Acceptability and Adequacy in Translation of John Steinbeck's Novel by Soroush Habibi

Reza Fatemi

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study examines a novel written by John Steinbeck and correspondingly its translation into Persian by Soroush Habibi (2009). 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 Habibi'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.

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

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. 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 Soroush Habibi 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 impossibility 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 idiosyncrasies (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.

Soroush Habibi has translated several literary books and novels. He translated *'Of Mice and Men'* in 2010. His translation is based on the contemporary culture in Iran after the Islamic Revolution. He has not used many terms and expressions that are in the ST which were not allowed according to Iranian culture and religion. So, Habibi has used some translation strategies in order to translate the ST in the best way. Thus, it could be a worthwhile tool for conducting 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. "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. "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)

4. "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)

5. 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)

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

7. "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."

8. "Well, you look her over, mister. You see if she ain't a tart." (p. 14)

9. 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)

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

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

12. "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)

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

14. "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)

15. 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)

3.2. Target Texts

1. "اما ... اگه ... شما یه کارگر کم توقع خواسین که فقط خوراک و رختخوابشو بدین و براتون کار بکنه من هسم! باتون می آم. درسته که قوزی ام، اما اگه بخوام مث هر *حمال* دیگه ای تونم کار کنم!" (p. 106).

2. با تحقیر گفت: "تو پدر سوخته ی دیوونه، می خوای خرگوش نیگر داری؟! خرگوشا محل سگم بهت نمی ذارن! تو عرضه نداری، یادت می ره علفشون بدی و گرسنه شون می ذاری! تو غیر از این عرضه ی هیچ کاری نداری! اون وقت جورج چی فکر می کنه؟" (p. 140)

3. با سنگدلی به او پرخاش کرد که: " لعنتی! دس آخر کار خودتو کردی؟ گند زری به بساط ما! لابد حالا کیف می کنی! همه می دونسن که کارت گنده کاریه! تو هیچ وقت آدم نبودی! حالا هیچی نیسی! یه تیکه گه!" (p. 131)

4. گفت: "من به عمرم کسی رو ندیدم که جداء به زمینش برسه! خیلیا رو دیدم که از درد خواب زمینداری داشتن دیوونه می شدن، اما پولشششونو تو نجیب خونه یا سر میز بیست ویک گذاشتن و باز آس پاس برگشتن به جون کندن برا اربابا!" (p. 106)

5. جورج گفت: "من تا آخر این ماه این جا کار می کنم. پنجاه دلارمو می گیرم می برم یه شب تا صبح *الواطی*. یا میرم تو یه کافه و می مونم تا آخر شب و می شم مشتری آخرش. همه ی پولمو می ذارم پای بطری! بعد برمی گردم این جا، روز از نو روزی از نو! یه ماه دیگه جون می کنم! تا باز پنجاه دلار گیرم بیاد! (p. 130)

6. "ولت می کنه، تو پدر سوخته دیوونه رو می ذاره می ره! تک و تنهات می ذاردت. تو بی پدر خل رو ولت می کنه!" (p. 141)

7. "اگه تو نبودی جورج همه ش می تونست خوش باشه و کیف کنه! می تونس مزدشو که گرفت بره *الواطی*! می تونس بره بیلیارد بازی کنه، اما کیف خودشو می داشت که مواظب تو باشه!" (p. 140)

8. "نیگاش که بکنی فوری می فهمی که زیر دمیش سسته!" (p. 44)

9. جورج گذاشت که بر پایش کنند و گفت: " آره، یه گلویی تر کنیم!" اسلیم گفت :" تو مجبور بودی جورج، به خدا چاره ای نداشتی! بیا، بیا بریم!" (p. 147)

10. کندی به دنبال سلام و تعارف خود گفت :" تو دست و بال شما چیزی پیزی پیدا نمیشه یه لبی تر کنم؟ قولنج بیچاره م کرده!" (p. 64)

11. " خب، بگو ببینم، جورج حالا کجاس؟ رفته شهر دنبال الواطی! همیشه خدا همینه!" (p. 105)

12. "گوش کن ببین چی می گم، لا مصب خر دیوونه! تو نیگاشم نمی کنی! به ما هیچ دخلی نداره چی می گی یا چی می کنه. دفعه اول نیست که از این افعیا تو زندون. تو طرفشم نمی ری!" (p. 13) ببینم. یه قلابیه که آدمو صاف می کشه (p. 48)

13. آهسته گفت: "بدبخت پسر خوبی بود!" (p. 135)

14. " خبری نیس. میریم خونه ی سوزی. خیلی جای خوبیه. خونه ی سوزی (p. 75) انقدر می خندی که حالت جا می آد. مدام شوخیه و خنده!"

15. جورج آهی کشید و گفت: "باز افتادیم تو هچل! این جا یه تله ی کوفتیه که آدمو یه راست می فرسته زندون!" (p. 79)

4. Data Analysis

The translator used a euphemistic expression in the translated text for "son-of-a-bictch". He translated this term as "Porter" "حمال". This is an acceptable translation, since the equivalent used in his translation has no negative value, and conveys the same meaning. In example 2, Habibi translated "You crazy bastard" as "تو پدر سوخته ی دیوونه". The translator uses the euphemism strategy so as to avoid the abusive word in his translation. By doing so, he considers the target cultural norms and target readers. This translation is considered as an acceptable one. In his translation nothing is lost and the message of the text is conveyed indirectly. So, the acceptability of his translation can be over 95%.

In example 3, Habibi translates the word "tart" as " یه تیکه گه". He uses the euphemism strategy in his translation. In fact, he applies an equivalent which is based on the norms of target text. So, the translation is acceptable or target text oriented. Habibi used a euphemistic expression," نجیب خونه" for "whore house", which is a case of an acceptable translation.

Habibi translates the same word as "الواطی" in which he uses the euphemism strategy in order to soften the taboo in the target text. In fact, Habibi's translation is based on the norms

of target language. And also, he domesticated this item according to target language which is a strategy used by him on track of acceptability of translation. The researcher believes that Habibi's translation is acceptable for those target text readers who do not know what exactly "الواطی" means but is not acceptable for those target text readers, specially aged readers who know the meaning of this word. This word had another meaning in the past; its meaning maybe has been changed during the time. "الواطی" refers to those people who are quarrelsome. These people are looking for struggle and altercation. This is not a proper equivalent because it does not include those who would like drink or go to whore house. These people do not look for struggle but they drink and just want to enjoy themselves.

The translator applies "پدر سوخته" for "bastard". So, he uses a euphemistic phrase to be close to the target text culture. He follows the acceptability in translation. In the source text, George could have such a good time spending his time in a pool room so as to play snooker or go to a whore house. However, in the given translation, Habibi translated "whorehouse "as " الواطی" which is a translation based on the cultural norms of the target text. And also, he used a euphemistic expression for this item according to target language which is a strategy used by him on track of acceptability of translation.

In the original text, the writer mentions Curley's wife acts as a tart. Habibi translates the sentence "You see if she ain't a tart" as "می فهمی که زیر دمبش سسته!". He applies a euphemistic expression and doesn't use an offensive expression. In fact, the translator applies an equivalent which is accepted in the target text and translates the taboo indirectly. This translation which is based on target language norms is an acceptable one. As seen in the example, Habibi translated "drink" as " یه گلویی تر کنیم!". He used this euphemistic expression to avoid using the taboo in the target text. Because drinking liquor, alcohol, beer is forbidden in Iran. Those who use these alcoholic drinks will be penalized by the judicial authorities. In fact, the translator conveys the message indirectly. This is an action applied by the translator to observe the norms of the target language. This could be an acceptable translation.

There is another example of euphemism made in the translation process by Habibi which seems to be ideologically oriented. The deleted word is "whisky". Habibi translates this word as "یه لبی تر کنم" in which he applies a euphemistic expression. He uses this strategy to transfer the message indirectly. Target readers fully understand the concept of the text. Thus, his translation is acceptable. Like the previous examples, example 7 also shows the use of euphemism technique in the translated texts by Habibi. It can be seen that "whorehouse" in the source text is translated as "الواطی". He uses a euphemistic expression to avoid the taboo word. The translator considers the target readers and translates the source text cultural norms into target culture norms. So, this can be an acceptable translation.

Habibi also adds the expression "لا مصبب خر دیوونه" to the target text in example 12 to come close to the target language culture. However these additions can make the translations acceptable, but the degrees of acceptability are low.

According to Toury, the poles between adequate and acceptable translations "are on a continuum since no translation is ever totally adequate or totally acceptable" (1995, p .57). Based on what mentioned above, it is said that the translator omitted the word "dastard" in his translation (example 13). Instead, he used a rewriting and a neutral item

"پسر خوبی بود" which is an action towards cultural norms adopted in the Target language. The translator also observed the pitiful tone in translation. This is crucial to depict the exact scene in translation and is done in his translation. Thus, the translation is mostly acceptable; that is, the translation is target text oriented.

As seen in the translation (example 14), he omitted these sentences, "Susy opens the door and yells over her shoulder, 'Get yor coats on, girls, here comes the sheriff.' She never talks dirty, neither. Got five girls there". The situation in the translation indicates that they are going to one of their relatives' home. By this omission, the translator has changed the atmosphere of the story completely. However, this is an acceptable translation. In order to have a more acceptable translation, the translator should apply those equivalences which are accepted in the target language.

As seen in example 15, these parts "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" are deleted. The translation does not convey the message intended by the author, the location is also vague. This kind of distortion makes the target language readers to infer the text themselves. This is not accepted in translation to omit some parts with no equivalences applying to them.

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 translators.

Habibi's translation can be considered as the acceptable one. Habibi applies the equivalents which do not distort the source text and also are accepted in the target culture. He translates the source text expressions into the target text indirectly. In doing so, he uses the euphemism, domestication and sometimes rewording strategies to convey the message of the source text as he is writing for the target readers. Habibi does not go beyond the theme of the story. He translates those taboo words as non-offensive ones but maintains the message of the source text; for example, he translates the word "cat house" as "الواطی".

In the case of Habibi's translation, quasi-omission can be seen in some parts of the translation which are ideologically oriented. Having an Islamic ideology, he considered the norms of the target language and target readers. Domestication was the most frequently used strategy in Habibi's translation. In many cases he domesticated the foreign elements in the translation.

By doing so, Habibi moved toward the target readers. Too much use of euphemism by Habibi is another point that made his translation acceptable. His indirect way of translation without any offensive words was a useful tool in making his translation highly acceptable.

References

اشتاین بک، ج.(1937) موش ها وآدمها . (س.حبیبی، مترجم) (1392). تهران: انتشارات ماهی.

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.* Reterived 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: sSt. Jerome.

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

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