
A Micro- and Macro-Level Descriptive-Analytical Study of Translation Criticism in Iran: Are We Moving within a Framework?

Mir Saeed Mousavi Razavi^{1*}, Morteza Gholami²

¹ Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, AllamehTabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

² MA in Translation Studies, AllamehTabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

Received: 01 September 2018

Accepted: 12 January 2019

Abstract

The present corpus-driven study addresses the current situation of translation criticisms published in print or online in the Iranian media. A sample of 17 criticisms (roughly 68,000 words altogether) from a variety of valid media outlets was compiled. Having been categorized into those with, and those without an explicit theoretical framework, the criticisms were examined on two levels: firstly, on a micro-textual level to ascertain their degree of subjectivity as well as the general features and secondly, on a macro-textual level, the aim of which was to find out the overall organizational pattern(s). The results showed that only 17 percent of the criticisms had been carried out within an explicit theoretical framework. The micro-textual analysis indicated that, despite being unsystematic, the criticisms' degree of subjectivity is relatively low: 0.81 percent in the first and 2.8 percent in the second category. The macro-structural analysis revealed interesting similarities and differences within and between the two categories, most strikingly the resemblance between the macro-textual structure of criticisms with an explicit framework and that of academic papers. The findings of this study might contribute to the literature on translation criticism and review in terms of both theory and practice.

Keywords: Translation criticism, Translation review, Criticism criteria, Macro/Micro-textual analysis

INTRODUCTION

In her paper, politics and translation, Schäffner (2007) asserts "in an increasingly globalized world, processes of text production and reception are no longer confined to one language and one culture" (p. 135). This is what makes translation an indispensable part of contemporary human life. Translation has turned into a ubiquitous phenomenon; an inevitable necessity. As indispensable as translation itself, translation criticism is a

mechanism for checking the quality of translation. Debates on how this quality check should be carried out are as old as debates on how translation should be undertaken in the first place. This is where translation criticism comes to play.

As far as the definition of translation criticism and/or review is concerned, there seems to be no consensus among scholars. Kelly (1979, as cited in Maier, 2009, p. 237), for instance, believes that the distinction between bad and good translation always depends on "ethnocentric approaches to the task of criticism". The disagreements stem, in

*Corresponding Author's Email:
s.mousavi@atu.ac.ir

part, from the fact that there is no “universal canon according to which texts may be assessed” (Bassnett, 2002, p. 21). Similarly, Maier (2009, p. 237) is on the belief that no general set of principles, and consequently, no theoretical framework can be extracted due to the fact that comments on translations are “highly motivated with respect to a translator’s effort or to the profession of translation itself”. Maier further aptly summarizes the lack of explicit and objective criteria to be attributable to “the error identification and highly subjective appraisals” (p. 238). Paloposki (2012) quotes Holmes (1972/1988) as saying that translation review as an academic branch of translation studies discipline is underdeveloped and has received small contribution from the discipline. Besides, research into translation criticism is important since it can help systematize its criteria, which may, in turn, lead the critics to adopt objective criteria in criticizing translations. This research and others alike, may play a role in making that contribution.

In the Iranian context, translation review and criticism lack systematic, organized and well-established criteria. Khazaefar (2015, p.73) claims that “translation criticism has no objective and systematic process and the definition of criticism – as envisaged both by the critic and the reader– is often absolutist.” This problem stems from the fact that there seems to be no explicitly stated and established set of criteria or model for translation criticism. Thus, the present research project is an attempt to fill the existing gap through analytically investigating the translation criticisms published in print or online in Iran, and identifying the general patterns and/or criteria employed by the critics. This may help to recognize and organize the criteria for translation review and criticism in Iran. The findings of this study might contribute to the literature on translation criticism and review in terms of both theory and practice. They may also provide further illuminating insights for translation studies researchers.

Translation Criticism

To begin with, it would be useful to look at the model proposed by Farahzad (2012), who distinguishes between two types of criticisms: comparative and non-comparative, and three levels of criticism: textual, paratextual and semiotic.

According to her model, Reiss’s (2000) inclination is toward comparative criticism, mainly at the textual level. She maintains that reviewers often fall short of sparing the required time and effort to make comparisons between a translation and the original text, even if they happen to know both languages. Reiss (2000, p. 2) asserts:

The result is outrageous: a work is examined for its content, style and sometimes also for its esthetic character, and both the author and his work are judged only on the basis of a translation without consulting the original work.

Thus, Reiss (2000) does not regard literary critics as qualified to pass judgments on translation because they see it as an original work and their focus is solely on the product of translation while the process oftentimes remains ignored. Apparently, she favors translation criticism at the textual level based on the concept of equivalence between two texts. In line with the focus on textual relationship, Reiss (2000, pp. 2-3) proposes that “translation criticism is possible only by persons who are familiar with both the target and source languages, and are accordingly in a position to compare the translation directly with its original.” And in the first chapter of her book, she makes it as explicit as possible: “no critique without a comparison with the original”.

As far as the concept of equivalence is concerned, House (2015) also proposes her model within the realm of Translation Quality Assessment (TQA). Although named differently, it is very closely interrelated with translation criticism. The criterion of evaluation for adequacy of translation is the degree of equality (being ‘match’ in House’s terms) between “textual profile and function of the translation (derived from an analogous analysis)” (p. 63).

The distinction between House and Reiss's approach is that the former is after grading translations while the latter, (Reiss, 2000), advocates offering improvements along with casting negative criticism, i.e., detecting erroneous elements and rectifying them. Reiss stresses that "to avoid any suspicion of mere quibbling, this principle should always be observed".

Another difference between TQA and (literary) translation criticism is reflected in Hewson's (2011, p. 3) remark "TQA usually addresses different types of pragmatic texts, and thus does not necessarily look in detail at the particular issues associated with the literary text, which requires specific methodology and criteria".

However, Hewson (2011) himself proposes a model for translation criticism which is not based on 'assessment' of translation; rather, it focuses on giving a 'theoretically-based description' of translation, which is referred to as an 'interpretive approach' to translation criticism.

In an attempt to support his approach, Hewson (1999, as cited in Hewson, 2011, p. 6), quotes McAlester as saying that translation criticism is not restricted to "stating the appropriateness of a translation, which naturally also implies a value judgment, though it need not be quantified or even made explicit". Instead, he prefers to probe the 'interpretive potential' of the translation in terms of 'translational choices'. In other words, he seeks to explore how the translator's choices have created a specific interpretive potential.

In brief, there seems to be no pre-established, systematic criteria or model in criticizing translations. Thus, the present research is aimed at identifying the prevailing criteria and approaches utilized in translation criticism as well as developing a better understanding of the context of translation criticism in Iran.

Related Studies

In the current context of Iran, as Khazaeefar (2015) argues that there is no systematic and objective way of criticizing translations. He distinguishes four types of criticisms prevalent in Iran. The following is a brief account of these four

types: 1) Criticisms in which the translated work is treated as an original and its cultural or literary importance is taken into account. At the end, a short judgment like 'good translation' is passed, 2) Criticisms in which the critic acts as a strict editor who pinpoints the linguistic problems appearing in the translation. The errors singled out are introduced as a small sample implying a larger body of errors and the translation is labeled 'bad', 3) In contrast to the previous one, in this type of translation criticism, the critic only mentions the merits of the translation, and finally 4) The 'fair criticism', in which the merits and demerits of the translation are both paid attention to, though more emphasis is given to the merits. This type of criticism gives its readers an impression that the critic has, with a perfect command of the issue at hand, undertaken the task of criticism in a non-commendatory manner. This notwithstanding, should an in-depth analysis be carried out, it will become clear that most of these criticisms lack coherence and are merely personal assumptions by the critic with regard to different issues.

In another study, conducted by Heidarpour and Hashemi (2013), stylistic, lexical and semantic aspects of translation criticism on contemporary works of both literary and non-literary nature (1941-1978), which they consider as a historical study of translation criticism, have been investigated. According to their findings, there is a diverse range of opinions about the above-mentioned aspects of translation criticism. They conclude that these criticisms are neither objective nor systematic and that they are carried out arbitrarily based on subjective judgment.

This problem, however, is not confined to the Iranian context; rather, it seems to exist on a global scale as well. Vanderschelden (2000) reports literary translation evaluation is not "universal or systematic" (p. 287) and characterizes translation criticism criteria as unclear and unsupported. She also describes 'accuracy' to be the main criterion that critics take into account, a concept which is itself but unclear and unestablished. "My study of French reviews suggests

that the criteria used for evaluating translations amount to no more than a set of presuppositions and subjective assumptions which vary from one reviewer to the next” (Reiss, 2000, p. 287). It is clear that the term ‘accuracy’ is vague and can be interpreted in various ways. However, Vanderschelden does not fall short of noting that the underlying definition adopted by these critics seems to be ‘closeness to the original’.

Fawcett (2000) investigates translation reviews in the British media. Like Vanderschelden, he goes on to investigate the “parameters defining the usually implicit framework within which translation criticism is conducted and what seems to be the overwhelmingly preferred translation strategy” (p. 295).

Fawcett (2000, p. 296) summarizes his findings, as follows, in terms of the prevailing criteria in British broadsheets- non-tabloid publications which contain book reviews: ‘a strong inclination for “transparent translation” as well as strong disinclination for “source-tainted” translation, non-provision of analysis, evidence or justification for the criticisms, non-provision of original text, and a fairly harsh tone of criticism.’

Transparency, fluency and readability are all near-synonyms describing how translations are reviewed in the broadsheets in Britain (Fawcett, 2000). This emphasis seems to stem from the fact that they are reviews; by definition, a review does not involve any comparison between the source text and the target text and the assessment is mainly based on the content, range of audience and target language (Reiss, 2000). This is where the two studies by Vanderschelden (2000) and Fawcett (2000) seem to diverge; according to Fawcett’s findings, unlike Vanderschelden, the critics’ main criterion is not accuracy anymore. This maybe, in part, due to the fact that the critics have not used the “comparative method advocated by many translation specialists as a more effective and objective way of judging the quality of a translation” (Vanderschelden, 2000, p. 288). Thus, according to separate researches by Vanderschelden (2000) and Fawcett (2000), critics’ main concern is evaluative factors of target

language like fluency, coherence, text-type tailored language, etc. This is why elements in translation which disturb the naturalness of target language, normally motivated by source language features, are singled out and described as non-coherent, problematic elements. As Fawcett (2000, p. 296) notes the main attitude in reviewing “is condemnation of source-language contamination”.

METHODS

The present research was conducted with a view to investigating, both on a micro-level and a macro-level, the current situation of translation criticisms published in the Iranian press over the past decade. The criteria and/or approaches adopted in translation criticisms, (not) following a specified framework for criticism, the extent of being subjective/objective, and general macro-structural patterns followed have been of prime importance to the researchers. To help achieve the desired objectives, certain questions were formulated.

Research Questions

It was the intention of the present research to find, as far as possible, objective, reliable answers to the following questions. The initial question that triggered off the research in the first place was:

Q1. What percentage of the translation criticisms in Iran follows ‘a specified theoretical framework’?

Having categorized the criticisms into two separate groups of criticisms *with* and *without* a specified framework to answer the initial question, the researchers then embarked on a micro-textual analysis (i.e., an analysis on the level of words and sentences) to find out the prevalent features of the criticisms in the two groups. The analysis was an attempt to answer the following questions:

Q2. To what extent are translation criticisms *with* a specified framework subjective?

Q3. To what extent are translation criticisms **without** a specified framework subjective?

Q4. What are the prevalent features of translation criticisms **with** and **without** a specified framework? What are the possible similarities or differences?

As the researchers were on the belief that (not) following a specified theoretical framework could possibly have ramifications on the general textual patterns, a further macro-textual analysis (i.e., an analysis on the level of text structure) was also undertaken to help answer the questions below:

Q5. On a macro-structural level of text organization, what general patterns are followed in translation criticisms **with** a specified framework?

Q6. On a macro-structural level of text organization, what general patterns are followed in translation criticisms **without** a specified framework?

Corpus

To help answer the research questions, a corpus needed to be compiled. A collection of translation criticisms, published in the Iranian media (journals, newspapers, and online sources), was selected and compiled as the sample population in this study. Care was taken to include different sources so as to ensure representativeness of the sample: *Motarjem*, *Šharq Daily* and *Ketāb-e Māh* are among the sources included. The corpus contains translation criticisms published in print or in electronic format. The majority of electronic-data was available for free on the Internet while the printed data, which covers a seven-year period from 2008 to 2015, had to be purchased.

Here is a brief account of the publications constituting the corpus along with their aims and scope of interest. *Ketāb-e Māh* is a monthly journal publishing book criticisms and reviews, interviews, news and reports about books. It has eight sub-journals, of which *AdabiyātandFalsafe* is one. *Motarjem* is an online specialized journal in

translation (in Persian, *Motarjem* means translator), which is published quarterly and deals with areas such as theory, practice, history and criticism of translation. It has been published since 1991. The next is *AdabiyātDāstāni*, which is another quarterly journal. It publishes articles on Persian literature as well as book criticisms and reviews. *Šharq Daily* is the most popular reformist newspaper in Iran publishing reports and news on various topics and areas including literature.

Data Analysis Procedure

Upon compilation, the whole corpus was divided into two sections: 1) criticisms which follow an explicit framework, and 2) criticisms which do not follow any explicit framework. For ease of reporting, criticisms were labeled and numbered using the initials of the published volumes in which they appeared. For example, the three criticisms belonging to the journal *Ketāb-e Māh* were labeled K1, K2, and K3. The data was tabulated accordingly and the first research question was answered.

The next step involved a micro-level analysis; the total number of words contained in the main body of the translation criticisms (excluding theoretical explanations, examples, etc.) was calculated. Then, having extracted the ‘subjective remarks’ from the criticisms, the total number of words contained in such remarks was calculated as well. By ‘subjective remarks’ we mean those remarks which are not supported by any objective reason: for example, ‘this is a good translation’, if not followed by any kind of justification, is a subjective sentence consisting of five words. The ratio of subjective words to the total number of words in each set of criticisms was taken as an ‘indicator’ of the degree of subjectivity. In simple words, the higher the percentage of subjective words contained, the more subjective a translation criticism. This helped answer questions 2 and 3.

To answer question 4, a detailed examination of the content of each criticism was undertaken to reveal the mechanics of criticizing as well as the approaches adopted by the critics.

The final step involved a macro-level investigation of the textual structure of the criticisms with a view to finding out possible similarities and/or differences as well as any possible relationship between the macrostructure of a criticism and its (not) following an explicit theoretical framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first step for conducting the present research was categorization of the criticisms: the criticisms listed in table 1 below are the ones that provide readers with a theory or framework based on which the assessment of translation has been carried out. For example, K2 has been carried out based on Antoine Berman's (1995) typology of deforming tendencies. In the criticisms listed in table 2, however, no explicit criteria for assessment have been stated. As Venuti (1995) holds translation criticism criteria usually are based on individual presumptions and incline towards being implied rather than explicitly stated.

Out of the total seventeen criticisms examined, only three fell under the first category, that is to say, only 17.6% of the criticisms followed an explicit theoretical framework while the remaining fourteen failed to do so. This small number shows only a minority of translation critics tend to follow a certain theoretical framework while the majority do not. This finding is evidence in support of Khazaefar's (2015) claim that translation criticisms in Iran are not 'systematic'.

It may be inferred that most of those who write translation criticisms are unfamiliar with the frameworks existing within the discipline of translation studies. These frameworks include, but are not limited to, the ones proposed by Reiss (2000), House (2015), and Berman (1995). What lends support to our inference is that further investigation about the critics concerned, revealed that the authors of these three criticisms were translation scholars, and naturally enough, familiar with the

Table 1

Subjectivity in Criticisms with an Explicit Framework

Translation criticisms	Total number of words	Number of words in subjective remarks
K1	750	0
K2	900	0

theoretical frameworks for translation criticism.

Micro-level Analysis

The micro-level analysis was carried out in two steps: first the ratio of subjective words to the total number of words in each set of criticisms was calculated and tabulated accordingly. Then general features of the criticisms, including the mechanics of criticizing, the criteria used, and the approaches adopted were explored.

Degree of Subjectivity

In the three criticisms (table 1) where the framework within which the translation has been criticized is explicitly stated, there is a total of 2450 words, out of which only 20 subjective words were identified, that is to say, a negligible 0.81% of the total number of words.

In the fourteen criticisms (table 2) which lack an explicit framework, there is a total of 15410 words while the number of subjective words here is 430, constituting 2.8% of the total.

In both categories, the ratio of subjective words, which is considered as an indicator of the degree of subjectivity, is remarkably low. It follows from the sparseness of subjective remarks that, contrary to Khazaefar's (2015) claim, Iranian critics tend to be fairly objective in their approach to evaluating translations. They generally avoid unsupported, 'hackneyed' expressions like 'good/bad/smooth/natural translation'; instead, they try to be as objective as possible through providing the reader with logical reasons when passing a judgment. This may also be due, in part, to the fact all the critics have used the "comparative method advocated by many translation specialists as a more effective and objective way of judging the quality of a translation" (Maier, 2009, p. 288).

Table 2
Subjectivity in Criticisms without an Explicit Framework

Translation criticisms	Total number of words	Number of words in subjective remarks
K4	3000	35
K5	1000	40
M1	1000	50
M2	900	50
M3	1200	30
M4	1000	60
M5	900	35
M6	600	20
A1	750	100
F1	900	10
F2	660	214
Sh1	1000	0
Sh2	1000	0
Sh3	1500	0

Being 'objective', however, should not be taken to mean that they are 'systematic'. They still suffer from arbitrariness. They do provide a justification for the translational problems identified. For instance, the critic mentions an improper equivalent, a case of misunderstanding by the translator, or a stylistic problem. Yet, this does not suffice to give a bigger picture of translation evaluation; a random set of problems cannot serve as the criteria for translation quality assessment.

The problem is that the basis for judgment is not spelled out in the first place; it is, implicitly, assumed to be linguistic equivalence, which, as Hewson (2011) argues, is not an appropriate criterion for evaluating translations. Besides, Khazaefar (2015) points out that the set of translational problems identified by the critic functions as a sample representative of the whole book. Based on this sample, the critic passes their judgment. What makes these criticisms' unsystematic, and consequently arbitrary, is the following questions, which remain unanswered: to what extent are these samples representative of the whole translation? How, and on what basis are they selected and singled out?

Still another interesting finding in support of the criticisms' being unsystematic is that in

almost all of the cases, particularly those with

out an explicit framework, the criticisms are negative. From this perspective, as Hewson (2011, p. 3) points out “translations are fundamentally flawed and should be dealt with as ‘deficient’ texts.” In other words, the criticisms amount to nothing more than quibbling and singling out deficiencies, then judging translations on the basis of a few randomly chosen translational problems. Such an evaluation process is not systematic as it “hardly serve[s] to understand the general impact of translational choices” and “give[s] limited insight into short passages of a text” (Vanderschelden, 2000, p. 2).

Mechanics of Criticizing

A detailed examination of each individual criticism was undertaken to explore their general characteristics and criteria, as well as the mechanics of criticizing.

Criticisms with an explicit framework

K1, K2, and K3: the common feature among these criticisms is that they first introduce a translation-studies-based theory, try to adapt it to the atmosphere of the assessment, and then evaluate the translation according to the theoretical framework explained. Thus, we observed very few value judgments-if any at all. Unlike criticisms without an explicit framework, labeling translations as ‘bad’ or ‘good’ has been avoided. They describe the translation based on the theory and point out the strengths and weaknesses of the translation within the limits of the specified theory.

Criticisms without an explicit framework

K4, and K5: they sometimes compare two or more translations and explain what translational problems one has and the other does not. Their focus is on isolated phrases, with little or even no contextual clue for the reader, rejecting the translation and offering the critic’s own version. Overall, they mostly enumerate translation problems.

M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, and M6: they mostly compare two or three translations of a literary work and their main focus is on translational errors, e.g., incorrect equivalents. Regarding the

target language, which is Persian/Farsi here, they describe translations as (not) being ‘smooth’, ‘natural’ and ‘stylistically homogenous’. The critic frequently mentions specific stretches of the source text which the translator has failed to understand, and consequently to render appropriately in the target language. Such parts are labeled as ‘inconsistent’ and ‘non-coherent’ with the logic of the work.

A1: the critic compares the translation with the source text, his main criterion in literary translation being preservation of the rhythm and aesthetic effects of the source text. He states that the translation has not been able to produce the same effect and impression on the reader (he probably thinks so because he himself has translated the very same short story!). Yet, no explicit and solid criterion is provided. In the rest of the criticism, he offers a numbered list of 24 influential lexical, syntactic and stylistic mistakes extracted from his comparison between the two texts. Another deficiency pointed out by the critic, which is more often than not mentioned by other critics as well, is that the translator has not been able to understand a certain part of the source text properly and has, as a result, fabricated that part.

F1, and F2: they closely compare the translation with the source text and single out the translation errors.

Singling out the ‘omissions’ in the translation and labeling them as demerits is another dominant characteristic of these criticisms. The critic does not explain why and how such omissions are destructive to the quality of translation. It is almost taken for granted that translation always entails some degree of loss and/or gain. It follows that omission is natural in translation. Downgrading a translation solely on account of the existence of certain omissions without providing reasons may give the readers the false impression that each and every single part of the original text must be rendered one by one.

They both single out semantically incorrect equivalents, focusing on sentences the meaning of which is not rendered in a satisfactory manner.

They also take into account stylistic issues with a view to unveiling flaws in the translation which are detrimental to its style making it inconsistent and non-coherent.

Sh1, Sh2, and Sh3: all three criticisms have been written by the same person since there is apparently one critic who writes translation criticisms in this newspaper. Having based his criticisms on a close comparison between the source and the target text, the critic analyzes the translation on the lexico-grammatical level, his main criteria being accuracy and correctness. One important point about these criticisms is that the translations chosen are in fact full of grave mistakes; they have apparently been done by inexperienced translators who just want to see their names on book covers. The criticisms seem to be meant to raise the alarm for publishers to be careful of what they publish, and for novice translators alike to beware of the terrible mistakes they may make.

In brief, the recurring pattern in criticisms without an explicit framework is that by resorting to a close comparison between the source and target texts, and relying on such concepts as accuracy, correctness, and correspondence (as vague as they might be), they are aimed at discovering errors. Oftentimes decontextualized, these ‘errors’ are usually on the level of lexis, and sometimes grammar. The critic then offers his own suggestion as a better, more accurate translation. It may be inferred that (linguistic) equivalence is the main criterion used in criticizing translations, just as Vanderschelden (2000, p. 287) concludes that “the two main assumptions underlying accuracy are equivalence and faithfulness”. As far as the target language is concerned, they expect the target (Persian) texts to be natural and smooth. Table 3 summarizes our findings in this section.

Macro-level Analysis

Table 3.

Mechanics of Criticizing in Criticisms without an Explicit Framework

Mechanics of criticizing	K4, and K5	M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, and M6	A1	Sh1, Sh2, and Sh3	F1, and F2
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------	----	-------------------	------------

Riazi (2003, para. 18) speaks of a type of text analysis which “focuses on the structure of written language, [...] found in such “texts” as essays and articles, notices, book chapters, and so on.” Such analyses are meant to shed light on the macro-structure of different text types. The general recurring patterns in any text type can, and do, contribute to the forming of the ‘meaning’ of text. As such, the macro-structure of a text can be as important as its micro-structure.

There are many macro-structural studies in different text genres (see: Salager-Meyer, 1992; Toledo, 2005; Martín, 2003; Gunnarsson, 1990); for instance, a research by Riazi (2003) and Bolivar (1994, as cited in Riazi, 2003) on the macro-structure of texts in the genre of newspaper and media. In his analysis, he found that the newspapers’ editorials consist of three main parts: “Lead, Follow, and Valuate (LFV), serving distinctive functions of initiation, follow-up, and evaluation of the two” (Riazi, 2003, para. 20). Riazi concludes that the general macro-structure of newspaper editorials is LFV.

In the second phase of our study, attempt was made to explore and present the macro-structure of translation criticisms in Iran.

In order to name the different parts recognized in the criticisms, we borrow the term ‘move’ from genre analysis. It is defined as “a meaningful unit represented in linguistic (lexical-grammatical) forms and related to the communicative purposes of the activity in which members of the community are engaged” (Vanderschelden, 2000, p. 1214). According to Vergaro, move describes the ‘function’ of a specific part in a discourse. In other words, any section in any discourse serves a specific purpose; it is strictly related to the preceding and following sections, while having its own special features making it distinct from the rest.

Error analysis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criteria used	Linguistic equivalence	-Linguistic equivalence -TT style (naturalness) -Correct transfer of meaning -Overall coherence and logic of the work	-Preserving rhythm and aesthetic effects of ST -Lexical, syntactic and stylistic mistakes -Correct transfer of meaning	-Linguistic equivalence: analysis of lexicon and grammar -Accuracy -Correct transfer of meaning	-Linguistic equivalence -TT style (naturalness) -Correct transfer of meaning -Overemphasis on omissions
Basis for analysis	-Comparing TT with ST(focus on isolated phrases)	-Comparing 2 or 3 translations of 1 literary work(focus on isolated sentences)	-Comparing TT with ST	-Comparing TT with ST(focus on isolated phrases)	-Comparing TT with ST(focus on isolated phrases)
Suggesting better alternatives	Yes(with little reasoning <i>why</i> the critic's suggestion is better)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Text type	Literary	Literary	Literary	Philosophical	Literary

Criticisms with an Explicit Framework

The overall organization of 'criticisms with an explicit framework' is as follows. They all tend to follow a macro-structural pattern which very closely resembles that of an 'academic paper'. The pattern is shown in table 4 below.

One of the criticisms (K1), however, has an additional distinctive feature. It includes a section that can be placed under the category of 'translation review' in its strict sense. This section is devoted to introducing and describing the translation as a standalone work in its own right, without making any reference to the source text. In fact, K1 can be divided into two separate sections: in the first one, the critic explains the

content, the author, and his/her position in the literature. This is commonly known as a 'review'. In the second section, the macro-structural organization is similar to the one presented in table 4 below. This is a hybrid type of translation-related writing which entails both criticizing and reviewing.

Criticisms without an Explicit Framework

In terms of macro-structure, the pattern followed in all criticisms in this category is summarized in the table 5 below. Interestingly, one of them (K4) is an instance of the hybrid type of criticism/review, which was discussed above.

Table 4.
Macro-structure of Criticisms with an Explicit Framework

Move	Function, characteristics
Title	Academic, informative, and clear-cut (for example: 'criticism of X literary work based on Y theory')
Abstract	A brief description of the writing (around 250 words)
Introduction	An introduction to the work under criticism, translation history, or translation criticism in general
Literature review	An analytical summary of translation studies, specifically of translation criticism and a short review of the technical terminology
Methodology	Presentation of framework(s) within which the criticism is carried out
Results	Presentation of the analysis conducted: pieces from the source text, their translation, then a descriptive analysis, sometimes accompanied by suggestion of alternatives
References/notes	A list of works cited/endnotes

Table 5.
Macro-structure of Criticisms without an Explicit Framework

Move	Function, characteristics
Title	Usually pompous and eye-catching, excluding the word 'criticism'
Introduction	A very short introduction to the work under criticism
Judgment	Overall judgment of how bad or good the translation is from the critic's point of view
Comparison	Presentation of (problematic) pieces from the source text, their translation, then pointing out the problems, oftentimes accompanied by suggestion of 'better' alternatives
References/notes	bibliography/endnotes

CONCLUSION

The present research aimed at shedding light on the current situation of translation criticism in Iranian media outlets. It was revealed that only a minority of the criticisms are carried out within an explicit framework while the majority does not rest on solid theoretical grounds. This may be attributable to the critics' unfamiliarity with, or otherwise reluctance to use, the existing models as the basis for assessment of translation quality.

The criticisms with a framework tend to introduce a translation-studies-based theory/model, adapt it to suit the purpose of the assessment, avoid value judgments, and pinpoint the merits and demerits of the translation within the limits of the specified theory using a descriptive approach. On the other hand, the criticisms without a framework share the following features: almost all of them seem to have assumed 'linguistic equivalence' to be the criterion for assessment of translation. As a result, they rely on a close comparison between selected parts of the ST and their corresponding parts in the TT. The selected parts are often decontextualized, and the rationale behind their selection is not stated. This is why the criticisms are almost always negative, i.e., the

whole criticism boils down to enumeration of the 'errors' along with 'better' alternatives suggested by the critic. This is further proof that translation criticisms in Iran are not systematic (Khazaefar, 2015).

The degree of subjectivity, however, turned out to be relatively low in both criticisms with and criticisms without an explicit framework. Yet, it is worth noting that those with a framework had a lower degree of subjectivity (0.81%) as compared to those without a framework (2.8%). This may be an indicator of how moving within a solid framework for criticism can help increase objectivity in the process and product of translation criticism as a translation-related text production procedure.

A noteworthy finding of our study is that almost all the criticisms studied, were related to literary works. This may imply that within the Iranian community of critics, it is still literary works which are considered as 'important' and 'worthy of attention' and other texts, and by extension their translations, are deemed as 'secondary' and 'less important'. Therefore, the criticism, too, tend to be about translation of literary

texts although they have been published in a variety of media outlets, not necessarily concerned with literature. Such an outlook is certainly rooted in the larger socio-cultural context in which translation criticism is embedded. It can reflect the prevailing attitudes to text production practices in a certain society at a given point in time.

From a macro-structural perspective, interesting similarities and differences were discovered both within and between the two categories of criticisms. One interesting finding is that the general macro-textual pattern observed in criticisms with a framework bears a notable resemblance to that of academic writings. This is important as the macrostructure of a text can reflect the thought structure of the text producer. Similarly, the overall logical organization of a text can, and does, play a part in how the text will be received by the readership. It not only influences, but also is part of the ‘meaning’ of the text.

Our initial aim was to keep the distinction between criticism and review, focusing solely on translation criticisms, and excluding translation reviews from the scope of the study. ‘Review’ are, by definition, meant to “alert a reader to new books, describing them and passing judgment as to whether they are worth reading and buying (Hewson, 2011) Translation criticisms, on the other hand, take into account the existence of the source text and its relation to the TT. However, it was revealed that some of the criticisms in the corpus also shared features of a review. As a matter of fact, the distinction in theory, is not always applicable to what happens in practice. What we were faced with was a hybrid type of translation-related writing, which we propose be referred to as ‘*translation criview*’.

As a final remark, we suggest more research be conducted on the situation of translation criticism and review in different countries as we believe this situation can be closely interrelated with the larger social, cultural, political contexts. It is only with the benefit of accumulated data and comparative studies that reliable, comprehensive conclusions may be drawn on a larger scale about translation criticism and review in

different nations and cultures, its roots, and its consequences.

References

- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Berman, A. (1995). *Toward Translation Criticism* (L. v. Flotow, Trans.). Paris: Gallimard.
- Farahzad, F. (2012). Translation criticism: A three-dimensional model based on CDA. *Translation Studies*, 9(36), 27-44.
- Fawcett, P. (2000). Translation in the broadsheets. *The Translator*, 6(2), 295-307.
- Gunnarsson, B. L. (1990). *A model for text analysis*. Paper presented at the Learning, Keeping and Using Language: Selected papers from the Eighth World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney.
- Heidarpour, A. D., & Hashemi, M. (2012-13). Exploring stylistic considerations in translation criticism practice in contemporary in Iran (1951-1978). *Translation Studies*, 11 (43), 21-32.
- Hewson, L. (2011). *An approach to translation criticism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment*. New York: Routledge.
- Khazaeefar, A. (2015). Translation criticism in Iran: methods and problems. *Nameh Farhangestan*, 3 (14), 71-93.
- Maier, C. (2009). Reviewing and criticism. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 236-240). New York: Routledge.
- Martín, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for specific purposes*, 22 (1), 25-43.
- Paloposki, O. (2012). Translation criticism. In Y. Gambier & L. v. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 3, pp. 184-190). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism-the potentials and limitations: Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment* (E. F. Rhodes, Trans.). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Riazi, A. (2003). The invisible in translation: The role of text structure. *Translation Journal*, 7 (2), retrieved from translationjournal.net/journal/24structure.htm.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1992). A text-type and move analysis study of verb tense and modality distribution in medical English abstracts. *English for specific purposes* 11 (2), 93-113.
- Schäffner, C. (2007). Politics and translation. In P. Kuhiwczak & K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to translation studies* (pp. 134-187). New York: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Toledo, P. F. (2005). Genre analysis and reading of English as a foreign language: Genre schemata beyond text typologies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37 (7), 1059-1079.
- Vanderschelden, I. (2000a). Quality assessment and literary translation in France. *The Translator*, 6(2), 271-293.
- Vanderschelden, I. (2000b). Quality assessment and literary translation in France. *The Translator*, 6 (2), 271-293.
- Vergaro, C. (2002). ‘‘Dear sirs, what would you do if you were in our position?’’. Discourse strategies in Italian and English money chasing letters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(9), 1211-1233.

Biodata

Dr Mir Saeed Mousavi Razavi is Assistant Professor of Translation Studies at AllamehTabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. His research has embraced translation/interpreting pedagogy, translation evaluation, translation criticism, and research methodologies among other areas and he has published books and papers on these topics. He has also been working as a professional English-Persian interpreter since 2007.

Email: s.mousavi@atu.ac.ir

Mr Morteza Gholami holds a master's degree in Translation Studies from Allameh Tabataba'i University. He is interested in translation research, translation criticism, cross-cultural translation and translation pedagogy. He has co-authored a number of papers presented at national and international conferences.

Email: m.gholami@atu.ac.ir