

A Translation Criticism: A critical study of discourse in translation

Masood KHOSHSALIGHEH
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Abstract/Résumé

Le présent article est une étude de traduction descriptive qui utilise un modèle de critique de la traduction basée sur l'analyse critique du discours. L'étude a pour but de réfléchir sur un éventuel impact des orientations idéologiques et des préjugés des traducteurs sur leurs décisions au cours de la traduction. L'étude porte principalement sur l'intervention des idéologies qui sont sous-jacentes au subconscient des traducteurs. Les traducteurs inexpérimentés qui n'ont pas reçu de formation professionnelle ont été choisis. Dix traductions en anglais sur l'histoire du féminisme réalisées par dix participantes iraniennes ont été étudiées. Les résultats de l'analyse montrent que les écarts qui ne sont pas forcément dus aux différences linguistiques existent bien entre le texte cible et le texte source. Ces écarts peuvent être expliqués par les représentations des idéologies de traducteurs.

Keywords/Mots-clés

Translation criticism, CDA, ideology, intervention, Persian and English.

I. Introduction

Translation has had various functions and has been put into use for a myriad of purposes; in particular it has been a means to social ends. The social movement of Feminism, for instance, utilizes translating and translation strategies among others to amplify the 'voice' of women in society; their research focus in this regard has been detection of attempts and approaches which could result in the absence of the voice of women in the translated text and processes of translation (Fazeli, 2009). This instrumentality of translation especially in the social domain germinates from the fact that translation as an instance of language use is a vigorous form of social practice (Fairclough, 1989). Also considering the insights from critical discourse analysis (CDA) in terms of interaction and interdependence of society and language—with translation as an act of rewriting and reproducing language (Lefevere, 1992)—approaching evaluation

and criticism of the translated text does not pose a one-dimensional and easy-to-reach image.

According to Farahzad (2009) the terms translation quality assessment (TQA) and translation criticism have been in use interchangeably in the field; she believes that the confusion may come from the fact that they all examine a metatext in comparison with a protext in spite of varied objectives and focuses. Advocating a CDA-based approach to translation criticism, she clarifies the difference between quality assessment and criticism of translation:

Translation evaluation starts with a protext-metatext comparison and ends there. It is restricted to textual boundaries. It ... [is] looking for right and wrong/good and bad, within the limits of an ever changing concept of equivalence. Translation criticism, in the present model, uses the same starting point, but focuses on representations, power relations and ideologies by examining textual features, the translator's lexical, syntactic, and other choices, their implications, and their impacts on and within the socio-historical contexts in which the translation is produced and received. Translation criticism may as well study translations, as independent texts, and their impacts in the target society, or translation trends through history, in which case it may draw upon socio-historical evidence rather than any protext-metatext comparison. (pp. 39-40)

A number of scholars have studied the role and effect of ideology and social variables on translation and the translator. Hatim and Mason (1997) illuminated that the issue of ideology in translation and that ideology impinges on the work of the translator; they refer to scholarly works (Hermans, 1985, Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, Venuti, 1995) which reveal the traces of translator's views in translation and the fact that the translator's preferences and orientations, cultural and otherwise, result in marked consequences in the translated text. Similarly, Newmark (1981) argues that opting for semantic or communicative translation is a choice towards mass readership or single voice of the text writer. This option is believed to be implicitly ideological, where Hatim and Mason (1997) refer to this visible trend as mediation. They explain (see

Hatim & Mason, 1997) the extent to which translators mediate in the transfer process, in-putting their own knowledge and views into their rendition of a text. They demonstrate the range of this mediation on a continuum with three posts: minimal, maximal and partial mediation, maintaining that “there is a host of textual device which may serve as the vehicles for a discourse and provide evidence of the assumptions which compose an ideology” (pp. 148-163).

Based on the notions of intertextuality integrated in her model, Farahzad (2009) considers a text as the absorption and transformation of another text. She explains that “intertextuality questions the concepts of origin and source ... no text is original, no text is source of another” (p. 40). Although, traditionally, translation involves two text categories, namely source and target text, she tends to call the former ‘protext’ and the later ‘metatext’ (see Farahzad, 2008, 2009). She contends, in translation as an act of intertextual practice, the metatext:

- a. overtly and covertly repeats and transforms the protext in terms of content and form;
- b. is not a reproduction of any other text, including the protext;
- c. reflects only one of the possible meanings (interpretations) of the protext;
- d. bears the voice of the translator;
- e. can never be equivalent to the protext, because it unfolds in a different linguistic, sociohistorical and intertextual context,
- f. reflects linguistic, social, ideological and discursive conventions and norms of the receiving society. (2009, p. 41)

The present study aims at detecting the traces and voices of non-professional translators in the translated text. So the following research question in the study is formulated and addressed. Do nonprofessional translators reflect and display their own ideologies in the translated text?

As the suggested criticism model advocated by Farahzad (2009) draws on the principles of critical discourse analysis, a quick review of the basics of critical study of discourse is given below to clarify the theoretical framework of the study. However, prior to that the concept of ideology from several angles are presented and discussed in

the following.

II. Ideology and discourse

It is barely possible to find one single adequate definition of ideology. In this regard, Eagleton (1991) states a reason for this missing comprehensive definition as there is an entire spectrum of useful meanings for the term, 'ideology', some of which do not even seem to be fully compatible with each other. He further states that an attempt to incorporate such riches of meaning into one individual definition would be therefore not helpful, even if possible. To Eagleton, ideology is a *text* woven of a whole tissue of various conceptual strands. In the following, there is a number of presently circulating definitions of ideology by which Eagleton (1991) pictures the diversity of the meaning of the term.

- a. The process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life
- b. A body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class
- c. Ideas that help legitimate a dominant political power
- d. False ideas that help legitimate a dominant political power
- e. Forms of thoughts motivated by social interests
- f. Identity thinning
- g. Socially necessary illusion
- h. The conjecture of discourse and power
- i. The confusion of linguistic and phenomenal variety
- j. Semiotic closure
- k. Action-oriented sets of beliefs

As noted above, the definitions seem to share certain commonalities as well as incompatibilities and even conflicts, providing support for the claim that ideology is a diverse term and too rich of meanings that avoids a single all-inclusive definition.

From another perspective, Hawkes (2003) states that postmodernism is a means devised to deny the binary contradiction between capital and labor in the contemporary

societal structure. Realizing that capital is nothing but objectified labor which is totally in opposition with human subjective activity and in conflict with life itself is the accurate comprehension of the dilemma of our current era. He asserts that there are determined and strong modes of thoughts trying to obscure this comprehension on the purpose of the postmodernism, and he names these modes as 'ideology'.

In this regards, Hatim and Mason (1997) express that in the Western world, it is accepted that in the realm of journalism and popular writing on politics to consider ideologies as deviations from the established norms. To disapprove of this perspective, they bring the example that often times in western media, such a statement is made that a particular political move or measure is ideologically motivated, and they criticize such statements as if other moves were not. In the end, they with Simpson (1993) define ideology as the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups.

More to the point, despite all the given vagueness as well as vastness of the concept of ideology, van Dijk (1998) argues that it is barely any vaguer than other notions in humanities and social sciences such as 'society', 'power', 'mind', 'knowledge' and even 'discourse' among several others. He believes that definitions are mostly inadequate to capture all the complex intricacies of such notions like 'ideology'. Nevertheless, it is believed that definitions should not be expected to sum up all the multiple insights accommodated in such bodies of knowledge even though there were not any controversies over the meaning of constructs like ideology. In spite of all the various approaches to the notion of ideology, the historical terms have a shared routine back to the eighteenth century, at a time when Destutt de Tracy suggested a 'science of ideas' to be named *ideologie*, a discipline that never made it, in case we do not take philosophy or even psychology as the existing representatives (van Dijk, 1998).

According to the writing of this French philosopher, Tracy, ideology has to do with the system of beliefs, particularly social, political and religious beliefs which a social group shares. With Tracy, to exemplify this, van Dijk (2000) names communism as well as anti-communism, socialism and liberalism, feminism and sexism to name a few among others that some may be more or less negative or positive depending on our own point of view and group membership. To van Dijk (2000) a working definition of ideology could be "the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members." Still in many

social sciences a negative notion of ideology as a system of self-serving beliefs of the dominant group does exist by which he delineates that a polarization between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ can be presupposed—we have true knowledge; they have ideologies.

Critical Discourse Analysis stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA analyzes real and often extended instances of social interactions which take a full or partial linguistic form; therefore, they sum up one of the major tenets of CDA to be the notion that discourse does ideological work. Likewise, van Dijk (2001), a forerunner in CDA also subscribes to the fact that ideology has always been a typical notion of concern for many scholars in Critical Discourse Analysis. In the same line, Wodak (2001) observes that CDA is especially interested in the ways in which ideology is mediated by language in various social institutions.

Fairclough (1989, 2001) proposed a model for critical study of discourse which encompasses three inter-related processes of analysis—text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation) and social analysis (explanation). It is recommended that the following questions be asked for the purpose of critical and textual analysis of discourse (Fairclough, 2001):

A. Vocabulary

1. What *experiential* values do words have?

What classification schemes are drawn upon?

Are there words which are ideologically contested?

Is there *rewording* or *overwording*?

What ideologically significant meaning relations are there between words?

2. What *relational* values do words have?

Are there euphemistic expressions?

Are there markedly formal or informal words?

3. What *expressive* values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. Grammar

5. What *experiential* values do grammatical features have?
 - What types of process and participants predominate?
 - Is agency unclear?
 - Are processes what they seem?
 - Are normalizations used?
 - Are sentences active or passive?
 - Are sentences positive or negative?
6. What *relational* values do grammatical features have?
 - What modes (*declarative, imperative, or grammatical question*) are used?
 - Are there important features of relational modality?
 - Are the pronouns *we* and *you* used and if so, how?
7. What *expressive* values do grammatical features have?
 - Are there important features of expressive modality?
8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
 - What logical connectors are used?
 - Are complex sentences characterized by coordination or/ subordination?
 - What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C. Textual Structures

9. What interactional conventions are used?
 - Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?
10. What larger scale structures does the text have?

In brief, Fairclough states that for describing and tracing the ideological potentials of a text, one ought to systematically examine the following discourse structures: lexical choices, active and passive voice, nominalization use, mood choice, formality level, patterns of transitivity, modality choices, text thematic structure, information focus, and cohesive devices.

According to van Dijk (1998) the expression of ideology in discourse is normally more than an explicit or concealed display of an individual's beliefs; it mostly serves a

persuasive purpose. He continues that the notion of ideological discourse structures may be ambiguous in the sense that specific structures are employed in the representation and persuasion of ideologies in discourse. Although that holds true, it should be assumed that in a given text any structure or substructure of discourse may be benefited to this end. On the other hand, van Dijk insists that certain strategies or structures which may function ideologically in one context may not be ideologically invested in another context (p. 263). In addition, van Dijk (2000) states that:

Discourse is very complex, featuring many levels of structures, each with their own categories and elements, which may be combined in innumerable ways. As we have seen, ideologies may be expressed explicitly and then are easy to detect, but this may also happen very indirectly, implicitly, concealed or in less obvious structures of discourse, such as an intonation, a hesitation or a pronoun. (p. 42)

The overall strategy of most of the ideological discourse is a very general one – say positive things about ‘Us’, and say negative things about ‘Them’. This form of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is not only a very general characteristic of group conflict and the ways we interact with opposed groups, but also characterizes the way we talk about ourselves and others. Thus, van Dijk further maintains that ideology may be exhibited in virtually all structures of text or talk, yet on the other hand, it makes sense that this may be more typical for some than for other structures and sub-structures. He enumerates some of the structures that typically exhibit underlying ideologies:

- A. Meaning
 - a. Topics
 - b. Level of description
 - c. Implications and presuppositions
 - d. Local coherence
 - e. Synonymy, paraphrase
 - f. Contrast

- g. Examples and illustrations
- h. Disclaimers
- B. Propositional structures
 - a. Actors
 - b. Modality
 - c. Evidentiality
 - d. Hedging and vagueness
 - e. Topoi
- C. Formal structures
- D. Sentence syntax
 - a. Word order
 - b. Nominalization
 - c. Passive or active sentences
 - d. Topicalization
- E. Discourse forms
- F. Argumentation
- G. Rhetoric
- H. Action and interaction

Fairclough (1995), on the other hand, as a disclaimer expresses that there are limitations for the concept of ideology in discourse. He essentially suggests that discursal practices are ideologically loaded as long as they help sustaining or undermining power relations.

Relations of power may in principle be affected by discursal practices in any type of discourse, even in scientific and theoretical discourse. This precludes the categorical opposition between ideology, on the one hand, and science and theory on the other hand which some writer have suggested. But, this does not imply that all discourse is irredeemably ideological. Ideologies arise in class societies characterized by relations of domination, and in so far as human beings are capable of transcending such societies, they are capable of transcending ideology. (p. 82)

III. Method

In this study, the adopted method draws on a CDA-based model of translation criticism. The present research is designed to examine the presence/extent of interventions of nonprofessional translators with regard to their display of ideologies in the translated text.

3.1 Instrumentation

A translation task was used in this study to provide the linguistic corpus needed for analysis. The text assigned for translation into Persian was an English passage of approximately six hundred words which described a brief review of the history of movement of women to accomplish the opportunity of votes in the political agenda. The passage hosts a tone of appreciation of women's activities and efforts towards their goal which is proudly illustrated in the text to be achieved at last. It was one of the passages of an IELTS reading module. Such a text from an international English language proficiency examination was used to provide reassurance regarding the appropriate readability of the instrument for the target audience.

3.2 Participants

A theoretical sampling technique (Dörnyei, 2007) was adopted to select the participants of the study. Selection was based on two sets of eligibility criteria. The potential participants in the study were chosen from among female Iranian Persian native speakers who do not translate professionally or major in translation or translation studies. Another criterion was inviting graduates or graduate students of programs in English Language or other graduate students with English language proficiency qualifications above upper-intermediate (i.e., an overall score band of seven in IELTS). Eventually, ten female Iranians contributed to the study by producing a translation according to the instructions given. The contributors were in the mid or late twenties or early thirties. The study was delimited not to use professional translators or translation students as participants so that the formal translation training or professional experience

of translators were controlled in the study and thus from the results in order that conclusions can be possible to make pertaining to the unwitting or unconscious effect of ideologies in the process of translation.

3.3 Data Collection

The potential individuals who were assumed to be eligible for the study were contacted, and after pointing out the requirements of the research task, their willingness to contribute to the study were sought. Naturally several of them declined the invitation, and some of the contributions later on were found to be incomplete, and therefore excluded from the study. Ten complete translations were after all received.

The English passage for translation in addition to a cover letter was posted to the volunteers and the necessary instructions were enclosed. They were asked to translate the attached text into Persian, and they were allowed to use any sources such as dictionaries and encyclopedias if necessary. They, nevertheless, needed to complete the task on their own and could not seek advice on the task from others. They could take as much time as they required, and were given two weeks time to return the completed translation.

3.4 Data Analysis

To analyze the discourse collected and address the question of the study, the translation criticism model advocated by Farahzad (2009) was used as the guideline. In her model the analysis is described to take place at two levels: micro-level and macro-level (pp. 42-47). At micro-level analysis, everything in the text, or “the physically recorded material” including grammatical structures, overt and covert meanings and implications, among others are to be examined. In this study a few discourse structures and sub-structure at micro-level are selected as points of focus and comparison, including lexicalization, metaphor, euphemism, and level of formality. At the macro-level analysis, it is advised to examine the following:

- a. Translator's/editor's/ publisher's judgment, notes, and comments
- b. Illustrations
- c. The graphic design of the book cover, and the like

Since translations at issue are not in book scale, naturally the macro-level analysis is not much applicable to the present corpus in question. However, certain features such as punctuation marks and sectioning of the text into paragraphs have been considered for examination.

IV. Results

The following is the outcome of comparing the Persian translated cases with each other and in relation to the English source text, in keeping with the CDA approach adopted in the criticism model.

4.1 Micro-level analysis

4.1.1 Lexicalization

In the category of Lexicalization of the model (Farahzad, 2009), it is recommended that attention is paid to ideologically significant lexical choices. It is probably safe to assume that "title" of any text accounts for the most crucial lexical choice by the text producer. Under the category of Discourse Forms, van Dijk (2000) refers to 'titles' in addition to other similar discourse structures such as 'abstracts' in scholarly articles and 'leads' in newspapers as characteristic examples of being significantly prone to ideological investments. He states that information which is expressed in the beginning of a text thus receives extra emphasis, and it is read first and therefore will have more control over the interpretation of the rest of the text. To begin with, the Persian translation of the title of the English passage under study 'Votes for Women' by the translators was the first to examine. The title was mostly a word for word translation for "Votes for Women", yet with addition of certain explications (of some of their

understood connotations vaguely implied) in the title. To explicate their understanding of the concept of ‘entitlement’, a number of the translators included the term ‘*right*’ in the Persian translation of the title as in ‘The Right of Women’s Voting’. As well, there were two instances of the added phrase of ‘*defending the right of*’ which resulted in translating the title as “Defending the Right of Voting for Women”. There were a few cases of using the Persian word for ‘*ladies*’ used in the translation instead of the word ‘*women*’ which differ in their level of formality in both English and Persian, a case that was seen again, all across the body of the translated texts by many.

4.1.2 Formality

Fairclough (2001) in his set of analytical questions for critical analysis of discourse under ‘What *relational* values do words have?’ poses the question whether there are markedly formal or informal words. He defines, “a formal feature with *relational* value is a trace of and cue to the social relationships which are enacted via the text in the discourse. *Relational* value is to do with relations and social relationships.” In terms of the changes occurred in the translated metatext, upgrading some vocabulary items to a higher level of formality can be easily observed. There are more frequent uses of the single and plural forms of a Persian word closely equivalent to ‘*lady*’ or ‘*ladies*’ as more formal and more respectable substitutes for the Persian equivalents for the words ‘woman’ and ‘women’. The replacement of concepts of ‘woman/women’ with ‘lady/ladies’ as a prevalent point of difference in the source text in relation to the translated texts accounts for one of the noted instances. The participants’ high level of proficiency in English provides adequate reason to believe that most probably the choices are not random or resulting from the lack of knowledge of the lexical items.

4.1.3 Euphemism

In terms of lexical choices of the text producer, van Dijk (1998) extends the concept of Lexicalization also to the use of ‘euphemism’ (i.e., a word or expression substituted for a more conventional or familiar one as a way of avoiding negative values) and introduces that as a strong ideological means in discourse to emphasize bad things of

the ‘outgroup’ as well as good things of the ‘ingroup’ and to deemphasize good things of the ‘outgroup’ and bad things of the ‘ingroup’. An instance of using euphemistic expressions in the translation is also a point that was observed on this study. The word ‘militant’ is defined in Merriam-Webster Online dictionary as an *adjective: a. engaged in warfare or combat: fighting b. aggressively active (as in a cause)*, and in the Dictionary.com as: *a. vigorously active and aggressive, esp. in support of a cause b. engaged in warfare; fighting*. Similarly, bilingual English-Persian dictionaries (Haghshenas, 2001; Bateni, 2007) offer equivalents for both the senses besides more euphemistic equivalents (e.g., inflexible) for the term ‘militant’, an adjective which in the first paragraph modifies the activities attributed to the Suffragette Movement. To translate this word, more than half of the participants chose to dismiss equivalents denoting combat or warfare and instead either picked an equivalent meaning ‘aggressive’ or even euphemistic Persian equivalent close to simply ‘inflexible’.

4.1.4 Metaphor

Metaphor is a means as Fairclough states (2001, p. 119) for representing one aspect of an experience in terms of another, and is not limited to the literary discourse as it normally and stereotypically associated with. For van Dijk (2000) all rhetorical devices or figures of style are and can be strongly deployed to emphasize our good things and their bad ones, and vice versa for our good things and their bad things; as such metaphorical uses among other rhetorics can be ideologically invested. Translation of a (dead) metaphor ‘war chest’ and how it was handled by the participants is worth mentioning. Fairclough with regard to including analysis of metaphor in his model asserts that the ideological significance of metaphors is that they tended to take dominant interests to be the interest of all. Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries define ‘war chest’ as both ‘a fund accumulated to finance a war’ as well as ‘a fund assigned for a specific purpose, like an election campaign’, yet most of the participants rendered it as fund for a campaign exclusive of any war-related semantic quality, apparently to tender the nature of those activities.

4.2 Macro-level analysis

4.2.1 Punctuation

Punctuation marks in a text serve several purposes. One of their main uses can be functioning similar to a tool available in oral communication which facilitates understanding the tone over the words, like highlighting a chunk of words by raising the sound pitch level or changing the speed of speaking. Since it can help topicalization and foregrounding of some meaning in discourse, it can be ideologically instrumental. Punctuation marks such as quotation marks or italics can for similar ways put an ideological load on some strings of words in written discourse. The passage at issue end with a sentence that ironically criticizes some politicians of the time who believed women are not intelligent enough to make smart political decisions and as such do not qualify for votes.

And it illustrates the intelligence employed by women who were at that time deemed by several politicians to have ‘brains too small to know how to vote’.

Several of the translators seemed to feel obliged to put more emphasis on the marked part by highlighting it using bold font, italics or underlining or even two of them at the same time. Obviously, such a intervention in translation for foregrounding and attracting more attention (like raising one's voice when saying something more significant) is not hard to be assumed as an act with ideological intentions.

4.2.2 Paragraphing

The discussion on the unit of translation has caused certain controversies; however, the unit of sentence is what the majority of scholars adhere to. Paragraphing is also a significant tool for organizing the content of discourse in writing. Paragraphing can also function for foregrounding certain supporting statements into a topic sentence by attracting more attention and focusing on the part of the readers—specifically while

skimming the text. By considering such a significant role of paragraphing in a written text, during translation, whether a paragraph is holistically translated or not appears to be an important decision. As van Dijk (1998) contends whenever a text producer has more than a single option for creating a message textually, such choices are ideologically significant and so is the choice of a translator in deciding to keep a paragraph intact or to merge it with others or even to split it into two smaller paragraphs. The English passage in the present study was originally in seven paragraphs. Despite the low frequency of such a decision, there were two translated cases with an extra division, namely eight paragraphs. Two of the translators seemed to have split a paragraph into two. The sectioning of the fourth paragraph was exercised in a way that helped a sentence (about one of the most lucrative initiatives of women at the time which helped advancement of their campaign) in the middle of the paragraph, gain the status of a topic sentence with a far more foregrounded position where can be paid more attention and more noted by the readers.

V. Conclusion

The results of the analysis of the data seem to provide reasonable indications to assumptions about the manipulations of the translators and their ideologically charged interventions in the translated discourse. The research question of the study, whether nonprofessional translators reflect and display their own ideologies in the translated text as such can be positively addressed. According to the results, female translators participating in the study demonstrated a number of interventions and manipulations at micro- and macro-levels of the discourse which could reasonably provide indications to ideological representations of the translators. These interventions comprised emphasizing, topicalizing, and foregrounding the good things, and deemphasizing the bad ones related to their favorite group (women's movement) in addition to emphasizing the bad things about the opposing group in the text. The study being qualitative in nature does not intend to generalize the obtained conclusion; however, it is safe to assume that an in-depth insight into the disposition of the process of translation was plausibly attained – that translation as a social act is prone to take in

manipulations at all levels of the text by the text reproducers (the translators, even untrained ones) which also are highly likely to be ideologically charged.

The finding of the research is congruent with other studies regarding the impact of ideological orientations of translators on their translatorial decisions. As noted, even untrained translators who have not received technical education are under the influence of their beliefs and cannot remain unbiased and impartial to the ideological representations in the text in translation.

The study also provides evidence for practical functionality of the translation criticism model proposed by Farahzad (2009). Besides, the results of the study tend to recommend the view that source text and target text are right to be seen as protext and metatext (where one of the absolute source of the other) which are not in an equal relation with each other and are dissimilar to each other in terms of more than the difference of language system. In other writing, it can be concluded that a translated text is different from the original passage in more than the variable of language, and every translated text is prone to be ideologically manipulated, and the translator's implicit mediations have to be expected, accounting for the next variable of difference.

Looking from a pedagogical perspective into the matter, it is therefore highly recommended for translator educators and translation curriculum designers to familiarize students with principles of critical study of discourse and to motivate students to be aware of the covert and overt messages of the source text or any text so as not to fall victim as van Dijk (1998) warns that ideological discourse does not simply intend to display personal beliefs but aims at influencing the minds of the readership. This influence on mental models of the individual is especially more powerful when ideologies are expressed in an implicit and concealed fashion between the lines of the text, written or spoken, translated or otherwise.

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1990). *Translation, history and culture* London, England: Pinter.
- Batani, M. R. (Ed.) (2007). (3rd ed.). Tehran: Farhang Moaser.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, England: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). London, England: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. London, England: Sage.
- Farahzad, F. (2008). Translation as an intertextual practice. *Perspectives*, 16(3), 125-131.
- Farahzad, F. (2009). Translation criticism: A CDA approach. *Translation Studies*, 6(24), 39-47.
- Fazeli, M. (2009). Theoretical insights on the sociology of translation [Bineshshaye nazari dar bareye jameeshenasiye tarjome]. *Translation Studies*, 7(25), 29-46.
- Haghshenas, A. M. (Ed.) (2001). Farhang moaser English-Persian millennium dictionary. Tehran, Iran: Farhang Moaser Publishing.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (1985). *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. London, England: Croom Helm.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. London, England: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach* London, England: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Retrieved May 01, 2008, from <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%and%20discourse.pdf>

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about - A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Masood KHOSHSALIGHEH

Masood Khoshsaligheh is Assistant Professor in Translation Studies at the Department of English at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran where he teaches graduate courses on translation theory and research. He also supervises and examines theses in Translation Studies at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, main and international campus. His research interests include translator education, psychometrics in Translation Studies, translation process, ideology in translation, and translator competence. He is the managing editor of the *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*.

khoshsaligheh@um.ac.ir