Acceptability and Adequacy in Translation of John Steinbeck's Novel by Valiallah Ebrahimi

Reza Fatemi

ABSTRACT

This study examines a novel written by John Steinbeck and correspondingly its translation into Persian by Valiallah Ebrahimi (1990). Gideon Toury's Acceptability, Adequacy and Cultural Norms (1995) have been applied in this study. The researcher gathered some information about Toury and his theory of "cultural norms", and also the two types of translation, namely "adequate" and "acceptable" defined by the same scholar. The translated text was analyzed against the original work to determine if it is source-oriented (adequate) or receptor-oriented (acceptable). The impact of the ideology of the translator on adequacy and acceptability in translation has also been considered as the most important case in the study. The findings of the study revealed that Ebrahimi's translation was acceptable.

1. Introduction

Munday (2001, p. 5) maintains that "Throughout history of man, written and spoken translations have played a crucial role in interhuman communication, not least in providing access to important text for scholarship and religious purposes." Translating a text maybe a rather ambiguous process that involves processing unknown linguistic and cultural input, which might eventually causes uncertainty and/or confusion on the part of students and translators. As translators we are faced with an unfamiliar culture which requires that its message maybe conveyed. The culture expresses its idiosyncrasies in a way that is 'culturally-bound': cultural words, proverbs and of course idiomatic expressions, whose origin and use are intrinsically and uniquely bound to the culture concerned (Karamanian, 2001, p. 48).

Over the last two decades, translation studies have received a number of pristine perspectives and in this way have been influenced by the discipline of cultural studies. Translation scholars in England and America such as Bassnett, Lefevere, David L1oyd, and Maria Tymoczko distanced themselves from Even-Zohars's polysestem model. They were on this belief that Zohar's model was too formalistic and restrictive. By adopting more of cultural studies, they concentrated both on institutions of prestige and power within any given culture and patterns in literary translation. Most of translation theorists consider translation as a form of "political" intervention not a neutral activity.

"How to deal with features like dialect and heteroglossia, literary allusions, culturally specific items such as food or architecture, or further-reaching differences in the assumed contextual knowledge that surrounds the text and gives it meaning" are indeed complex technical issues raised in cultural translation (Sturge, 2009, p. 67). Culture is interconnected to language. It determines the way that people behave or speak. Wardhaugh claims that "the structure of a given language determines the way in which the speakers of that language view the world" (1986, p. 212).

Larson declares that "different cultures have different focuses. Some societies are more technical and others less technical." This difference is reflected in the amount of vocabulary which is available to talk about a particular topic (1984, p. 95).

Nord uses the term 'cultureme' to refer to the culture specific items. He defines cultureme as "a cultural phenomenon that is present in culture X but not present (in the same way) in culture Y" (1997, p. 34). Baker refers to the cultural words and concedes that the SL words may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. She points out that the concept in question may be "abstract or concrete, it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food." Baker then, calls such concepts 'culture-specific items' (1992, p. 21).

According to Gideon Toury, translations are not isolated utterances and a translator does not operate in a vacuum, but is rather "playing a social role", "fulfilling a function allotted by a community", which means that translation as cultural activity is governed by certain constraints, or norms (1995, p. 53). When analyzing translations for the purpose of uncovering the underlying norms in the tradition of Descriptive Translation Studies (Toury 1995), it is beneficial to study certain features that can be seen as symptomatic of these norms.

In the mid-20th century, there has been increasing interest in the question of translators' attitudes to cultural hegemonies when cultural features and values expressed in a Source Text (ST)are different from the translator's, and target reader's. But in this regard, there is a question remains to be answered, which is how to translate these cultural factors. Since culture plays an important role in translation, much consideration should be taken to handle the process of translational cultural norms.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

According to Toury's work, there are specific norms which govern the translator and his performance. These norms are either source-oriented or receptor-oriented.

Tele:
E-mail address: r_fatemi61@yahoo.com

Toury considers a translation to be either source-oriented "adequate" or receptor-oriented "acceptable." The main problem examined in this research is whether the translation of John Steinbeck's novel by Valiallah Ebrahimi is adequate or acceptable.

1.2. Research Significance

This study is one of the rare researches which have been conducted on the cross-cultural overlap and gaps in English and Persian influencing translation in the literary work. It can help translators, interpreters, translation students,….know more about the acceptability and adequacy of translation. This is also a topic which is excessively worthy of research and investigation. Concerning acceptability and adequacy as somehow problematic cases affecting various aspects of translation including: quality, assessment, translators' views, translation policy and…. should be more discussed and investigated. Moreover, this research tries to enlarge the horizon for English Department students who wish for more understanding of the area. It is expected that this study offers some effective aids to the translators when doing the translation of cultural norms and assist them to overcome the misunderstandings and barriers during the cross-cultural communication.

1.3. Research Questions

1. Considering acceptability and adequacy in translation, to what extent is the translation of "Of mice and men" compatible with Gideon Toury's model?
2. What strategies have been employed by the translator in rendering the samples from English into Persian in the novel *"Of Mice and Men"*?
3. What effects do the translated cultural norms have on the meaning of the novel?

1.4. Research Limitations

In the wide and expanding world of translation studies, there exists a large number of names, each with numerous theories and concepts. Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida, Catford, Venuti, John Dryden, and many other names are only some of the scholars working in the field of translation studies. It is possible to analyze the selected translation on the basis of theories belonging to each of these figures. However, spatial and temporal limitations do not allow the researcher to apply more than one theory.

One book may be translated into one language by different translators, and indeed, it is possible for one source text to have a number of target texts. This can be true for the selected novel. However, once again, spatial and temporal restriction does not allow the researcher to investigate all translations of the novel.

A translator might be affected by numerous factors and phenomena and they can influence on the quality of his or her work. Such factors as age, sex, social class, educational background, economical status, etc., all may be influential in translator's performance. Investigation of all these factors and phenomena is beyond the scope of this study. Because of the factors mentioned above, this study has failed to address all linguistic aspects and mention all translational ways. Thus, some of the conclusions drawn from the findings may be rather subjective and the issues mentioned are still somewhat general.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Translation and Translation Studies

Generally, translation is a process of rendering meaning, ideas, or messages of a text from one language to other language (Nugroho, 2013, p. 1). Some considerations are involved in this process which mainly attributed to quality of translation (Larson, 1984), these are as follows:

☐ accuracy: representing the meaning of the source text as faithfully as possible;
☐ naturalness: using the receptor language in ways appropriate to the text being translated; and,
☐ clearness: expressing the meaning in an understandable way to the intended audience (p. 54).

According to Catford (1965, p. 20), "Translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)", and Nida (1969, p. 12) states that translation consists of reproducing in the receptor language the natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style.

The definition of translation is not only limited to Catford's and Nida's view points. A number of scholars in translation have stated different definitions for translation. Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) define translation as:

An incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways. For example, one may talk of translation as a process or a product, and identify each sub-type as literary translation, technical translation, subtitling and machine translation; moreover, while more typically it just refers to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also include interpreting. (p. 181)

Translation studies, on the other hand, is a newly-established discipline which involves a large number of names of figures and scholars suggesting a variety of theories and concepts in this area. These figures have suggested numerous dichotomies for the process and different types of translations including Julian House's 'overt' and 'covert' translation (1971), Peter Newmark's 'semantic' and 'communicative' translation (1988), Roman Jakobson's 'interlingual', 'intralingual' and 'intersemiotic' translation (1959), Eugene Nida's 'formal' and 'dynamic' equivalence (1964), and other distinctions. Such an (overabundance of terminology), as suggested by Munday (2001), might lead to the confusion of students studying in this field. However, it provides a good opportunity for researchers and students to select anyone of the scholars in this area and his or her concepts and theories, based on their interest and topic of study.

While Munday, (2001. p. 5) points out the crucial role of written and spoken translations in inter human communication and providing access to important texts for scholarship and religious purposes, he asserts that studying translation as an academic subject has only begun in the past fifty years which is now generally known as 'translation studies' thanks to Holmes. According to Baker (1998):

Translation studies is now understood to refer to the academic discipline concerned with the study of translation at large, including literary and non-literary translation, various forms of oral interpreting, as well as dubbing and subtitling. The terms 'translation' and 'translators' are used in this generic sense throughout this entry. 'Translation studies' is also understood to cover the whole spectrum of research and pedagogical activities, from developing theoretical frameworks to conducting individual case studies to engaging in practical matters such as training translators and developing criteria for translation assessment. (p. 227)

2.2. Culture

The way "culture" is defined in the Concise Oxford Dictionary is different from descriptions of the "Arts" to plant

and bacteria cultivation and includes a wide range of intermediary aspects. Technically, regarding language and translation, Newmark defines culture as "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" (Newmark, 1988, p. 94), so asserting that each language group has its own culturally specific features. Also, he obviously mentions that he does "not regard language as a component or feature of culture" (Newmark, 1988, p. 95) and opposes to the view taken by Vermeer who states that "language is part of a culture" (1988, p .222). Newmark believes that Vermeer's viewpoint would imply the impossility to translate whereas for the latter, translating the source language (SL) into a suitable form of TL is part of the translator's role in transcultural communication.

Translation is process of connection between two cultures. It could be said that without translation exchange of material or non-material factors of two cultures are impossible, because according to Ivir (1987) there is an inseparable relation between culture and language and entrance of a cultural factor from one culture to another is through language. Based on this idea, translation means translation of cultures not languages.

Hongwei (1999) believes in language as a portrait of culture. He says that "language mirrors other parts of culture, supports them, spreads them and helps to develop others" (p.121). This special feature of language distinguishes it from all other facets of culture and makes it crucially important for the transfer of culture. It is no exaggeration to say that, as Hongwei believes too, "language is the life-blood of culture and that culture is the track along which language forms and develops" (p. 121). The formation and development of all aspects of a culture are closely related to one another, and language is no exception. A careful study of the meanings of words and how these changes demonstrate how material culture, institutional culture and mental culture influence the formation and development of language (Hongwei, 1999, p. 123).

2.3.Ideology

The term ideology' has been always accompanied by its political connotation as it is evident in its dictionary definition as a system of ideas and ideals, especially one which forms the basis of economic or *political* theory and *policy*' (The New Oxford Dictionary of English). The ideology of translation could be traced in both process and product of translation which are, however, closely interdependent. The ideology of a translation, according to Tymoczko (2003), will be a combination of the content of the source text and the various speech acts represented in the source text relevant to the source context, layered together with the representation of the content, its relevance to the receptor audience, and the various speech acts of the translation itself addressing the target context, as well as resonance and discrepancies between these two _utterances'. However, she further explains that _the ideology of translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audience'(pp. 182–83). Schäffner (2003) explains:

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

its genre and communicative purposes (p. 23).

Most translation projects are initiated by an actor of the domestic culture such as state ideology, cultural climate, the expectations of the target audience, economic and social reasons, etc., and foreign texts are selected not by the translators themselves but by this actor, who manipulates the whole process. The very function of translation thus becomes the rewriting of the foreign text into the domestic culture, in compliance with the domestic cultural norms and resources that make up the overall system of the society. Lawrence Venuti argues that in instances where translations are governed by the state or a similar institution, the identity-forming process initiated by a translated text has the potential to affect social mores by providing a sense of what is true, good, and possible. Translations may create a corpus with the ideological qualification to assume a role of performing a function in an institution (Venuti, 1998, p. 67).

2.4.Norms

The term "norm" may refer both to a regularity in behavior and to the mechanism which accounts for this regularity. The mechanism has a socially regulatory function and comprises a psychological as well as a social dimension. It mediates between the individual and the collective, between the individual's intentions, choices, and expectations, and collectively held beliefs, values, and preferences. Norms bear on the interaction between people, more especially on the degree of coordination required for the continued, more or less harmonious coexistence with others in a group. Norms contribute to the stability of interpersonal relations by reducing uncertainty about how others will act.

By generalizing from past experience and allowing projections concerning similar types of situation in the future, norms help to make behavior more predictable. Translation in a social environment involves transactions between several parties who have an interest in these transactions taking place. The translator, as one of the decision making parties in the transaction, is an agent whose actions are neither wholly free nor predetermined, especially as the entire process is played out in the context of existing social structures. The more the parties can coordinate their actions, the greater the likelihood that they will consider their interaction successful. To appreciate the role of norms and conventions in solving interpersonal coordination problems, we may start from the definition of convention provided by the American philosopher David Lewis (1969).

Lewis describes conventions as regularities in behavior which emerge as contingent solutions to recurrent problems of interpersonal coordination. The solutions are contingent in that they are neither necessary nor impossible: they could have been different. If they prove effective, these solutions become the preferred course of action for individuals in a given type of situation. Conventions grow from precedent into social habit. They do not have to be explicitly agreed, but they presuppose a degree of common knowledge and acceptance. They imply reciprocal expectations and the expectation of expectations: the expectation of others that, in a given situation, I will adopt a certain course of action, and my expectation that others expect me to adopt that course of action.

Conventions are not norms, although the distinction is not always made and conventions are sometimes regarded as implicit norms or "quasi-norms" (Lewis, 1969, p. 97; Hjort, 1990, p. 43). They can, however, become norms by falling victim to their own success.

If a convention has served its purpose sufficiently well for long enough, the mutually shared expectation about what course of action to adopt in certain types of situation may grow beyond a mere preference and acquire a binding character. At that point the modality of the expectation changes from cognitive to normative (Galtung, 1959).

Like conventions, norms derive their legitimacy from shared knowledge and mutual expectations; on the individual level, they are largely internalized. Unlike conventions, norms have a directive character: They tell individuals not just how others expect them to behave but how others prefer them to behave. Norms imply that there is a course of action which is more or less strongly preferred because it is accepted as proper or correct or appropriate.

2.5. Toury

The idea of translation being a norm-governed activity was first explored at length by Gideon Toury in his innovative book In Search of a Theory of Translation in 1980. Toury (1995, p. 55) defines norms as: "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations". Toury further refined and updated the model in Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond published in 1995.

Norms have played a significant role in descriptive translation studies, as (Toury, 1995, p. 61) *"it is norms that determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested by actual translations".* Equivalence is the name given to the relationship, of whatever type and extent, between a translation and its original, and the existence of such a relationship is axiomatic in the theory. According to Toury, translations are not isolated utterances and a translator does not operate in a vacuum, but is rather "playing a social role", "fulfilling a function allotted by a community", which means that translation as cultural activity is governed by certain constraints, or norms (1995, p. 53).

According to Toury, norms occupy the middle-ground in a scale of sociocultural constraints ranging, in terms of their force, from more or less absolute rules to mere idiosyncracies (1995, p. 54). The borderline between these constraints is by no means absolute, quite the reverse. They can gain or lose their validity across time along with "changes of status within a society" (1995, p. 54). Norms could be described as the society's way of regulating behaviour by saying what is accepted or tolerated, on the one hand, and what is disapproved of or outright forbidden, on the other (1995, p. 55). Learning this code of conduct is part of an individual's socialisation process (1995, P. 55).

The community within which a translator operates sets certain expectations on the translator for his/her product to be acceptable as a translation within that community. Norms can be considered as general values that are shared by a community and have been converted into instructions governing and evaluating the acceptability of behaviour – for example the activity of translating – applicable to particular situations (Toury, 1995, p. 55). Deviations from agreed norms can result in 'sanctions' or penalties or, in rare cases, positive changes to existing systems (Toury, 1995, p. 64).

These norms are sociocultural constraints specific to culture, society and time. Toury sees various kinds of norms operating at various stages of the translation process. These norms are as follows**:** *initial, preliminary* and *operational.* Basically Initial norm is the question of a translator deciding to

conform to the norms of the source text and, by implication, of the source culture, or to those of the target culture. The two poles between which a translator then operates are, therefore, the translation's adequacy, or "adherence to source norms" (Toury, 1995, p .56), and its acceptability, or adherence to target norms. In practice, the choices made by a translator involve some sort of compromise or negotiation between the two extremes. Preliminary Norm is the choice of text-types or individual texts to be translated (Toury, 1995, pp. 56-59). Operational Norms, those norms governing the way "translations come into being", involving both source and target norms, though to a varying degree (Toury 1995, p .60). In Toury's general classification of norms, Initial norm is situated in the preliminary norms group (1995, p .61).

When discussing norms, Toury mentions two of their qualities that bear on every practicing translator as well as anyone wishing to study them methodically: the socio-cultural specificity of norms and their instability (1995, p. 62). As regards their specificity, norms do not necessarily apply across cultures nor even across the various sub-cultures of a society, whereas their fundamental instability means that they also change across time. Such changes may be prompted by translators themselves, translation criticism, translation ideology, and translation schools (1995, p. 62).

There are two different sources for studying translational norms: textual sources, i.e. actual translations showing the effects of norms, and extratextual sources, i.e. normative and critical formulations and comments from those involved, though they can sometimes be biased (1995, p. 65). By studying these sources a scholar could find out whether particular norms are, in terms of their force, basic or rule-like norms, secondary norms or tendencies, or tolerated behaviour (1995, p. 67).

The concept of norms has become of core importance within Translation Studies, particularly in DTS. Toury's attempt to be objective, descriptive and precise when analysing them has encouraged a new approach towards translation practice, tackling features which had been overlooked until then, such as the very existence of norms operating in the production of translated texts. Undoubtedly, his position towards translational behaviour has proved to have invaluable resonance on translation critics in the last decade. In fact, being acquainted with the current norms in a given literary system seems now to be a crucial initial step when taking into consideration the translation practices within a given culture.

3. Data Collection

There were lots of novels available but not all of them were appropriate to be selected as the data collection source for this study, because some of them were not written originally in English and they were translations from other languages. Therefore, the novel *"Of mice and men"* by John Steinbeck, the Nobel prize-winning American author, was selected because it has been written originally in English. Another reason and the most important one for this selection was that the novel is stuffed with different taboos, cultural norms, and also included many instances of acceptability and adequacy which were needed for data collection process. This study analyzes the translation of a literary book according to Toury's model to find omissions, distortions, alterations, euphemism, etc by the Iranian translator.

Valiallah Ebrahimi, is the Head Translator at Official Farsi Translation (ATIO Certified & Member of CTTIC). Formerly, he was engaged in English teaching at Tehran Azad

University, Tehran Central Branch and was Faculty of Foreign languages. He translated many literary books. He translated '*Of Mice and Men*' in 1990. Ebrahimi has used many strategies in his translation in order to be close to the TL. His translation is according to Iranian Ideologies and culture in which can help the researcher to conduct this research.

3.1.Source text

1. " . . . . If you . . . . guys would want a hand to work for nothing—just his keep, why I'd come an'lend a hand. I ain't so crippled I can't work like a *son-of-a-bitch* if I want to." (p. 38)

2. "You God damn tramp", he said viciously. "You done it, di'n't you? I s'pose you're glad. Ever' body knowed you'd mess things up. You wasn't no good. You ain't no good now, you lousy tart." (p. 47)

3. George said, "I'll work my month an' I'll take my fifty bucks an' I'll stay all night in some lousy cat house. Or I'll set in some poolroom till ever' body goes home. An' then I'll come back an' work another month an' I'll have fifty bucks more." (p. 47)

4. George sighed. "You give me a good whore house every time," he said. "A guy can go in an' get drunk and get ever' thing outa his system all at once, an' no messes. And he knows how much it's gonna set him back. These here jail baits is just set on the trigger of the hoosegow." (p. 28)

5. Candy went on, "Either you guys got a slug of whisky? I gotta gut ache." (p. 21)

6. "Sure. Come along. It's a hell of a lot of fun—her crackin' jokes all the time. Like she says one time, she says, 'I've knew people that if they got a rag rug on the floor an' a kewpie doll lamp on the phonograph they think they're running a parlor house.' That's Clara's house she's talkin' about. An' Susy says, 'I know what you boys want,' she says. 'My girls is clean,' she says, 'an' there ain't no water in my whisky,' she says. 'If any you guys wanta look at a kewpie doll lamp an' take your own chance gettin' burned, why you know where to go.' An' she says, 'There's guys around here walk in' bow-legged 'cause they like to look at a kewpie doll lamp.'" (p. 26)

7. "Yeah?" said Crooks. "An' where's George now? In town in a whorehouse. That's where your money's goin'" (p. 37)

8. "Don't you even take a look at that bitch. I don't care what she says and what she does. I seen em poison before, but I never seen no piece of jail bait worse than her. You leave her be." (p. 16)

9. "I know, Aunt Clara, ma'am. I'll go right off in the hills an' I'll fin' a cave an' I'll live there so I won't be no more trouble to George." (p. 51)

10. "I never seen a guy really do it," he said. "I seen guys nearly crazy with loneliness for land, but ever' time a whore house or a blackjack game took what it takes." (p. 37)

11. "Poor bastard," He said softly. (p. 48)

12. "Well, we ain't got any," George exploded. "Whatever we ain't got, that's what you want. God a'mighty, if I was alone I could live so easy. I could go get a job an' work, an' no trouble e. No mess at all, and when the end of the month come I could take my fifty bucks and go into town and get whatever I want. Why, I could stay in a cat house all night. I could eat any place I want, hotel or any place, and order any damn thing I could think of. An' I could do all that every damn month. Get a gallon of whisky, or set in a pool room and play cards or shoot pool." (p. 6)

13. George looked carefully at the solitaire hand. He put an ace up on his scoring rack and piled a two, three and four of diamonds on it. (p. 27)

14. "He gonna leave you, ya crazy bastard. He gonna leave ya all alone. He gonna leave ya, crazy bastard." (p. 92)

15. George looked up. "If that crazy bastard's foolin' around too much, jus' kick him out, Slim." (p. 24)

16. "All the time he coulda had such a good time if it wasn't for you. He woulda took his pay an' raised hell in a whorehouse, and he coulda set in a pool room an' played snooker. But he got to take care of you."

17. "An' when the enda the month come—"
"An' when the end of the month came I could take my fifty bucks an' go to a . . . . cat house—" (p. 52)

18. "Jus' the usual thing. We go in to old Susy's place. Hell of a nice place. Old Susy's a laugh—always crackin' jokes. Like she says when we come up on the front porch las' Sat'day night. Susy opens the door and then she yells over her shoulder, 'Get yor coats on, girls, here comes the sheriff.' She never talks dirty, neither. Got five girls there." (p. 26)

19. George let himself be helped to his feet. "Yeah, a drink." Slim said, "You hadda, George. I swear you hadda. Come on with me." (p. 53)

20. "Tend rabbits," it said scornfully. "You crazy bastard. You ain't fit to lick the boots of no rabbit. You'd forget 'em and let 'em go hungry. That's what you'd do. An' then what would George think?" (p. 50)

3.2.Target Text

1. "اگر شما مردهای مومن و مُتعهد کسی را بخواهید برایتان کار کند و در عوض از او و نگهداری کنید من با شما خواهم آمد. من آنقدرها هم دست و پاچلفتی نیستم که نتوانم مثل یک فرد عادی و مسئول کار کنم و نان شرافتمندانه ای بخورم." (p. 148)

2. "_ خداوند ترا لعنت کند. تو لنی بیگناه را ویلان کردی. همه میدانستند که تو رسوایی و بدبختی ببار میاوری. تو آدم خوبی نبودی، حالا هم خوب نیستی. زنیکه بد کاره گندیده! تف بر تو!..." (p. 181)

3. جرج گفت: " من این ماه را کار می کنم. پنجاه دلارمو می گیرم و خوش میگذرانم، یا اینکه همه پولم را قمار می کنم، اخر شب که همه بازیکنان رفتند، دوباره با این لجنزار بر می گردم، یک ماه دیگر کار می کنم و پنجاه دلارمو می گیرمودر قمار میبازم." (p. 180)

4. ژرژ خرناسی کشید و گفت: "میخانه بهتر از اینجاست. آدم در آنجا باده می نوشه، مست میکنه و از بیخ معده عربده میکشه. بعد هم میفهمه چقدر پول خرج کرده. اما این دختره ولگرد که اینجاست، دل و روده آدم را بهم میزنه." (p. 107)

5. "_ هیچکدام از شما دارو ندارید؟ دلم درد گرفته!" (p. 83)

6. "آره، با ما بیا! خوش میگذرد. او همیشه با تو و امثال تو گل می گوید و گل. میشنود و بارها برفقا گفته:
_ کسانی را می شناسم که یک قطعه گلیم پاره کف اتاقک کاهگلی انداخته و یک چراغ شیشه ای و کم نور روی گرامافون گذاشته اند و خیال می کنند کاخ سر بفلک کشیده ای دارند و روی تشک پر قو غلت میزنند!" سوزی همچنین گفت: میدام آقا پسرها چه میخواهند، گارسونهای من تمییز و مودب هستند و شربتها، قهوه ها، کاکائوها و چایهایم آبکی نیست. اگر کسی نخواهد اینجا بیاید، می تواند بختش را بیازماید و بکافه "ماریا" ی خودارا، دهن لق و جیب خالی کن برود. کسانی را میشناسم که با باد بآستین میاندازند و گشاد گشاد راه می روند، بخاطر اینکه شبی از شبها عشقشان گل کرده بلانه کثیف و بد نام "ماریا" بروند و سری بخمره بزنند. این پاچه ور مالیده های مست لایعقل، همیشه کلاهشان پس معرکه است." (p. 101)

7. " آره جرج کجاست؟ الان توی شهر در کافه ها و رستورانها پلاس است. پولهای شما بدبختهای نادان اینطور بهدر میرود." (p. 146)

8. "-گوش کن! هیچوقت باو نگاه مکن! بمن و تو مربوط نیست که او کی هست و چی میگوید. من مارهای خوش خط و خال زیاد دیده ام ولی در تمام عمرم چنین افعی سمی و خطرناکی ندیده بودم. تو باید برای حفظ شرف و ناموس خودت حتما از او فاصله بگیری." (p. 63)

9. " میدانم. عمه کلارا! بجون عزیز خودت میدانم. به تپه و ماهورها روی می آورم، غاری دنج و تاریک پیدا میکنم و در آن روزگار بسر میبرم. دور از آدمهای سودجو و ستمگر زندگی میکنم و با موشها، خرگوشها و سنجابها خوی میگرم تا دیگر جرج ناراحت نشود." (p. 192)

10. "_ کسی را ندیده ام که *محض رضای خدا و بقصد نوعپروری* دست به این کار مهم و اساسی بزند. خیلی ها را سراغ دارم که دلشان برای یک تکه زمین لک زده بود ولی پولهایشان را *خرج الواطی، عرق خوری و قمار* کرده اند.")p. 148(

11. "_ بیچاره! این چه غائله ای بود که بر پا کردی؟ حالا در آن دنیا، توی آتش جهنم بسوز و جواب پرده دریها و زشت کاریهایت را بده." p. 187(

12. "_ و با خشم و غضب گفت: هرچه ما نداریم پیدا کنم و دردسری هم نداشته باشم. آخر ماه هم حقوقم را می گرفتم و به شهر می رفتم و هر چه می توانستم می خریدم. بعد هم می توانستم تمام شب را بخنده و شادی بگذرانم، در ضمن می توانستم هر چه دلم می خواهد در مهمانخانه یا هر جای دیگر بخورم و تخت بخوابم. اولا این کار را هر ماه می توانستم بکنم، *در ثانی از محل پولهای پس اندازم، خانه نقلی و قشنگی می ساختم، زن خوب و فرمانبری میگرفتم و در میان بچه های قد و نیمقد بو شیرین زبانم میلولیدم*")p. 23-24(

13. جرج ابروانش را در هم کشید، تبسم تلخی بر لبانش نقش بست. (p. 108)

14. "او می رود... آره ترا ول میکند." (p. 194)

15. جرج بالا را نگاه کرد و گفت: "اگر خیره سری کرد، با لگد بیرونش کن." (p. 97)

16. "_ در تمام این مدت اگرتو نبودی، او می توانست خوش بگذراند، حقوقش را بگیرد، صرفه جویی کند، تشکیل خانواده بدهد و کودکان خردسال و شرین زبانی داشته باشد. ولی جوانیش را فدای پرورش روحی و سعادت آینده تو کرد. زهی بیوفائی!.. اوف! بر ناسپاسی!..." (p. 192)

17. " وهر وقت آخر ماه می رسید... آره هر وقت آخر ماه می رسید، پنجاه دلار می گرفتم و به دک و پزم می رسیدم." (p. 196)

18. هیچی، طبق معمول بکافه "سوزی" پیر می رویم. آنجا جای خوبیست. _" سوزی زن خنده دار و شوخ طبعی است. روزهای شنبه وقتی سر و کله ما در حیاط جلوی پیدا میشود، فریاد میکشد: آهای! بچه ها! کدخدا دارد میاید. او هیچوقت حرفهای رکیک نمی زند و با مشتریها با ادب و نزاکت رفتار می کند." (p. 100)

19. جورج از جای برخاست و گفت:" آره باید به آستان خدای بنده نواز روی آوریم واز کرده های زشتمان توبه کنیم." اسلیم گفت :" تو به تقویت روحی احتیاج داری... خیلی هم احتیاج داری، با من بیا!"(p. 202)

20. با صدای نرم و نازکی گفت: "_ خرگوش داشته باشی؟ لایق نیستی که پنجه های خرگوش را نوازش کنی. او را فراموش میکنی و گرسنه اش میگذاری. بله، تو این ندانم کاریها را می کنی و انتظار داری جرج خم بابرو نیاورد؟" (p. 193)

4.Data Analysis

Ebrahimi used the euphemism strategy and inculcated the Islamic Ideas in the translation. He translated "son-of-a-bictch" as "ordinary and committed person" ''فرد عادی و مسئول''. He goes so beyond the theme of the original text; that is, it does not concord with the message of the source text. The translator uses the euphemism strategy in this case to avoid taboo word in the target text.

As demonstrated in the source text (example 3), readers of the source text get impression that George talks about staying at cat house. Whilst the message of Ebrahimi's translation is different, he intentionally omits the word "cat house" and replaces it by "having fun". Of course, he uses the euphemism strategy to lessen the negative connotation of this item. Therefore, the readers of the target text read a distorted text. On the one hand, Ebrahimi replaces it with a general phrase. On the other hand, the translation does not refer to an inappropriate pastime. The translation must depicts the ways of thoughts and wishes of the characters of the story, but we do not see this feature in the translation.

The word "whore house" in the translation is replaced by ''میخانه'' "bar" in which its negative value is less than the previous one. This deliberate avoidance by Ebrahimi is an example of euphemism strategy which is used by him to lessen the taboo word value in Persian. By doing so, the translator considers the target language norms and target text readers. This case can be an example of acceptability of translation.

Example 5 is another case of euphemism made in the translation process by Ebrahimi which seems to be ideologically oriented. Ebrahimi also uses euphemism technique to avoid using taboo word. The word "whisky" is deleted in his translation, and it is replaced by ''دارو'' "drug" which has different meaning. The reason behind this deletion is that the word such as "whisky" is undesirable for the target readers. Therefore, the translator uses this translation strategy to debar the negative values of the word in accordance with Islamic culture. The researcher believes that if the acceptability of the translation is concerned it is fifty-fifty acceptable.

Ebrahimi like the previous example uses the euphemism technique in his translation (example 6). His translation also highlights that those words which have negative values are omitted and replaced by ones which would not refer to the concepts of the original text. As seen in the translation, the sentences 'there ain't no water in my whisky' and 'My girls is clean' that appears in the source text are translated as '' شربتها، ''there is no water in my juice, ''قهوه ها، کاکائوها و چایهایم آبکی نیست coffee, cacao, and tea'' and ''گارسونهای من تمییز و مودب هستند'' "my waitresses are clean and polite". The words "whisky" and "girls" are deleted and they are replaced by "juice, coffee, cacao, and tea" and "waitress" which have different meanings. Such rewriting indicates that some words or phrases are considered to be inappropriate in the target text. Therefore, these kinds of changes result from the Islamic ideology of the translator. As a matter of fact, alcoholic drinks are forbidden in Muslim communities. The translation of the word "whisky" as a kind of alcoholic drink into a non-alcoholic drink can be considered as an ideologically oriented action. However, the researcher believes that the translation is fifty percent acceptable. Because, the translation is target text oriented and the translator tries to use less offensive words. In this way, he uses the words which have no negative connotations.

Like the previous examples, example 7 also shows the use of euphemism technique in the translated text. Ebrahimi uses the euphemistic expressions so as not to use the offensive words in translation. It is clear that the word "whorehouse" in the original text is translated as ''کافه ها و رستورانها'' "cafes and restaurants", because it is undesirable for Islamic culture. So, this word is deleted from the text and replaced by the other concepts which do not have negative values. The avoidance of lexical items that have negative values is referred to the ideology of the translator.

As seen in the eighth example, the phrases "honour and chastity" are added with a religious connotation. But nothing has been mentioned in the ST which is equal with " حفظ شرف و ناموس". It may be argued that this translation is an addition instance. Ebrahimi has used this strategy to convey the message according to the Target culture. In this way, this kind of distortion of the target text is done for the target-language audience. It shows the intervention of a religious ideology of the translator. This kind of addition to the translation is not acceptable, since it says something other than what mentioned in the original text.

There is an alteration of the original text in the translation of example 9. The addition part can be a sort of distortion in the translation process. He deliberately adds the sentence "I live away from jobbers and oppressive people and habituate myself to mice, rabbits and squirrels so that George wouldn't

be upset anymore", while it is absent from the source text. This irrelevant information has been mentioned in the text.

There is an example of intervention which is as the result of a religious ideology. There is no mention in the original text of example 10 that "I've never seen anybody to do this important work only for the sake of God and philanthropy," which appears in the translation. Like the previous one, Ebrahimi adds something to the source text; an addition part which is much more loaded with religious connotations. These kinds of addition which disrupt the balance of the text are not allowed in translation.

In example 11, Ebrahimi adds the sentences "Poor guy! What have you done? Now you should burn in hell due to your shamelessness and ugly deeds." Some additions are seen in the above translation which could be considered to be a sort of distortion. Since these additions are loaded with religious connotations; this distortion made in the translation process seems to be indicative of Islamic ideology of the translator. However, the responsibility of the translator is to attach to the original message and not to add additional information to the total message. This must be done so smoothly that reading the text does not necessitate the readers' high concentration on the text. A translator is dealing with concepts in the structures of both languages. Each language will focus on a particular area of reality or experience in a different way. So, the translation is not acceptable.

Ebrahimi completely omitted 'whisky' and 'pool room' in his translation of example 12. The italicized expression seen in the extract in the translation does not appear in the source text. There is no mention in the source text about George's wife and his children. George's words in the translation are as follows: "secondly, I would build a cozy and pretty house from my savings, get a nice and obedient wife, and wiggle among my tall and short and sugary kids". Like the previous one, Ebrahimi adds something to the source text. This example demonstrates that the translator has avoided the lexical items that are not suitable to Islamic and Iranian Ideology. In this regard, he has replaced them by different ones which is relating to his own culture. In this case, the translation is rewriting. In fact, the readers of the target text actually read the text from their culture. This way of rewriting is not accepted, because the translator completely distorts the original text and does not convey the same message as the original. The researcher believes that the translator could use some equivalents that show the wishes and personalities of those characters in the story. By this way he can avoid using taboos in target text.

Ebrahimi does not translate the source text (example 13). He deletes the whole parts of the original text. To omit completely some parts in translation and replace them with other information which is wholly irrelevant is not accepted in translating from one language into another. There is an addition in his translation. He translates it as this sentence: "George wrinkled his eyebrow, a bitter smile appeared on his lips," which is absent in the source text. In the translation of example 14, the negative elements such as "crazy bastard" are deleted. Ebrahimi summarizes and deletes the sentence "He gonna leave ya all alone". Example 15 is similar to the previous one, since it is an instance of deletion. Therefore, this can also be considered an example of distortion made in the translation process, which seems to be ideologically oriented. In example 16, "play snooker" and "go to whore house" are omitted. Ebrahimi translated the sentence as "Through all this

time, he could have fun, take his salary, save money, start a family and have young and sugary children, if you were not. However, he sacrificed his youth to nurture your spirit and future happiness. Alas faithlessness! Phew to the ingratitude!" The additions used are associated with Islamic ideology which are absolutely absent in the source text. The translation has been done for Iranian readers who are assumed to belong to the Islamic religion. Considering the relation to the other examples, this could be regarded as a kind of distortion made in the translation process which appears to be ideologically oriented. So, this translation is not equivalent with the source text but this is an acceptable translation, but its degree of acceptability is less than 30%.

Example 17 is similar to the previous examples; the distortion is seen in the translation. The word "cat house" is used in the source text while it is deleted in the translation. The translator replaces "And I could take care of my appearance" instead of 'going to cat house'. Since going to this kind of houses is unlawful according to Islamic religion and is not accepted in Iranian culture. This is not a good equivalent for "cat house". The translation is too far away from the current text. However, this is an acceptable translation, because the translator follows the norms of target culture. The researcher believes he should find an appropriate equivalence to achieve more acceptability of translation.

In the case of example 18's translation, "Get yor coats on, girls" and "Got five girls there" are deleted. The word "girls" is replaced by "guys". In the extract taken from the translation, rewording has been used by the translator. His translation has completely different meaning comparing with the source text. Therefore, the translation is an instance of oppositional wording. In the original text, Susy is the owner of the place who has five girls there. Such omissions prove that certain words and phrases are considered inappropriate in the target text. The reason behind is because of particular ideology. However, Ebrahimi's translation is acceptable. He tried to apply the ideologies of Iranian people but he omitted many parts of the text.

Ebrahimi deletes the word "drink" in example 19. The reason for the omission might be the fact that it is undesirable for Islamic culture. These words are intentionally substituted by other words. He translated this sentence "Yeah, a drink." as "آره باید به آستان خدای بنده نواز روی آوریم واز کرده های زشتمان توبه کنیم." while nothing has been mentioned in the source text as 'to repent before the gracious God because of our evil deeds'. He completely omits the whole sentence and applies some expressions which are irrelevant to the source text and gives totally different meaning. By doing so, the translator distorts the source text and recreates other contents. This kind of distortion beats the cohesion of the text. This case cannot be considered as acceptable translation.

Finally, Ebrahimi omitted this part "You crazy bastard" in his translation (example 20). The translator tries to make the translated text suitable for the target readers. He avoids using the words which are not accepted in the target culture. His translation is acceptable but the degree of his acceptability is 50%. The researcher believes that he could give an equivalent in the target text which refers to the source text message indirectly. He could resort to this strategy in his last choice.

5.Conclusion

The study demonstrated that to what extent Toury's dichotomy of "acceptability" and "adequacy" was seen in the Persian translation of the novel. Considering cultural norms

and their effects on individuals' beliefs, thoughts, way of living, many translators take up a fortified position in transferring these norms based on those accepted in their communities and some are faithful to the original text and try to maintain the source language norms in translation; that is, they are not sensitive to their own cultural norms. So, the aim of the analysis rooted in the ideology of translator.

The findings of the study indicated that the translation of the novel *'Of Mice and Men'* by Ebrahimi can be seen somewhat as an acceptable one; because he avoided all lexical items related to "drinking", cat house" and all "vulgar expressions" which are not suitable for Iranian and Islamic culture. He replaced them by words related to his own culture. His additions to the translation were loaded with religious connotations. The translator distorted the source text to make it closer to Iranian culture. Therefore, his manipulations led to target readers' attention to an Islamic worldview. He changed the meaning of the words within mostly domestication, rewording, euphemism and delition strategies for the target-language audiences.

Lexical choices in the translation of Ebrahimi prove that he had an Islamic Ideology. Having such a kind of ideology, he considered the target readers who were mostly Muslim. The translator had many instances of full omission in his translation. Also, he distorted the sentences which seemed to be ideologically contested and in most cases he reworded the sentences completely. Because of rewording, Ebrahimi's translation had oppositional wordings. He preferred to delete offensive words and foreign elements in translation. The differences between the original text and Ebrahimi's translation rooted in his Islamic ideology. He had completely Islamic ideology and his translation was contrary to the source text linguistics and norms. His Islamic ideology causes him to distort the source text completely in order to move towards the norms of the target language which are Islamic and religious.

References

اشتاین بک، ج. (1937) *موش ها وآدمها*. (و. ابراهیمی، مترجم) (1369). تهران: انتشارات سعیدی.

Baker, M. (1992). *In other words*: *A coursebook on translation*. London and New York:

Baker, M. (1998). *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies.* London: Routledge

Catford, J. C. (1965/2000). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Hjort, A. M. (1990). Translation and the consequences of scepticism. In S. Bassnett & A.

Hongwei, C. (1999). Cultural difference and translation. *Translations' Journal, 44,* 121-132.

Karamanian, A. (2001). Translation and Culture. Retrieved May 28, 2013, from
http://www.kwintessential.co.uk/index.php?option=com_conte
nd&id=2144&lang=en&layout=edit&view=article

Larson, M. L. (1984) *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence.*

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. London: Rutledge

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation.* Singapore: Prentice Hall International.

Nida, E, A. and Taber, R. Ch. (1969). *The theory and practice of translating*. Leiden: E.J Brill.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*.

Nugroho, A. (2013). *Meaning and translation*. Reteived May 12, 2014: from
https://www.academia.edu/3727334/meaning_and_translation

Schäffner, Ch. (2010). 'Norms of translation.' In Y. Gambier & Luc van Dorslaer (Ed.),
*Handbook of Translation Studies (*pp. 58-69). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of translation studies*, Manchester: St.
Jerome.
encyclopedia of translation studies (pp. 67-70). New York: Routledge.

Steinbeck, J. (1937). *Of Mice and Men*. Retrieved Apr 13, 2014 from
http://staff.oswego.orgo.org/ephaneuf/web/ENG-9R/Steinbeck,%20John%20-20%Of%20%Mice%20and%Men.pdf

Sturge, K. (2009). Cultural Translation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge*

Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Porter Institute.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia:

Tymoczko, M. (2003). *Ideology and the position of the translator: In what Sense is a translator*
in between'? In M. Calzada-Pérez (Ed.) Apropos of ideology (pp. 181-202). Manchester:
St. Jerome.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Basil Backwell.