

Transmission of Ideology through Translation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Chomsky’s “Media Control” and its Persian Translations

Zahra Khajeh

Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas Branch

roshanak82kh@yahoo.com

Hajar Khanmohammad

Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran

Fer987295kia@yahoo.com

Abstract

Among factors that might manipulate translators’ mind while producing a text is the notion of ideology transmission through text or talk. Adopting Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with particular emphasis on the framework of Van Dijk (1999), the present investigation is an attempt to shed light on the relationship between language and ideology involved in translation in general, and more specifically, to uncover the underlying ideological assumptions invisible in the texts, both source text (ST) and target text (TT), and consequently ascertain whether or not translators’ ideologies are imposed in their translations.

The corpus consists of the full text of two different Persian translations of the book *Media Control* by Noam Chomsky, written in English. In a qualitative phase, a detailed contrastive/comparative study at the micro-level in terms of fore/back-grounding mechanisms including explanation of lexical items and dominant grammatical metaphors (passive vs. active, nominalization vs. denominalization, addition vs. omission, and modalization) was conducted to examine, describe and subsequently interpret the patterns in the English source

text and its Persian translated versions. In order to make the research data interpretations as objective as possible, having computed frequencies of ideologically significant instances, and percentages, Chi-square formula was applied to find out any difference between proportions of information extracted from the target text concerning their fore/back-grounding and their positions against the source text as well as to test the research null hypothesis, which was consequently rejected.

The findings reveal that there are significant changes made by the two translators, either intentionally or unintentionally, in their selection of lexical items and syntactic structures in comparison to those in the source text. The findings of the study also show that many distortions or transformations between the original and the two translated versions were not only arbitrary, but also ideologically encoded in the texts, with specific purposes and functions. **Keywords:** critical discourse analysis, ideology, power, fore/back-grounding, discursive practice, micro/macro structure, domestication, foreignization, grammatical metaphors, lexicalization

1. Introduction

A thorough study of the history of translation uncovers that, translation, over centuries always, as a meeting point of different cultures and civilizations has been dynamically involving with an introduction of various perspectives on the path of enlightening and awakening nations around the world. It indicates that translation, in fact, cannot be considered as an isolated and solitary mode of writing. According to Hatim & Mason (1997), translation is “an act of communication” permanently dealing with at least two different languages along with a broad network of elements including cultural, historical, political and ideological differences. Furthermore, language is the most significant feature of human beings, regarded as an integrated part of meaning, on the one hand, and closely related to thought, on the other hand. In fact, language is commonly used to tell the truth (Cook, 2003), nevertheless, it should not be

neglected that sometimes, it is also served to distort realities, in the way to socially construct people's worldview; to convince them to take a particular position towards the false facts through manipulating their feelings, ideas, beliefs and thoughts.

Since translation students always read texts in a traditional way, that is, trying to comprehend it in an uncritical manner, this inquiry is a step allowing translation practitioners or students to identify and hence focus on particular linguistic features of texts (here political texts), which usually act as the potential sources of misleading for novice translators. Therefore, this article applies the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis in a comparative study of three corpora including one single politically slanted English book (ST) and its two corresponding Persian translations. This study is expected to provide the readers with a deep insight as well as a conducive translation pattern to explore why a specific word, phrase or structure is chosen rather than the other possible; generally speaking, it will show that any linguistic choices that are made in a text, can carry out ideological meanings as well. As such, the present study will enable the translation students to identify how language is actually used in specific communicative situations; in other words, they will understand the ways such invoking ideological structures are expressed and function through linguistic elements in that particular text.

What Critical Discourse Analysis is about?

Basically, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the main branch of discourse analysis, which can be used both as a theory and as a method in social scientific research. It is considered as one of the privileged interdisciplinary studies in which linguistic and cultural-ideological approaches to translation can be fitted. Of course, CDA, in order to carry out its primary activity of tracing the dialectic relationship between text and process, takes a radically different standpoint first and foremost giving much account of sociological variables such as ideology, power, hierarchy and gender seen as mainly effective elements for

Transmission of Ideology through Translation: A Critical...

interpretation or production of a text. In other words, in such a context, focus is not only put on the text, rather in its relation to different kinds of societal impulses and structures. Therefore it can be said that CDA is a highly context bound approach by and large taking democratic and ethical stance over social issues.

Fairclough (1991) who has made a great contribution to the establishment of CDA as a direction of research, maintains that the text does not convey meaning through linguistic features but it is generated and realized by its discursive formations reflecting certain ideologies or given ways of controlling and manipulating power relations. Taken in broad sense, similarly, van Dijk (1988, chap. 1), in his approach, developed a range of CDA and explained that “Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context”. His analytical method, suggests two levels of analysis: *a) micro-structure*: analysis of the text in terms of syntax (grammar) and lexis (vocabulary) and *b) macro-structure*: analysis and description of rhetorical organization of various texts. By the same token, in this paradigm the function of underlying involvement of actors such as their agency or responsibility are manifested using grammatical variations in terms of *foregrounding* and *backgrounding* mechanisms; for example in a news report on a demonstration, the choice between different syntactic structures like passive and active voice is a decision to foreground or background specific event.

The Position of Power

One of the major themes of Critical Discourse Analysis is the study of power existing in discourse (text or talk) or the power relations. It can be expressed that ideology and power are two interdependent and closely relative notions, which are very much linked to the language. CDA holds that, those members of less powerful groups who are most often influenced by discourse have the more

chances to get manipulated easily in the interest of dominant groups. Consequently it can be assumed that “more powerful actors have the more means and resource to influence the actions and minds of the less powerful” (van Dijk, 1988). He, described educational settings as an example, where the participants are unequal, the authoritative, trustworthy or credible sources like teachers and professors due to their access to the knowledge take the control of particular type of discourse like scholarly discourses over their students. In more critical situations, lawyers, judges and police officers based on their deep knowledge and information integrated in laws, rules, regulations and norms can get a direct answer or even confession from a suspect accordingly.

Language as Ideology

Within the framework of a new, long-term, multidisciplinary project on the complex relationship between discourse and ideology, in his most comprehensive study, van Dijk (1999) identified a conceptual triangle of society, discourse and social cognition, in which ideology constituted by critical discourse analysis plays a prominent role in creating the common social cognitions accepted by social groups, organizations or institutions. In this sense, ideologies have both a *cognitive* dimension that deal with fundamental mental objects such as ideas, thoughts, beliefs, judgments, values, knowledge, understanding and perception, and a *social* facet, which, in a large view, involves other social groups such as professionals (journalists, professors), action groups (anti-racists, environmentalists, Pro-Life anti-abortionists, etc.). According to his ideological notion, to find the ways ideologies are actually created, manipulated, imposed, legitimated, confirmed, and even finally made known the way they are enacted in a society, a close investigation is required through their discursive manifestations in text and talk.

CDA and Ideology in Translation

Based on a number of investigations carried out, the effects of the notions such as ideology, power, dominance, hierarchy and gender were all seen as relevant to the production of meaning and interpretation in translation processes. From modern translation studies' view point under two major influencing schools of post-culturalism and functionalism, any translation is a product resulted not from the linguistic surface of the source text (ST), but according to the target language norms and conventions, the source language text is retextualized by the translator (Karoubi, 2005). Likewise, Hatim and Mason (1997) proposed that, translating not only has never been a neutral activity as appeared, but also undeniably the political in terms of either activity or product. In Niranjana's (1991) words the translator has to constantly bear in mind the so-called gap existing between the source and the target culture with the aim of exploring the awareness of asymmetry as well as historicity made repressed or absent in several kinds of writings by different techniques (cited in Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 210). Alternatively, Lefever in 1992 has made the key notes on ideology in terms of translation in which a network of forms, conventions and beliefs are to shape the translators' actions. Eventually, he brought an end to his statements on the interaction between poetics and ideology as well as translation as the following: "on every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tends to win out" (Munday, 2004, p. 130). Venuti (1997), with regard to translation, distinguished two types of translating strategy: **a) domestication** and **b) foreignization** meaning that whether to leave the writer in peace, and to drag the reader towards him or to leave the reader alone as much as possible and push the author close to him. Venuti also defines "domestication" and "foreignization" as two relative terms basically loaded with ideological stances, as when making the text recognizable and familiar to the reader in target culture by domesticating method, or when through a foreignizing technique, under ideology and pressure of ST, translator

disturbs the cultural codes prevailing in TT in the way to take the target reader over to the unknown world of the author.

2. Objectives of the Study

Based on CDA approach as a support theory with a particular emphasis on fore/backgrounding mechanisms, the main aim of this study was to investigate and examine the extent to which specific socio-cultural and ideological constraints influence the translators' strategies in providing the finished product. Ultimately, the present study primarily attempted to uncover the underlying ideological assumptions hidden in the texts, both source text (ST) and target text (TT), consequently to ascertain whether the translators' ideologies were imposed on their respective translations; that is to say to identify where translators according to their own ideological principles adopted different strategies from what the author had applied in the text resulting in significant changes in the target text production.

Research Questions

Following the problem mentioned above, the researcher frames her objective into three questions:

1. Do particular socio-cultural and ideological constraints of the translator affect the translation of the political discourse?
2. How hidden underlying ideological structures can be represented in English and Persian discourses particularly in political texts?
3. What are the potential strategies and procedures on using fore/back grounding mechanisms when translating from English into Persian?

3. Method

Materials and Procedures

In pursuing the above-mentioned objectives, an illustrative corpus of the two full-text Persian translations of one single politically sensitive book titled *Media Control* written by *Noam Chomsky* in English was selected. Therefore, the materials used in this study were divided into three groups: (1) an English source text i.e. *Media Control* (2002) by Noam Chomsky, (2) one Persian translated text i.e. “کنترل رسانه ها” (1383/2004) by Dr. Ziā Xosrowshāhi, and (3) the same text translated into Persian i.e. “حاکمیت رسانه ها” (1385/2007) by Sa‘id Sāri Aşlāni.

Within CDA theory, having adopted the framework of van Dijk (1999) as a basis for data analysis, the content of all three texts was individually examined at micro-level of analysis. It would, therefore, include the revelation of a generalized conception of fore/backgrounding mechanisms which dealt with the following items:

- ***Lexicalization***: It focuses on the use of biased words, certain concepts or ideologically-laden terms
- ***Dominant syntactic choices or grammatical metaphors***: A powerful ideological tool which consists of various strategies as a response to possible interlingual translation problems such as: passivization, nominalization, modalization, and addition/omission

In the qualitative phase of the investigation, through a careful sentence-by-sentence comparative/contrastive reading of the source full-text and its translations, a number of evidences of underlying ideological structures represented in English ST as well as various instances of fore/back-groundings applied as translation solutions and strategies by the two Persian translators were discovered in TTs. As a result, to increase the reliability of the conclusions and hence, to make the research data interpretations as objective as possible,

having computed frequencies, recurring patterns of ideologically significant instances, and percentages, Chi-Square formula was used to systematically find out what proportions of the information extracted from the two translated texts were noticeably foregrounded or backgrounded against the source text.

4. Results

General Observations on Discursive Structures behind the ST

Before interpreting the data found in the present study, it is necessary to take a brief look at basic statistical facts about patterns of occurrence of discursive structures in the ST summarized in a table. Table 1, in general, brings forth a handful of meaningful information about the English version of the material under study. As shown, Item No. 1 indicates the degree of ideologically implicated words in the source text including 800 Items (19.25 %), moreover, Item No. 2, remarks that about 167 sentences of the ST amounting to 24.6 % have been written in passive voice rather than the active one. However, the frequency of the use of nominalization by the writer measures 311 (45.7%), while Item No. 4 presents the tendency of the writer to apply the modal auxiliary verbs which number 207 (30.4%).

No	Discursive structures	Frequency in ST	Percentage in ST
1	Lexicalization	800	19.25
2	Passivization	167	24.6
3	Nominalization	311	45.7
4	Modalization	207	30.4

Table 1

Basic descriptive statistics about patterns of occurrence of discursive structures in the **ST**

Transmission of Ideology through Translation: A Critical...

As already indicated, ideological constructions are connected to subconscious assumptions the text producers encode either intentionally or unintentionally encoded in the text they create.

Instances of back/foregrounding as Ideological Translation Strategies in TT1 and TT2

Findings of this study revealed that, the two translators almost always took different strategies in translating certain ideologically-laden terms and concepts or a series of grammatical structures in comparison with the original text. For example, shifting the voice of the writer in some cases from active to passive and vice versa, replacing source text nominalizations with Persian verb phrases and vice versa, and adding or deleting some information throughout both target texts. (Table 2)

No	Translation strategy	TT1		TT2	
		fr.	per.	fr.	per.
1	Lexicalization	1372	8.8	1458	12.36
2	Passivization	162	25.9	209	33.8
3	Nominalization	344	55.1	484	78.3
4	Deletion	18	2.8	7	1.1
5	Addition/expansion	133	21.5	25	4.04
6	Modalization	163	26.3	137	21.9

Table 2

Comparative translational solutions in TT1 and TT2

With the data on frequencies available, at the final stage, Chi-Square (χ^2) was applied in order to make the research data interpretations as objective as possible. This provides a way to find out what proportions of the information extracted from the two translated texts were noticeably foregrounded or backgrounded against the source text.

Items	TT1f	TT2f	TT1-TT2	(TT1-TT2) ²	(TT1-TT2) ² /TT2
Lexicalization	1372	1458	-86	7396	5.07
Passivization	162	209	-40	1600	7.6
Modalization	163	137	26	676	4.9
Nominalization	344	484	-140	19600	40.49
Deletion	18	7	11	121	17.28
Addition	133	25	108	11664	466.56

Table 3

Statistical test of nominal data- difference between foregrounding and backgrounding in TT1 and TT2

$$\chi^2 = \sum (TT1f - TT2f)^2 / E = 541.9$$

For the present study based on the number of different types of translation solutions observed, the d.f. was: 6-1=5.

According to table of Chi-square, the critical value of χ^2 with 5 d.f. was 11.07 for the 0.05 level and 15.08 for the 0.01 level. The result (541.9) calculated via the formula shown above, allows us to reject any null hypothesis, if chosen. Therefore with fairly confidence it can be expressed that **there is a relationship between socio-cultural and ideological constraints of the translator and the potential translation strategies s/he adopts while reproducing the text.**

For more clarification, in the following the most significant instances of versions of both ST and TTs are briefly presented, below:

Lexicalization

The lexical choices made by both translators were classified into three categories by their types as following:

- **Lexical variations:** Ideologically valued words like (*war, propaganda, freedom, peace, democracy, revolution, totalitarian state, state power*) are repeated 800 times throughout the source text (see table 1), while their

Transmission of Ideology through Translation: A Critical...

frequencies in TT1 (Xosrowshāhi) and TT2 (Aṣḷāni) are 1372 and 1458 times respectively. This degree of recurrence of ideological lexical items in TT2 portrays one type of foregrounding system in which the target text readers are intentionally provided with a specific point of view, in that a more powerful discourse as well as a radical political situation is reinforced than what the source text intended.

- **Over-lexicalization:** In contrast to the first translator Xosrowshāhi (TT1), the choices made by the second translator, Aṣḷāni (TT2), in referring to the same political terms, were rather more complex, negative and even ideologically meaningful. This simply has been an effort to create a strong and heavy sense of persuasively political or ideological impact on the readers' opinions. A few examples are presented in table 4.

ST	TT1	TT2
Pacifistic	آرامش طلب	جنگ ستیز
Propaganda	تبلیغات	هیاهوی سیاسی
Democracy	دموکراسی	مردم سالاری
Sanctions	تحریم ها	مجازات های اقتصادی
Mass murderers	کشتارهای جمعی	حاکمیت جلادان آدمکش
Bad strikers	اعتصاب کنندگان بدکردار	اعتصاب کنندگان شرور
Control	کنترل	حاکمیت

Table 4

Top seven over-lexicalized terms

- **Inconsistent use of lexical equivalents:** a number of words with heavy connotative values have not been translated consistently, though the original was noticeably referring to the same concept throughout. Chomsky's reference to "bewildered herd" has been translated variously in TT1 as "گله وحشی" (p.14), "رَمه وحشی" (p.18), "گله سردرگم" (p.13, 20, 25,

31, 44), “*رّمه های سردرگم*” (p.45) and “*جامعه گوسفند صفت*” (p.17, 25). On the other hand, in TT2, three different equivalents were offered by the translator for the term “propaganda” as “*هیاھوی سیاسی*” (p. 5, 6, 8, 15, 40, 42, 44, 48, 50), “*هیاھوی تبلیغاتی*” (p.18), “*تبلیغات*” (p.7, 9, 31).

After all, **non-systematic** applications of two opposite strategies (domestication vs. foreignization) in rendition of lexical items in Aşlāni’s translation were worthwhile to note. For reference the reader is presented to some examples in Table 5.

ST	TT1	TT2
Democracy	دموکراسی	مردم سالاری
Dictatorial goon	دیکتاتور بزرگ	آدمکش مستبد
Control	کنترل	اعمال نظارت
Ideological assumptions	ایدئولوژیکی فرضیه های	پیش فرضهای عقیدتی
Mohawk valley formula	فرمول موهاک ولی	صور تبندی دره مهاک
San Francisco Examiner	سانفرانسیسکو <u>اگزامینر</u>	<u>آزمونگر</u> سانفرانسیسکو
Oligarchy	<u>حکومت کوچک</u>	<u>اولیگارش</u>
Wartime Hysteria	<u>خواهان جنگ بیمارگونه</u>	<u>هیستری دوران جنگ</u>
Diplomacy	<u>دیپلماسی</u>	<u>دیپلماسی</u>
Sadism	<u>مردم آزاری</u>	<u>سادیسیم</u>

Table 5

Top ten inconsistent uses of lexical equivalents

Dominant syntactic choices

Passivization

The comparison of passive and active voices in the source and the two target texts did not provide considerable results from ideological point of view. In fact, as tables 1 and 2 show, TT1 comprises of 162 passive structures (25.96%), TT2 includes 209 (33.8%), while in ST 24.6% of the whole text contains passive constructions. The idea is that, both the author and

translators have followed the same trend to explicitly de-mystifying the causality and responsibility of the U.S. atrocities.

(1)

Passive —→ Active:

1. They **got signed** affidavits from 430 of them in which they described under oath, the torture... (p. 36)

TT1 : تحت سوگند 432 استشهدانامه به امضا می رسد... (ص.49)

TT2 : چهارصد و سی و دو نفر در آن زندان اسیر بودند که همگی قسم خوردند که شکنجه شده اند و اقرارنامه را امضا کردند. (ص.38)

In English and Persian linguistic structures, the choices about the representation of actions, actors and events have to do with the distinction between active and passive voices. Example (1) shows the possible ways in which a *Negative* action can be syntactically expressed in different ways. In TT2 the responsible agent of the action “signing the affidavits” has been made explicit while in TT1 it has been left unclear and unknown as it was in ST.

Nominalization

Table 2 indicates that in TT1, 344 (55.1%) nominalized constructions are utilized whereas in TT2 484 items (78.3%) have been changed under nominalization.

(2)

Nominalization —→ verb

There is an unstated premise here. (p.10)

TT1 : در اینجا یک موضوع ثابت شده از قبل وجود دارد که ذکر نشده است. (ص.15)

TT2 : پیش فرضی ناگفته در اینجا وجود دارد. (ص.12)

Syntactically, verbs tend to convey concrete notions, actions or processes rather than less effective abstract concepts. Although there is only a tendency, but it is quite enough to change readers' first interpretation out of the same issue. Example (2) is one type of nominalization, which is altered into a verbal

version of the action in TT1 to change readers' vision towards a more narrowed and specific event. On the other hand, in TT2, the ST sentence was translated in such a way that, nobody can ever make any guess about the actual involvement of an actor.

Modalization

By comparing tables 1 and 2, it was revealed that the number of modal verbs applied in TT1 (163 items) and TT2 (137 items), is less frequently used in the ST (207 items). Whatever the reasons that might lie behind representing modal verbs in the target texts, they were used less in the ST, they can pose different effects on the Persian readers with different cultural and ideological backgrounds.

(3)

There used to be one that was always readily available: the Russians. You **could** always defend yourself against the Russians. (p.32)

TT1 : این دشمنان دیو صفت پیوسته در آستین حاکمان جامعه کمین کرده بودند و هر زمان که آنان دلشان می خواست، آنها را بیرون می آوردند؛ مثلاً روسها. شما مجبور بودید همیشه بر علیه روسها به مقاومت پردازید. (ص.44)

TT2 : سابق بر این یک هیولایی داشتیم که پیوسته مورد استفاده قرار می گرفت: روس ها. همیشه می توانید در برابر روسها از خود دفاع کنید. (ص.34)

Here is another difference in syntactic transformation between the ST and TT1 & TT2. The past form of modal auxiliaries (*may-might, can-could, will-would, shall-should*) apart from their fairly negative force i.e. *not now*, indicate a further message as well; in this sense their effects become more tentative and uncertain in meaning (Hodge & Kress, 1993, chap. 7). Example (3) shows that, in TT1, not only *could* has not been translated with the same force as the original, but also it has been rendered in a way to establish an obligatory, commanding and even decisive function. On the other hand, the past tense of *could* has been translated with the present tense in TT2 (as underlined).

Addition vs. Deletion

In the analyzed data, It was found that the first translator (TT1), Xosrowshāhi, not only has added much further irrelevant information to his translation amounting to 133 items, but also at times he has simply deleted (about 18) items from words, phrases, sentences. Similarly, Aṣlāni (TT2) presented his own illustrative comments and interpretations of some specific concepts of the ST by adding about 25 footnotes (in average more than 5-6 lines) in his version while only 7 items were found missing.

(4)

That again is a hall mark of totalitarian culture. It ought to frighten us, that we are so deeply totalitarian that we can be driven to war without any reason being given for it and without anybody noticing Lebanon's request or caring. It's a very striking fact. (p.45)

TT1: این اوج نماد نمایش فرهنگ دیکتاتوری و خودکامگی آمریکا و یارانش است. حتماً باید ما را بترسانند که عمیقاً در درون سیاست خود کامگی فرو برویم و جهان را به سمت و سوی جنگ بکشانیم، بدون اینکه کوچکترین دلیلی در این خصوص ارائه شود و بدون اینکه کسی به خواسته های کشور لبنان توجهی کرده باشد. متأسفانه این است چهره مسخ کننده واقعیت سیاست غرب. (ص. 57)

TT2: دوباره تکرار می کنم، این نمودی از یک فرهنگ استبداد زده است. از اینکه، در چنان عمقی استبداد زده ایم، که می توانند بدون ارائه هیچ دلیلی ما را به میدان جنگ بفرستند، و اینکه هیچ کس به تقاضاها و بیم و هراس کشوری چون لبنان اهمیتی ندهد، باید هم وحشتزده شویم. این واقعیتی تکانهنده است. (ص. 47)

The first translator, Xosrowshāhi, noticeably appears to be trying to intentionally explicate some persuasive and motivating concepts about the United States. For instance, against the term "totalitarian culture" in the ST which is translated into "فرهنگ دیکتاتوری", he has also added another equivalent for that word to TT1 i.e. "خودکامگی آمریکا و یارانش". What is more, the translator has put more emphasis on his opinion about negative representation of the out-group (the United States and Europe) by adding

several negative terms into TT1 like “متأسفانه”, “مسخ کننده” etc. “سیاست غرب” (in comparison with TT2).

5. Discussion

As discussed earlier, politically implicated texts are of specific genres that pose different challenges to the translator as they have not been much touched upon. Overall, the critical analysis of *Media Control* along with its parallel Persian translations, on the one hand, reveals that what kind of discursive structures, translation strategies and moves are implicitly deployed at linguistic level of the text in positive presentation of the in-group and the negative presentation of the out-group, on the other hand discloses how readers' mind can be manipulated to form, confirm or reject an ideology. Although both Persian versions have been translated from an identical English text, apart from other syntactic and lexical variations between TT1 & TT2, noticeable differences are found mainly with respect to Additions and Deletions. As a matter of fact, the researcher found that some translation solutions have been consistently preferred, highlighted, focused upon, and made explicit and prominent by the first translator Xosrowshāhi. The most predominant strategy employed in the TT1& TT2 in relation to other ones was Nominalization. On the whole, at this level of analysis (micro-structure), it was observed that, Xosrowshāhi has provided much more evidence of conscious or unconscious manipulation in the production of his translation (TT1) than Aşlāni in TT2. On the contrary, it seems that Aşlāni has had tendency to somewhat confirm the ideology of the author and attempted to almost create the same reflection of Chomsky's under certain control of ideology as the original.

6. Conclusion

This comparative analysis located within Translation studies from a CDA viewpoint can provide a broader analytical angle for translation students

Transmission of Ideology through Translation: A Critical...

helping them to recognize texts in connection with all kinds of textual and extra textual constrains such as ideology, power relations, and cultural and historical backgrounds. Indeed, this enquiry was an attempt to emphasize that the underlying ideological filter, most often as an invisible hand, makes every text unbiased or innocent let alone texts having politicized language. Therefore, translators, as any other language users who actively participate in the process of creating meaning, need to be very aware of and conscious about every discursive strategy or choice, ranging from deletion and addition to syntactic and lexical variations, they might adopt during the process of producing the target text on the basis of the source text.

In view of this, the findings of the present paper and/or other CDA based research aim to contribute to a better understanding of politically slanted texts whose contents are more or less transparent, and accordingly to give translators a deeper insight towards subtle persuasive strategies which place readers in specific ideological positions.

References

- Basil, H., and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation an Advanced Resource Book*, New York: Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (2002). *Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda*, New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1991). *Language and Power*, New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B., and Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Hodge, B., and Kress, G. (2nd ed.) (1993). *Language as ideology*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Karoubi, B. (2005). *Ideology and Translation with a concluding point on translation teaching* [HTML Document] retrieved [04.02.06] available at: http://www.translationdirectory.com/article_233.htm

- Munday, J. (2004). *Introducing TRANSLATION STUDIES*, New York: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News as Discourse*, Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1999). "Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis", in *Discourse and Society* 10(4), pp. 459-470.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2000). *Critical discourse analysis* [HTML Document] retrieved [25.01.06] available at:
<http://www.discourse-in-society.org/OldArticles/the%20reality%20of%20racism.pdf>
- Venuti, L. (1997). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of differences*, New York: Routledge.

منابع فارسی

- احمدی گیوی، حسن و انوری، حسن (1385). *دستور زبان فارسی 1 و 2* (ویرایش سوم)، انتشارات فاطمی، تهران.
- انوری، حسن (1383). *فرهنگ سخن روز*، انتشارات سخن، تهران.
- آقاگل زاده، فردوس (1385). *تحلیل گفتمان انتقادی: تکوین تحلیل گفتمان در زبان شناسی*، انتشارات علمی و فرهنگی، تهران.
- پاک نهاد جبروتی، مریم (1381). *فردستی و فرودستی در زبان*، گام نو، تهران.
- تاجیک، محمدرضا (1379). *گفتمان و تحلیل گفتمانی*، انتشارات فرهنگ گفتمان، تهران.
- چامسکی، نوام (1928). *کنترل رسانه ها*، مترجم ضیا خسرو شاهی، نشر درسا 1385، چاپ دوم، تهران.
- چامسکی، نوام (1928). *حاکمیت بر رسانه ها*، مترجم سعید ساری اصلانی، انتشارات فرهنگ گفتمان 1385، چاپ اول، تهران.
- چامسکی، نوام و مویر، بل (1997). *زبان و اندیشه*، مترجم کوروش صفوی، انتشارات هرمس 1384، تهران.