequently. In contrast, the dominant strategies of foreignization in Costello's translation are borrowing and extra-lingual gloss. The interesting point worthy to notice here is that for each word borrowed directly from the original text, Costello has put an extra-lingual gloss to explain it – what Bashiri has not done for the borrowed words.

As it is clear, domestication strategies are dominant in both translations. Still, the considerable difference between the numbers of them in each translation signals a probable reason for Costello's success in attracting the target readers. In both translations, the dominant strategies of domestication are deletion, approximation, and paraphrase, respectively. Note that these strategies are not culturally-bound concepts; rather, they help the reader understand the text better.

Data Evaluation

Translator's Style through Domestication/ Foreignization

As for data evaluation, what is not yet clear is the relationship between the translator's style and domesticated/foreignized translation. As Venuti (1995, p. 20) has stated, "a domesticating method is an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home" and "a foreignizing method is an ethnic-deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad". Domestication "entails translating in a transparent, fluent, 'invisible' style to minimize the foreignness of the TT." (Munday 2001, p. 146), and foreignization "entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language" (ibid., p.147). Regarding these definitions, it is not so clear how the translator's style can be related to domesticated/foreignized translation. On the one hand, the writer's style contains linguistic habits in the way he has chosen from the repertoire of his source language. On the second hand, the style has been defined as the translator's thumbprint (Baker 2000),

indicating that the translator tries to keep his imprint in his translation. Now, the problem is raised: how to relate the number and amount of domestication/foreignization in two English translations of *The Blind Owl* to the way the English translators have kept Hedayat's style in their translations. As it was said, domestication was dominant in both translations, though not the same comparing translations. Does it mean that Hedayat's style has been lost or kept through domestication strategies employed by the translators? Based on the definitions, the more a translation is domesticated, the more the original style is gone with the wind. In this sense, Hedayat's style has gone with the wind in Costello's translation. Quite the contrary, the more Bashiri has used foreignization strategies, the more he has kept Hedayat's original linguistic habits and/or style. In other words, the more a translation is foreignized, the more the original style is retained; and the more the translation is domesticated, the more the original style has gone with the wind. Simply put, Bashiri has retained Hedayat's original style since he has taken the readers toward Hedayat; hence, his visibility in the

translation; Costello has lost Hedayat's style because he has taken Hedayat toward the readers; hence, his invisibility in the translation. However, the more Bashiri has made his translation foreignized, the more he has been visible in his translation, and another way around for Costello's translation. Does it mean Bashiri has kept his imprint/style through visibility, and Costello has lost his imprint/style through invisibility? In the face of it, it does not seem to be the case. In other words, it does not mean that whenever a translation is foreignized, the original style of the text and the writer have been kept, and whenever it is domesticated, the original style has gone with the wind. No, it is not the case.

As for evaluating such claims, two Persian academic professors, are qualified at an intermediate level of English proficiency. They were asked to read three experts taken out of the novel and to compare them with their corresponding two English translations. The results showed, although they had found some shifts comparing the ST with that of the TT, both English translators have done their best to keep Hedayat's style, though in varying degrees, through domesticating strategies (in

Costello's) and foreignizing strategies (in Bashiri's). This is along the lines of what some critics have said regarding Hedayat's overall meaning of his novel. For instance, considering the original novel, Shamisa has said:

> *The Blind Owl* is a surrealist novel. Events and materials presented in surrealist works are beyond the realm of reality. The source of these illusions or variant realities lies in the unconscious or, non-technically, soul. We are confronted with the unconscious manifestations of the soul in these works. … Surrealism is free writing without any limitations and constraints even in the language area. … Surrealism works are divided into some types so that we can consider psychological novels and those that have been written in a stream of consciousness the types of surrealism. Hence, we can categorize *The Blind Owl* as a psychological novel.

(1372, p. 22, translation added)

Considering the novel as a psychological one at the macro-level, Costello and Bashiri have done their best to keep the authenticity and the idiosyncrasy of this kind of novel through their translations, though they have employed a lot of domesticating and foreignizing strategies, respectively as the above tables and figures have shown. Also, regarding the philosophical meanings of the novel, Shamisa has noted that:

> *The Blind Owl* is the story of the division of the complete soul of a human being, and a totally united entity into two components: male and female, man and his interior feminine psyche (anima), woman and her interior masculine psyche (animus), conscious and unconscious, interior and exterior life. … in *The Blind Owl*, all-male protagonists are one person and all-female protagonists also are not more than one character, and finally, this man and woman also are one, that is, they should be a single entity.

(p. 26, translation added)

Again, regarding the English translations at the macro-level, both translators have kept at the maximum, though to a different degree, to convey such meanings to the readers through

their domesticating and foreignizing strategies, respectively.

Furthermore, knowing that Bashiri's translation is dominant with foreignization, does it go along with what Venuti has meant by this strategy?

Insofar as foreignizing translation seeks to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation, it is highly desirable today, a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others. Foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism, and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations. (Venuti, 1995: 20)

In this sense, Bashiri's translation, accepting that it is dominated by foreignization than domestication, seems to "pinch against the hegemonic English-language nations and the *unequal cultural exchange*…a form of *resistance* against ethnocentrism and

racism…." (Emphasis added). As far as the studies are concerned, the original novel, though it is a cultural-based text in which a foreignized translation is preferred, is more a psychological and philosophical text than an ethnic, racial, and imperial one.

Generally speaking, though Costello has employed more such domesticating strategies as indicated in the above tables in varying degrees, and Bashiri more foreignizing strategies at the micro-level structure, there has happened no meaningful difference concerning the style of the original text and the author at the macro-level structure of the translated novel. In other words, there seems to be no meaningful relationship between the amount of domestication/foreignization and the translator's linguistic habits designated as 'style'.

Results and Conclusion

The paper aimed to show how it is possible to find a way to justify the relationship between the translator's styles through domesticating/foreignizing strategies as proposed and formulated by Venuti (1995),

among others, in two English translations of Hedayat's *The Blind Owl*. For doing so, 100 samples were chosen randomly from each translation. Then, these 200 samples were related to the given strategies for domestication and foreignization. The numbers and figures showed that Costello's translation was dominated by domesticating strategies and Bashiri's with foreignizing ones. However, regarding the macro-level structure, there appeared no meaningful relationship between domesticating/foreignizing strategies used by the translators, and how they have put their imprint and/or style in their translations. In this sense, keeping or losing the style of the original text and author has nothing to do with the domesticating/foreignizing strategies employed by the translators in the process of translation.

As opposed to Ghazanfari (2006), who claimed that there is a relationship between Costello's domesticating strategies and the popularity of this translation, this study showed that there is no clear-cut relationship between domesticating strategies and the acceptance of a translation by the readership. Also, consistent with Mosavat (2018), who

showed that some stylistic features of Hedayat's novel have been changed in the process of translating such stylistic components as transitivity, modality, and point of view, this study shows that although the domesticating/foreignizing strategies have changed some aspects of the novel at the micro-level structure, the overall style of the original text and the author have been kept in both translations. In addition, as against Hassanzadeh Amin (1393) who, trying to assess the quality of both English translations, concludes that "Costello's translation was overall chosen as the one with higher quality" (p. 207), this study is not, by itself, an evaluative, and it is not in its domain to label the two translations as good or bad. As a concluding point, it can be said that it seems a little perplexing to indicate that there is a direct and meaningful relationship between the translator's style and domesticating/foreignizing strategies used by the translators, noting that these strategies, especially the latter, have been formulated initially to "pitch against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their

global others". It is a little difficult for the cases in which the texts are translated from non-hegemonic languages such as Persian into hegemonic languages such as English.

Generally, it seems that the Persian owl sings in rather the same song in two English translations.

References

[1] Arjmandi, M. & Aghagolzade, F., (2016). Criseme in Translation of Dubliners (Eveline): A Critical Discourse analysis to the Study. *Intl. J. of Humanities*, Vol. 23 (1): (45-59).

[2] Aghagolzadeh, F. Farazandeh-pour, F., Golfam, A., Farajiha, M., (2015). Improving the Quality of Legal Translation through Cultural Transfer. *Intl. J. of Humanities*, Vol. 22 (4): (65-82).

[3] Baker, M., (1998). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, Routledge, London.

[4] Bashiri, I., (1974). *Hedayat's ivory tower: structural analysis of the blind owl*, Manor House, United Kingdom.

[5] Bashiri, I., (1984). *The fiction of Sadeq Hedayat*, Mazda Publishers, Tehran.

[6] Beard, M., (1988). *Hedayat's blind owl as a western novel*, Princeton University Press, New York.

[7] Emami, K., (2002). 'Kargah-e tarjomeh 19 darbare-ye tarjome-ye englisi Bofe-e kur' {Translation workshop (19) on English translation of '*The blind owl*' novel}, *Translator*, vol. 36, pp. Pp. 32-40. (In Persian)

[8] Ghazanfari, M., (2005). 'Domestication in literary translation: the English translation of Hedayat's *The blind owl*', *Translation Studies, vol.* 3, pp. 28-38, <*https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=44702*>.

[9] Ghazanfari, M., (2006). 'An analytical framework for evaluation of ideological orientations in translation: a glance at Hedayat's *The blind owl*', *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities of Shiraz University*, vol. 23, pp. 76-88.

[10] Hassanzadeh Amin S M., (2014). 'Proposing a framework for translation quality-quantity assessment using Fairclough's CDA: a case study of two translations of *The blind owl*', Unpublished MA thesis, Ferdowsi University, Mashhad.

[11] Hedayat, S., (2004). *Boof-e- kur*, Sadegh Hedayat Press, Esfahan. (In Persian)

[12] Hedayat, S., (1957). *The blind owl*, trans. D P Costello, Grove Press, New York.

[13] Hedayat, S., (1974/2013). *The blind owl*, trans. I Bashiri, <http://www.anglefire.com/>.

[14] Hermans, T., (1996). 'The translator's voice in translated narrative', *Target,* vol. 8, pp. 23-48.

[15] Horri, A., (2007). 'Barrasi-ye sabk-e Salehe Hosseini dar magham-e motarjem-e adabi dar dow tarjome-ye *Be sooy-e fanoos-e daryaei* va *Khashm-o-hayaho*' {A study of Saleh Hosseini's style as a literary translator in two Persian translations of *To the lighthouse* and *The sound and the fury*}, Unpublished Manuscript, Arak University, Arak. (In Persian)

[16] Horri, A., (2009). 'A study of translator's style in translated narrative texts: translation universals in the Persian translation of Woolf's *to the lighthouse*', *Translation Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 5-26.

[17] Letafati, R., (2005). Translation comprehension/re-expression. Intl. J. Humanities, 12(3), 85 91. https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=97165

[18] Montakhab, R & Mollanazar H., (2007). 'A survey of foreignization and domestication strategies in English-Persian literary translation, *Translation Studies, vol.* 4, pp. 59-78.

[19] Mosavat, M., (2018). 'Examining certain stylistic features of Hedayat's *The blind owl* and its translations by Costello and Bashiri', Unpublished MA Thesis, Ferdowsi University, Mashhad.

[20] Munday, J., (2001). *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications*, Routledge, London.

[21] Sadeghi, Y., (2020). 'Analysis of translations of *The blind owl* based on systemic functional grammar, Unpublished MA Thesis, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran.

[22] Shamisa, S., (1993). *Dastan-e yek ruh* {The story of a soul}, Ferdows Press, Tehran. (In Persian)

[23] Venuti, L., (1995). *The translator's invisibility: a history of translation,* Routledge, London.

The
International
Journal of
Humanities

راهبردهای رهگذر بومی/بیگانه‌سازی در ترجمۀ سبک نویسندۀ فارسی: دو صدا از یک بوف کور

ابوالفضل حری[۱]

[۱] . استادیار مطالعات ترجمه، گروه زبان انگلیسی، دانشکده ادبیات و زبان‌ها، دانشگاه اراک، اراک، ایران.
E-mail: horri2004tr@gmail.com

چکیده: این مقاله، سبک نویسندۀ فارسی را از رهگذر راهبردهای بومی/بیگانه‌سازی در دو ترجمۀ انگلیسی رمان بوف کور از هدایت بررسی می‌کند. سبک به‌مثابه اثر انگشت، با الگوهای تکرارشـوندۀ عـادات زبـانی نویسنده و از همین رو، مترجم سَروکار دارد. راهبردهای بومی/بیگانه‌سازی که ونوتی آنها را پیشـنهاد کـرده، حاصل تبدیل‌هایی است که مترجم در انتقال سبک متن مبدأ به مقصد انجام می‌دهد. پرسش این اسـت کـه چه ارتباطی میان سبک نویسنده و این راهبردهای مترجمان وجود دارد؟ این مقاله پس از مرور پیشینۀ بحـث و پیشینۀ راهبردها، راهبردهای اصلی را که به مقوله‌های اصلی بومی/بیگانه‌سازی تعلق دارد، در ۲۰۰ جملـه از دو ترجمۀ انگلیسی رمان به‌طور تصادفی بررسی می‌کند. نتایج نشان دادند راهبردهـای بومی‌سـازی مثـل گرته‌برداری در ترجمۀ کاستلو وجه غالب دارد؛ در ترجمۀ بشیری، راهبردهای بیگانه‌سازی وجه غالب دارند. در هر دو ترجمه، این راهبردهای بومی‌سازی وجه غالب دارند: حذف، تقریب و نقل به معنا. با این حال، بـا توجـه بـه سـطح خـرد-سـاختار، رعایت‌کـردن یـا رعایت‌نکردن سـبک نویسنده ارتبـاطی بـا راهبردهـای بومی/بیگانه‌سازی ندارد. در نتیجه، کاری چندان ساده نیست کاربست این راهبردها در متونی که از زبان‌های غیرهژمونی مثل فارسی به زبان‌های هژمونی مثل انگلیسی، ترجمه می‌شوند.

واژه‌های کلیدی: بومی‌سازی، بیگانه‌سازی، ترجمه‌های فارسی، سبک نویسنده.