Discourse and Translation: A Case Study

Mandana Eftekhar Paziraie

Tehran, Iran, Postal Code: 1484744947
Meftekhar@hotmail.com

Abstract: The present article mainly focuses on translation analysis from the perspective of discourse analysis (DA) at micro level. In order to do that, the researcher applied the framework of Farshidvard (1984) and that of Shafaie (1984) to analyze the stylistic devices and synthetic patterns, respectively in the Persian novella "The Blind Owl" written by Sadegh Hedayat (1937) and English translations of that, done by Iraj Bashiri (1937) and D.P. Costello (1957). By carrying out this qualitative, quantitative, descriptive, corpus-based research, the researcher aimed at, first, finding the probable differences and similarities between the two English translations in terms of elements in each model, and second, finding out which translator has saved Sadegh Hedayat's style more. The results showed that the frequency of stylistic devices and synthetic patterns use have obviously influenced the translation products, in turn, making a considerable difference between the two English translations; therefore, both hypotheses were rejected at the end.

1. Introduction

The term translation itself has different meanings, although generally it can be defined as a process in which there are three main categories; the subject field, the product (the text that has been translated), and the process (the act of producing the translation). Moreover, the process of translation between two different languages involves the translator changing an original written text (the source text, or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or SL) into a written text (the target text, or TT) in a different verbal language (the target language or TL) (Munday, 2010: 5). This definition connotes that translation is not a single activity. In other words, there is always a context from which the process of translation starts and another one in which the act of translation takes place. What makes the process of translation more complicated is the issue of meaning. In fact, meaning in translation can be defined as the load that is transmitted from one text to another one. Therefore, it can be concluded that similar to the process of translation, meaning is never created alone. Finding out how complex is the process of translation and transmitting the meaning through it, the need of being equipped with a useful means for analyzing the texts before and after translation is evidently felt. In other words, if a translator has the chance to own a tool, which enables him/her to analyze the texts thoroughly before and after translation, the translator might be more successful to complete the hard mission of translation and the quality of translation product might be much better. Discourse analysis (DA) is one of the tools that let the users to analyze the texts at both micro and macro level. The flexibility of discourse

analysis makes this tool advantageous. The flexible nature of discourse analysis diversifies the users as well. The users or the addressees of discourse analysis are analysts, translators, and translation teachers. The analysts can take the advantage of DA by analyzing the different translated texts to find the strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, the translators take the advantage of DA, by analyzing the texts before translation, and it helps them to have a closer connection with the texts. Finally, Translation teachers might also take the advantage of DA by teaching how the Translation students can be the self-analyzers of their own works. Regarding the above-mentioned issues, the present article is aimed at applying two models of discourse analysis, which are developed by two Persian scholars, Khosro Farshidvard (1984) and Shafaie (1984), to analyze two English translations of a Persian Masterpiece "The Blind Owl" written by one of the most significant Persian authors "Sadegh Hedayat" at micro level. In addition, through investigating and comparing the two translated texts with each other and with the source text, the researcher is going to show how the models applied can be practiced and how they can help the analyzers to find the weaknesses and strengths of the translated texts. Furthermore, by analyzing the novel and the translated versions at micro level, the researcher is going to provide the readers with some suggestions for further researches in this field of study and with the same corpus. There are different scholars (Joshua 2008, as cited in Ray, 2008, and Munday, 2010) who have shown their interests to the history of translation by carrying out various researches on this subject. Munday (2010, 9-15) believes that writing on the subject of translation goes

far back in the recorded history, and as he continues the starting point of this movement begins with the discussions of Cicero and Horace (first century BCE), and St. Jerome (forth century CE), whose writings influenced the workings up to the twentieth century. Munday goes on and describes that the study of the translation field developed into an academic discipline in the second half of the twentieth century, and before that translation had normally been an element of language learning in modern language courses. In furtherance, he discusses each period and describes the characteristics of translation at that era. For example, Munday discusses that in the late eighteenth century; 1960s, translation was used to be taught at secondary schools through grammar-translation method, the aim of which was translating Holy Bible. In 1970s, the contrastive analysis has got out, and the linguistics-oriented 'science' of translation has continued strongly in Germany. The late 1970s and the 1980s, witnessed the rise of a descriptive approach that had its origins in comparative literature and Russian Formalism. Yet, the 1990s saw the incorporation of new schools and concepts, with Canadian-based translation and gender research led by Sherry Simon, the Brazilian Cannibalist School promoted by Else Vieira. This has continued space in the first decade of the new millennium, with special interest devoted to translation, globalization, and resistance. On one hand, the importance of translation issue, which has been the field of different researchers' interest (Briceno Iragorry, 1985: 145 as cited in Bastin and Bandia, 2006: 1, Lieven D'hulst, 2001: 21 as cited in Bastin and Bandia, 2006: 1-2, and Bastin and Bandia, 2006: 2-3). For example according to Lieven D'hulst (2001: 21, as cited in Bastin and Bandia, 2006: 1-2) "the history of translation has not received the attention it merits in terms of research and cannot be compared to any other type of research in translation studies." On the other hand, the issue that is significant in the field of translation and in general in the context, is the issue of discourse, the branch, which can be considered as the field of linguistics, has won a variety of researches' (Harris, 1952, Van Dijk, 1983, Brown and Yule, 1983) attentions and interests.

"Dictionary of language and linguistics" defines Discourse analysis as the following:

*Cover term for various analyses of **discourse**. Motivated by linguistic terminology and theory (**formal logic, structuralism, transformational grammar**) it is used synonymously with **text analysis,** with a particular interest in wellformedness (**coherence, cohesion**) and deductive rules (e.g. rules for **speech acts**). While in this strand of research, texts are mainly taken to be static products (**Discourse grammar, text linguistics**), there is another strand influenced by **functional grammar, psycholinguistics,** and approaches to cognitive science that emphasizes the dynamic*

character of discourse as construction and interpretation processes by the speaker/ writer and the listener/ reader (see Brown and Yule, 1983). (1998: 352)

Although discourse analysis is not a very old field of study since it was first introduced and defined by Harris (1952), many scholars and theorists (Levinson, 2003; and Van Dijk, 1985) to name a few, have considered this field of study in a variety of social science disciplines, such as semiotics, linguistics, anthropology, cognitive psychology, and translation studies. Lemke (2004) talks about the origin of discourse analysis and believes that Aristotle, Cicero, and Longinus and followers find the root of discourse analysis in the classical Rhetorical theory. Genc et al (2006: 135) states, "critical thinking about the analysis of situations/texts is as ancient as mankind or philosophy itself." As Bressler (2007) believed discourse analysis was re-born in the sixties. In other words, the modern discourse analysis derives initially from the formalists, structuralist work of Propp on the methodology of Russian folktales, the pioneer of Genre Theory. Then it was developed by the Russian and Prague schools of functional text analysis, both for literary and non-literary genres of writing, and to a smaller extent for speech. Stubbs (1983, 10-11) explains that discourse analysis is used to refer both to the study of language above the sentence (more accurately, above the clause), and to the study of naturally occurring language. Stubbs (1983:10) believes that there are three different decisions, which have to be made in deciding how much idealization is necessary or justifiable in the study of language:

(a) the size of units to be studied: basically smaller or larger than sentences; (b) whether these consequences are to be contrived by the linguist or to be naturally occurring; and (c) whether non0linguistic factors of the context are to be studied or not.

According to Van Dijk (1985), discourse analysis has become a new cross-disciplinary field of analysis since the early 1970s. It is of interests to disciplines such as anthropology, and sociolinguistics, artificial intelligence, cognitive science, philosophy of language, and text linguistics. Van Dijk (1983) believes that discourse is analyzed first at different levels, and each level has its own sub-levels. For example, as Van Dijk states, phonology is regarded as one main level for analyzing discourse, but at this level, there are different sub-levels such as intonation, the structure of sounds, and so on. Therefore, it can be concluded that discourse analysis has a comprehensive look at the details and not only studies the main levels which can be considered as the macro level of analysis, but also discourse analysis at micro level, scrutinize the sub-categories of its main category. Discourse analysts

believe that the units and structures of discourse analysis are completely different from those of languages in which "sentence" is regarded as the biggest units of the language. Now seeing discourse analysis from this point of view, it can be said that in linguistics, language is considered as a completely abstract system in which the functions of the rules will be studied, but in discourse analysis, language in its actual use has to be considered. In other words, in discourse analysis the pragmatics side of language, based on the language functions in communicating is studied. McCarthy (2005: 144-152) compares the spoken and written discourses and believes that spoken discourse types can be analyzed for their typical patterns and the linguistic realizations that accompany them, and the periodical literature of discourse analysis abounds in detailed studies of a vast range of types. However, letters are a good example of a discourse type where the receiver is usually a specified individual or group. Moreover, McCarthy believes that although, sentence was dismissed as being dubious value as a unit of discourse in speaking, it is more obvious as a grammatical unit in writing, not exactly in all kinds of writing signs and notices. In fact, McCarthy talks about the different types of discourse and divides them under the two categories of spoken and unspoken discourses. Yet, Georgakopulou et al (1977: 3-4) talk over the units of discourse analysis and in order to do that, they identifies the differences between "text" and "discourse." As they believe considering the notion of text, in the area of discourse analysis involves the material aspect of language communication. Then, they continue and state that although these two terms have been used interchangeably in different literatures, they might be completely different. According to them, text is used in the written sense of discourse, while discourse can be meant the spoken or the written form. Therefore:

> *Discourse analysis is, in some accounts, regarded as concerned with spoken texts (primarily conversation). Text linguistics, as a different discipline, has mainly been associated with written texts. In our view, the terms do not refer to different domains (speech and writing), but reflect a difference in focus. (p. 4)*

So, discourse analysis can be regarded as an umbrella term in their viewpoints for either spoken or written communication beyond the sentence. Text is the basic means of this communication. Discourse is thus a more embracing term that calls attention to the situated uses of text: It comprises both text and context. Nazari (2010: 5) explains that the scholars after Harris (1952) believed that discourse analysis includes structure analysis of the spoken language and text analysis of the written language. This current group believes that discourse analysis mostly considers the

pragmatics or the structure of the sentence. Alba-Juez (2009) believes that text-internal elements constitute the text, while text-external elements constitute the context. Schiffrin (1994) as cited in Alba-Juez (2009), states that discourse analysis takes both text and context into consideration. Therefore, as stated above discourse analysis involves the study of both text and context, so one might conclude that discourse analysis is more completed than linguistic analysis why the former analyzes both texts and contexts, but the latter studies only texts. Moreover, it should be added to the above-mentioned facts that Hatim and Mason define the context in terms of text focus. This model of context includes the general categories of genre, tenor, and mode, as well. As specific discourse classification and text type (Hatim and Mason, 1990). Schiffrin et al., as cited in Alba-Juez (2009), states that all the definitions of discourse analysis fall into these three categories:

1. Anything beyond the sentence
2. Language use

A broader range of social practice that includes non-linguistic and non-specific instances of language (2001: 1). Although for Harris (1952) discourse was a higher level than sentences, he used discourse in its expanded meaning. Instead for them discourse was an umbrella term which involved not only the propositional content, but also social, cultural and contextual contexts. It is also interesting to know that "discourse analytical approaches take as their starting point the claim of structuralist and poststructuralist linguistic philosophy that our access to reality is always through language." (Jorgenson et al., 2002:4). Yet, McNabb (2008: 393) expresses that discourse analysis has a "triple concern" with the themes of *action,* and *variability* in the message. In the following, he states that discourse analysis is regarded by the rhetorical or argumentative organization of texts and talks. At the end, he mentions the objective of discourse analysis and tells that discourse analysis "is to take the focus of analysis away from question of *how* a text version relates to reality to ask instead how the version is designed to compete successfully with one or more alternative versions." (McNabb, 2008: 393). Solhjoo (1998) also believes that discourse, includes larger units than sentences. Solhjoo believes that if the rules of discourse are applied, the sentences in a paragraph can be stated more concretely, which make the reader and the hearer move from one sentence to another easier. After introducing some approaches to discourse analysis, may be this question comes to mind that why analyzing discourse is important or in other words what kinds of application it can have. In order to answer such a question some possible application of discourse analysis can be provided. As it is written in Jorgenson's et al. article: "It can be used for analyzing the national

identity: how can we understand national identities and what consequences do the division of the world into nation states have?" (2002: 2).   Sanders and Maat (2006) declares that discourse shows connectedness and they state that the central objective of linguists who work on discourse analysis is characterizing this connectedness. In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider this connectedness and explain the text connectedness in terms of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 13) as cited in Sanders and Maat (2006: 591) "these explicit clues make a text a text." Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) as cited in Milagros Del Saz Rubio (2007: 24) state that cohesion "occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another." Having investigated the theoretical issues in discourse analysis, the researcher now will refer to the practical aspects of the related issue. It should be recalled that in this part, it has been tried to take a though look at some of the researches (articles, theses, dissertations, etc) which have been conducted on discourse analysis in different fields of study, literature preferably, narrative genre specifically. Rahimian *et al.* (2003) have analyzed one of the Jalal Al Ahmad's stories, "the school principal", from the discourse analysis point of view. They have applied the frameworks of Hatch (1992) to analyze the text at macro level and that of Halliday and Hasan (1976) to analyze the text at micro level. By analyzing the text at micro an macro level, they have shown how much cohesively the text is written, and if the text is a normal narration based on Hatch's model. Another research similar to the above-mentioned one has been conducted by Susan Nirmala (2009) in which she analyzed the discourse in "the man-eater of Malgudi" narrative. She applied a linguistic view on discourse, and explained the linguistic relations and its sub-categories such as anaphoric, cataphoric, cohesion, redundant, exclamations, repetitive phrases, all of which were used in the novel. After that, she investigated the dialogue discourse and finally she concluded that the language that the author has used in the novel was simple and enjoyable.

The other research, which was conducted in the field of discourse analysis is that of Labov *et al.* (1967, as cited in Schiffrin, 2001) which were done about "PEN" (Personal Experienced Narrative). In this research, they have gathered fourteen stories people narrated about their personal experiences mostly the embarrassing ones, and then they analyzed the discourse in these narratives based on a "formal" approach. Based on what they reported a clause in PEN can have two functions; referential and evaluative; referential clauses, have to do with what the story is about events, characters, and setting. Evaluative clauses, on the on the other hand, have to do with why

the narrator is telling the story and why the audience should listen to it. In another research, Navas Brenes (2005) conducted a research on analyzing an oral narrative using discourse analysis tools. The researcher used a narrator, who told an anecdote about a danger-of-death experience, then he analyzed the narration from different dimensions; characteristics of spoken texts, formulaic expressions, subordination with all their sub-categories and finally discourse analysis. Then he showed that how discourse analysis could provide EFL students with key tools in order to show them how spoken language works in authentic contexts.

1.1. The significance of *"The Blind Owl"*

There were multiple reasons for choosing the novella for this study. The reasons are as following: This novella, which is authored by Sadegh Hedayat (1937), who is regarded as Iran's foremost modern writer of prose fiction and short stories (Shamissa, 2000), is the most enduring work of prose and a major literary work of 20th century Iran (Shamissa, 2000). As shamissa (2000: 18) believes various scholars have written books on the novella as well as various movies that have been produced based on it. Moreover, scholars such as Andre Breton, the surrealists' leader, have talked over the novella. Moreover, this novella is rated as the #7 most significant Persian novels by Guardian bookshop (2011). Besides, the importance of the novella, another reason for choosing this novella, was that, this book is among the few Persian novels that have been translated into English by both English and Persian translators. In other words, each of these two translators had some advantages. In fact, since the source text is in Persian, the Persian translator could take the advantage of better understanding of the source text; however, although the English translator doesn't have the equal chance for understanding the Persian language much better than the Persian translator, he could take the advantage of better understanding of the target language. Since Bashiri is fluent in English, (Wikipedia, 2012), and Costello had written different works in English including; the Oxford Russian-English Dictionary, The rag tree: A novel of Ireland (bookfinder, 2012) the researcher aimed at finding out whether there is any difference between the two translations in terms of keeping the stylistic devices and synthetic patterns used by the original writer.

2. Material and Methods

In order to carry out this research, the researcher has applied the frameworks of Shafaie (1984) and that of Farshidvard (1984), to figure out the synthetic patterns and stylistic devices in the Persian novella and the English translated ones, respectively. The synthetic patterns include the type of sentences, ranging simple, compound, and complex sentences,

form of the sentences including assertive, interrogative, imperative, exclamation, conditional, active, and passive sentences. Moreover, the nominal and verbal sentences are analyzed as well. Yet, in explaining the micro level, the stylistic devices used in the story, are very important. The most important devices include description, simile, slang, and colloquial prose. In order to make the aims of the research more clear, the following questions and hypotheses are going to be raised here, all of which are considered the major focus of this research:

1. Are there any difference between the Bashiri's (1974) and Costello's (1957) English translations of "The Blind Owl" in terms of keeping the stylistic devices of the source text from the perspective of discourse analysis at micro level put by Farshidvard (1984)?

2. Are there any difference between the Bashiri's (1974) and Costello's (1957) English translations of "The Blind Owl" in terms of keeping the synthetic patterns of the source text from the perspective of discourse analysis at micro level put by Shafaie (1984)?

$H_0 1$: There is no difference between the two English translations of "The Blind Owl" in terms of keeping the stylistic devices of the source text from the perspective of discourse analysis at micro level put by Farshidvard (1984).

$H_0 2$: There is no difference between the two English translations of "The Blind Owl" in terms of keeping the synthetic patterns of the source text from the perspective of discourse analysis at micro level put by Shafaie (1984).

1.2. Corpus

The corpuses under the study included: 55 pages equals to 3237 sentences selected randomly out of 98 pages of Sadegh Hedayat's novella "The Blind Owl" *[Boof-e-Koor]* written in 1937, along with two of its English Translations one done by Iraj Bashiri (1974) and the other by Costello (1957).

2.2. Data Collection

This study basically aimed at contrasting the Persian source text and the two English translated texts to look for the synthetic patterns and stylistic devices. In this regard, any manipulation in the English translations, comparing to those in the original Persian novella, were precisely scrutinized within the DA frameworks at micro level proposed by Shafaie (1984) and Farshidvard (1984). As mentioned above, in order to do that, the researcher studied 55 pages or more exactly 3273 sentences of the Persian novella to look for the synthetic and stylistic devices under the investigation and then scrutinized the same number of sentences in the two English versions, to find the same item as well. Finally, she provided some tables in which, the frequency and percentage of each item for

both the original and the translated texts were inserted, based on which, the researcher made the conclusion.

3. Results

1.3. The Analysis of the Synthetic Patterns

The following table shows the most significant synthetic patterns that were found in the source and target texts. The analysis of table 1 is as the following:

Table1: synthetic patterns in the Persian version of "The Blind Owl" and the English translations done Bashiri (1974) and Costello (1957)

Hedayat's Novella (1937)	Bashiri's Translation (1974)	Costello's Translation (1957)
نمونه 1: من فقط برای سایه خودم می نویسم که جلو چراغ به دیوار افتاده است، باید خودم را بهش معرفی بکنم. (ص. 4) *[Man faghat baraye sayeye khodam minevisam ke joloye cheragh be divar oftadeh ast. Bayad khodam ra behesh moarefi bokonam.(p. 4)]*	Sample 1: I write only for my shadow, which is cast on the wall in front of the light. I must introduce myself to it. (p. 2)	Sample 1: 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. (p. 3)
نمونه 2: سه ماه‌نه- دو ماه و چهار روز بود که پی او را گم کرده بودم، ولی یادگار چشمهای جادویی یا شراره کشنده چشمهایش در زندگی من همیشه ماند. چطور می توانم او را فراموش بکنم که آنقدر وابسته به زندگی من است؟ (ص. 5) *[Se maah-na-do maah va chahar rooz boob ke paye oo ra gom karde bodam, vali yadegare cheshmhaye jadoye ya sharareye koshandeye cheshmhayash dar zndegie man hamishe mand. Chetor mitavanam oo ra faramoosh bokonam ke anghadr vabasteh be zengedie man ast? (p. 5)]*	Sample 2: It was three months, no, it was two months and four days since I had lost her, but the memory of her enchanting eyes, no, the attractive malice of her eyes, remained in my life forever. How can I forget one who is so pertinent to my life? (p. 2)	Sample 2: It is three months- no, it is two months and four days-since I lost her from sight but the memory of those magic eyes, of the fatal radiance of those eyes, has remained with me all times. How can I forget her, who is so intimately bound up with my own existence? (p. 4)
نمونه 3: تمام شب را به این فکر بودم. چندین بار خواستم از روزنه دیوار نگاه بکنم ولی از صدای خنده پیرمرد میترسیدم. (ص. 10) *[tamame shab ra be in fekr bodam. Chandin bar khastam az rozaneye divar negah bokonam vali az sedaye khandeye piremard mitarsidam (p. 10)]*	Sample 3: I thought about this throughout the night. Several times I wanted to go to the hole in the wall and look, but I was afraid of the old man's laughter. (p. 6)	Sample 3: All that night I thought about these things. Again and again I was on the point of going to look through the aperture in the wall, but fear of the old man's laughter held me back. (p. 12)

In Sample one of the Persian novella, there are two sentences: the first sentence is a complex sentence, and the second one is a simple sentence. Moreover, there are two assertive sentences, both of which are active and nominal sentences. This categorization is similar to sample one of Bashiri's, and Costello's translations. Therefore, in sample one there is no difference between sentences regarding the synthetic patterns. In sample two of the Persian novella, there are three sentences, the first sentence is a compound complex; therefore, it is regarded as two assertive sentences. Moreover, the final sentence is an interrogative sentence, all the three sentences are active, and except the interrogative one, there are nominal sentences. In sample two of Bashiri's translation; however, there are four sentences. In addition, there are one simple sentence, two compound sentences, and one complex sentence. Therefore, there are five assertive sentences, and one interrogative sentence. Furthermore, the assertive sentences are

nominal, except the interrogative sentence, and active sentences. The categorization is the same in Costello's translation. Thus, in sample 2, the English translations have a bit difference with the source text according to the number of synthetic patterns. In sample three of the Persian novella, there are two sentences. The first sentence is simple, but the second sentence is compound. Therefore, there are three assertive sentences, three nominal and three active sentences. However, in Bashiri's English translation, there are three sentences, the first sentence is simple, the second one is compound, and the third one is compound as well. Therefore, there are four assertive, four active, three nominal, and one verbal sentence. On the other hand, there are three sentences in Costello's English translation. The first sentence is simple, and the second sentence is compound. Therefore, there are three assertive, three active, two nominal, and one verbal sentence. Regardless of samples one and two, it can be stated that based on sample three, Costello's translation is much closer to the source text according the use of synthetic patterns.

Table 2: The Frequency and percentage of *Synthetic Patterns* in the source and translated texts

Type of sentence		Hedayat's novella (1937)	Bashiri's translation (1974)	Costello's translation (1957)
Simple	Frequency	320	336	331
	Percentage	10%	10%	10%
Compound	Frequency	332	239	308
	Percentage	10%	7%	10%
Complex	Frequency	32	185	217
	Percentage	1%	6%	7%
Assertive	Frequency	773	644	762
	Percentage	24%	20%	24%
Interrogative	Frequency	51	44	45
	Percentage	2%	1%	1%
Imperative	Frequency	4	5	3
	Percentage	0%	0%	0%
Exclamatory	Frequency	3	3	3
	Percentage	0%	0%	0%
Conditional	Frequency	15	10	13
	Percentage	0%	0%	0%
Nominal	Frequency	773	684	787
	Percentage	24%	21%	24%
Verbal	Frequency	80	89	50
	Percentage	2%	3%	2%
Active	Frequency	826	729	676
	Percentage	26%	23%	21%
Passive	Frequency	28	43	42
	Percentage	1%	1%	1%
Total Number		3237	3237	3237

Moreover, table (2) shows the frequency and percentage of each synthetic pattern in the Hedayat's "The Blind Owl" and the two English translations. Regarding the above table, it can be stated that the percentages of simple and compound sentences were equal in the source novel, but the percentage of complex sentences was much less than the other two kinds of sentences. However, although the percentage of simple sentences were the same among both English translation, the percentages of compound and complex sentences are more in Costello's translation than that of Bashiri's. Moreover, the percentage of assertive sentences was more than interrogatives in the source text; however, although the percentage of interrogative sentences was the same in both English translation, the

percentage of statements are more in Costello's translation than in Bashiri's. Furthermore, the percentages of imperative, exclamatory, and conditional sentences were the same in both source and translated texts. In addition, although the percentages of nominal sentences were more than the percentages of verbal sentences in both source and translated text, it should be stated that the percentages of nominal sentences were equal in both English translated texts, but the percentage of verbal sentences is more in Bashiri's English translation than in Costello's one.

Table 3: samples of stylistic devices used in the source and translated texts

Hedayat's Novella (1937)	Bashiri's Translation (1974)	Costello's Translation (1957)
نمونه 1: به هر حال عموم پیرمردی بود قوز کرده که شالمه هندی دور سرش بسته بود، و سر و رویش را با شال گردن پیچیده بوددیخه اش باز بود و سینه پشم آلودش دیده میشد. پلک های ناسور سرخ و لب شکری داشت. (ص. 7) *[sample one: be har hal amoyam pirmardi bood ghooz karde ke shalmeye hendi dore saresh basteh bod, va sar o royash ra ba shal garden pichede bood, yakheash baaz bood vaa sineye pashm aloodash dide mishod. Pelkhaye nasoor sorkh va labe shekari dasht (p. 7)]*	Sample 1: 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. One cold count the hairs of his thin bread as it protruded through his scarf. With his red, fistular eyelids and leprous lip, … (p. 4)	Sample 1: 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. (p. 7)
نمونه 2: لبخند مدهوشانه و بی اداره ی کنار لیش خشک شده بود، مثل اینکه به فکر شخص غایبی بوده باشد. از آنجا بود که چشمهای مهیب افسونگر، چشمهایی که مثل این بود که به انسان سرزنش تلخی میزند، چشمهای مضطرب، متعجب، تهدید کننده، و وعده دهنده او را دیدم و پرتو زندگی من روی این گودیهای براق پر معنی ممزوج و در ته آن جذب شد. (ص. 8) *[sample 2: labkhande mahdoshaneh va bi eradeye kenare labash khoshk shode bood, mesle inke be fekre shakhse ghayebi boodeh bashad. Az anja bood ke cheshmhaye mahibe afsoongar, cheshmhaye moztareb, moteajeb, tahdid konande,va vade dahandeye oo ra didam, va dar parto zendegi man roye in godihaye baragh por mani mamzooj va dar tahe aan jazb shod (p. 8)]*	Sample 2: and an unconscious, involuntary smile had dried to the corner of her lips; it seemed as though she was thinking of an absent person. It was from the stool that I saw her dreadful charming eyes, eyes, which were enchanting and reproachful at the same time. It was to the shining and dreadful balls of those worried, threatening, and inviting eyes that my single beam of life was attracted, and it was to the depth of those same eyes that my life was drawn and in them annihilated. (p. 5)	Sample 2: she wore on her lips a vague, involuntary smile as though she was thinking of someone who was absent. It was then that I first behold those frightening, magic eyes, those eyes, which seemed to express a bitter reproach to mankind, with their look of anxiety and wonder, of menace and promise-and the current of my existence was drawn towards those shining eyes charged with manifold significance and sank into their depths. (p. 9)
ولی من!من که بی ذوق و بیچاره بودم، یک نقاش روی جلد قلمدان، چه میتوانستم بکنم؟ با این تصاویر خشک و براق و بی روح که همه اش به یک شکل بود چه میتوانستم بکشم که شاهکار بشود؟ (ص. 18) Vali man! Man ke bi zogh o bichareh bodam, yek naghashe roye jelde ghalamdan, che mitanavestam bokonaam? Be in tasavire khsohk o baragh o bi rooh ke hameash be yek shekl bood che mitanavestam bekesham ke shahkar beshavad? (p. 18)	Sample 3: But I, who was devoid of talent and who was poor, a painter of pencase covers, what could I do? With these dry, glistening and lifeless pictures, all of which were the same, as models, what could I paint that would become a masterpiece? (p. 12)	Sample 3: But I, listless and helpless as I was, I, the decorator of pencase covers, what could I do? What means had I of creating a masterpiece when all that I could make were my lifeless, shiny little, each of them identical with all the rest? (p. 23)

Table 4: frequency and percentage of *stylistic devices* in the source and translated texts

The Element		Hedayat's novella (1937)	Bashiri's Translation (1974)	Costello's Translation (1957)
Description	Frequency	336	290	332
	Percentage	85%	96%	89%
Simile	Frequency	39	10	58
	Percentage	10%	3%	15%
Slang	Frequency	13	0	0
	Percentage	3%	0%	0%
Colloquial prose	Frequency	6	1	0
	Percentage	2%	0%	0%
Total Number		394	301	390

2.3. The Analysis of Stylistic Devices

In this part, the researcher examined the frequency and percentages of the stylistic devices introduced by Farshidvard (1984). However, in the beginning and, she has provided the most significant samples of these devices in the source and translated texts in table 3. The analysis of table 3 is as the following:

In sample one of the Persian novella, there are eight descriptions, all of which are the descriptions of the narrator's uncle; however, in the sample one of Bashiri's English translation there are up to ten descriptions, and in Costello's English translation there are also eight descriptions. Therefore, this number is the same as Persian novella. In sample two of the Persian novella, there are ten descriptions, and two similes. However, in the English translation of Bashiri, there are twelve descriptions, and there is only one simile. In the English translation of Costello, there are ten descriptions and one simile. In sample three of the Persian novella, there are five descriptions. However, in Bashiri's English translation, there are seven descriptions. Moreover, in Costello's English translation, there are six descriptions. According to the results achieved from the above table, it can be stated that Costello's use of stylistic devices is closer to the source text, than Bashiri's English translation. Furthermore, table 4 shows the frequency and percentage of stylistic devices applied in the Persian novella "The Blind Owl" and the two English translations. According to the above table, it can be stated that hedayat has used the most number of stylistic devices than the two translations. Moreover, as the results show, the percentages of description and simile were more in Costello's translation than in Bashiri's; In addition, the percentages of slang and colloquial prose were the same in both translations.

4. Discussions

Based on the data achieved from analyzing the synthetic patterns put by Shafaie (1984), among the 3237 items analyzed in both the source and translated texts, it should be stated that the percentages of simple, compound, assertive, nominal, and verbal sentences in Costello's translation have been much closer than the percentages of Bashiri's to the source text. On the other hand, the percentages of complex, and active sentences in Bashiri's translation were much closer to the source text than the percentages of Costello's. Furthermore, it should be stated that the percentages of interrogative sentences was the same between both translations. Finally, according to the data, it can be stated that the percentages of simple, imperative, exclamatory, conditional, and passive sentences were the same among all the texts under the study. Regarding the above-mentioned facts, since the data achieved from analyzing the Costello's translation was much closer to the source text than that of Bashiri's, it can be claimed that Costello has kept the synthetic patterns more than Bashiri in his translation. In other words, according to synthetic patterns, Costello's translation has been more successful in saving the originality of the source text. On the other hand, according the data achieved from analyzing the stylistic devices put by Farshidvard (1984) it should be stated that Hedayat's use of stylistic devices has been more than the translators. However, as the data show, Costello has used neither slang, nor colloquial prose in his translation, while Hedayat has used these two elements. Moreover, according to the data, Costello's frequency of description and simile use has been much closer to that of Hedayat; therefore, it can be stated that Costello has been more successful in saving the originality of the source text and that he has kept the similarity of the use of stylistic devices more than Bashiri, considering the source text. In addition, as the results indicate, Costello's translation has been more successful in keeping the original text stylistic devices and synthetic patterns. Of course, it should be mentioned that, this study aimed at comparing the two English translations of a Persian novel to find out which English translation has saved the synthetic patterns and stylistic devices used by the original writer more than the other. Therefore, based on the results, one cannot conclude that Costello's translation has been more successful than that of Bashiri in any other terms except the ones that were studied in this article.

5. Conclusion

This study analyzed Hedayat's "The Blind Owl" and the two English translations of that, by applying two frameworks of discourse analysis introduced by Shafaie (1984) and Farshidvard (1984), at micro level, with the aim of finding out if there is any difference between the two English translations according to each framework; therefore, two hypotheses were stated. The data achieved from the analysis of corpus indicated that regarding the Shafaie's model (1984) for analyzing synthetic patterns, Costello's translation was closer to the source text; therefore, the hypothesis one was rejected. Furthermore, the data also indicated that regarding the Farshidvard's model (1984) for analyzing stylistic devices, it turned out that Costello's translation has

been more successful than that of Bashiri's. In other word, in comparison with Bashiri, Costello's translation has kept the style of Hedayat in his translation more. Therefore, hypothesis two was rejected as well.

At the end, the researcher has provided the readers with some suggestions;

- ✓ According to Fairclough's framework (1989) what are the similarities and differences between the frequency of omissions and additions in the two English translations of "The Blind Owl?"
- ✓ According to Hatch's model (1992) what are the similarities and differences between the constitutional elements in the English translation of "The Blind Owl?"

Acknowledgements:

Corresponding Author:
Mandana Eftekhar Paziraie
Tehran, Iran,Postal Code: 1484744947
Meftekhar@hotmail.com

References

1. Alba-Juez, L. (2009). *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice.* UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing .
2. Bashiri, I. & Hedayat, S. (1974). The Blind Owl. [Literal Translation]. In Bashiri, ed., *Hedayat's Ivory Tower,* Minneapolis: Manor House.
3. Bastin, L. G, & Bandia, F. P. (2006). *Charting the Future of Translation History.* Canada: University of Ottawa Press.
4. *Bookfinder.* (2012). Retrieved May, 25, 2012 from.
5. Bressler, Ch. E. (2007). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice. Fourth Edition.* New Jersey: Pearson.
6. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1984). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Costello, D. P. (1957). *The Blind Owl.* USA: John Calder (Publishers) Ltd.
8. Del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2007). *English Discourse Markers of Reformulation.* Germany: Peter Long AG, International Academic Publishers.
9. Farshidvard, Kh. (1984). *Darbareye Adabiat va Naghd-e-Adabi. [About Literature and Literary Criticism].*vol, 1 & 2. Tehran: Amir Kabir.
10. Genc, B., & Boda, E. (2006). Oral Narrative Discourse of Anaphoric References of Turkish EFL Learners. *Reading Matrix, Vol. 6, No. 2.* Retrieved November 25, 2010, from. http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/genc_bada/article2.pdf.
11. Georgakopoulou , A., & Goutsos, D. (1977). *Discourse Analysis, An Introduction.* England: Edinburg University Press.
12. *Guardian Book shop.* (2012). Retrieved May, 10, 2012 from. http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2011/jul/20/kamin-mohammadi-top-10-iranian-books.
13. Halliday, M.A.K, & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longmans.
14. Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, Vol. 28, No. 1. USA: Linguistic society of America.
15. Hatch, Evelyn. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator.* London: Longman.
17. Hedayat, S. (1937). *Boof-e-Koor. [The Blind Owl].* Tehran: Moassesseye Matboati-e Amir Kabir.
18. Jorgenson, M., & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* Sage Publication: London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi.
19. Lemke, J. L. (2004). *Important Theories for Research Topics on the Website Discourse Analysis.* Retrieved November 25, 2010, from. http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/theories.htm#Discourse%20Analysis.
20. Levinson, Stephen, C. (2003). *Pragmatics.* England: Cambridge University Press.
21. McCarthy, M. (2005). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* UK: Cambridge University Press.
22. McNabb, D. (2008). *Research Methods in Public Administration and Nonprofit Management, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (2nd ed.). USA: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
23. Munday, J. (2010). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* USA & Canada: Taylor & Francis e-library.
24. Navas Brenes, C. A., (2005). *Analyzing an Oral Narrative Using Discourse Analysis Tools: Observing How Spoken Language Works.* Retrieved November 23, 2010.
25. Nazari, F. (2010). Ashenaee Moghadamati ba Gofteman, Tahlile Gofteman va Tahlile Enteghadi Gofteman. [Basic Acquaintance with Discourse, Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis]. Retrieved November25, 2010.
26. Nirmala, S. (2009). *A Discourse Analysis of R. K. Narayan's: The Man-Eater of Malgudi.* Vol. 9, 35-45.
27. Rahimian, j., & Momeni, A. (2003). Tajziye va Tahlile Goftemani Dastan E Modire Madrese. [A Discourse Analysis of the School Principal]. *Nashriyeye Daneshkadeye Adabiat va Oolume Ensani Daneshgahe Shahid Bahonar Kerman.[Journal of Kerman Shahid Bahonar University; Human and Art Faculty.* No. 12, 43-66.
28. Ray, M. K. (2008). *Studies in Translation; Translation: Its Brief History and Theory* (2nd rev. Enlarged ed.)*.* India: Nice Printing Press, Delhi.
29. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. (1998).* London and New York: Routledge.
30. Sandres, T., & Maat, H. P. (2006). *Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approaches.* Netherlands: Elsevier.
31. Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* UK: Blackwell Publishers.
32. Shafaie, A. (1984). *Mabani-e- Elmi-e- Dastouri-e-Zaban-e-Farsi [Scientific Principles of Persian Grammar].* Tehran: Entesharat Novin.
33. Shamissa, S. (2000). *Dastan-e Yek Rooh [The Story of One Soul]. Tehran: Entesharate Ferdos.*
34. Solhjoo, A. (2009). *Goftman va Tarjomeh.[Discourse and Tranlastion].*Tehran: Nashr Markaz.
35. Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
36. Van Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse Analysis: Its Development and Application to the Structure of News, *Journal of Communication*. Vol. 33. No. 2. pp. 20-43.
37. Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Dimensions of Discourse. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 2.* London: Academic Press.
38. *Wikipedia.* (2012). Retrieved May, 25, 2012 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraj_Bashiri.

8/3/2012