Handling an Object without Leaving Fingerprints? Translator's Presence in the Persian Translations of *The Dead*

Zohreh Gharaei*

Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, University of Kashan, Iran

Abstract

This study investigated the translator's presence in three Persian translations of *The Dead* according to the Bakhtinian approach. To this effect, the presence is traced at three levels. First, following Hermans' advice, the translations were analyzed apart from the source text for the noticeable presence of the translator. Second, following Munday's advice, a stylistic analysis was conducted focusing on the features of free indirect discourse in both the source and translated texts. In light of this analysis, the author identified two types of alterations in the interaction of the source voices indicating the presence of translators: suppressing the characters' voice through empowering the narrator's voice and suppressing the voice of the narrator by empowering the characters' voice. The analysis at this level added one more piece of evidence to May's hypothesis regarding the tendency of translators toward reducing the voices. To have a thorough examination of the translator's presence, a third level of analysis was also added, at which translations were compared with one another to look into the presence of the antecedent translator in the work of the following one. The author justifies this last kind of presence building on the Bakhtinian concepts of *dialogism*, *heteroglossia*, and *assimilation*. The use of the Bakhtinian perspective for justifying what goes on in translation is extended in this study to include the notion of *originality* and, thereby, wise assimilations on the part of translators were reflected on.

Keywords: Bakhtinian perspective; Free indirect discourse; Translator's presence; Voice

* Corresponding Author's email:
  zgharaei@kashanu.ac.ir

INTRODUCTION

The word 'translation' was traditionally perceived as a second-hand activity through which an *original* message is replaced with a substitute in a different language, a substitute with nothing of its own and whose existence is irrevocably bound up with the original. Such metaphors as "the back of a carpet", and "a kiss through a handkerchief" (see House, 2009, p. 3) used to describe translation, or the similes likening translators to "slaves", "mirrors" or "conduits" (see André, 2011, pp. 84-85) are all particularly suggestive of the inferior status of translation compared with the source text. This view is sometimes concomitant of the belief in the existence of a hierarchy of languages where some are considered inherently superior to others. This, in turn, has resulted in translations being perceived as subordinate and means through which target language is enriched (Pym, 2014). This widespread view of seeing translation through the lens of transparency and faithfulness to the source text, which is the result of marginal status attributed to translation and translators throughout the history, was not seriously challenged up until the 1980s and the *cultural turn* in translation studies.

"Cultural turn", termed by Mary Snell-Hornby (1990), is marked with the move away from merely linguistic, prescriptive considerations and the advent of such notions as translator's visibility and identity. Cultural turn, by bringing to the fore issues of power relations, ideology, institution and manipulation, pays special attention to marginal groups, post-colonial and gender approaches, and officially recognizes translators as agents having discursive presence, identity, and voice. Inspired by this change of direction in translation studies, this study sets as its aim to explore the presence of translators in the Persian translations of *The Dead*, the last story in James Joyce's *Dubliners* (1914). In so doing, using the ideas of Schiavi, Hermans and Munday, which have their roots in the Bakhtinian notion of "heteroglossia", the footsteps of the translators are followed in the three Persian translations of the work by Parviz Dariyush (1967), Mohammad Ali Safarian (1993), and Ahmad Golshiri (2009). To be more specific, this study sets as its aim to address the following questions:

1. *What are the signs of the translator's presence in the Persian translations of The Dead?*

(a) *What are the signs of the translator's presence when the translations are analyzed apart from the source text?*

(b) *What are the signs of the translator's presence when the translations are compared with the source text?*

(c) *What are the signs of the translator's presence when the translations are compared with one another?*

2. *Considering the third type of presence in which the voice of an earlier translator could be heard in the work of the retranslator, what are the limits and ethics of assimilation according to Bakhtin's views?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical reflections

Multiple presences are regarded as means for destroying deeply-rooted rigid hierarchies and hegemonies as they entail destabilization. Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) asserts that fiction is multi-voiced, dialogic and polyphonic; in other words, he acknowledges the existence of multiple presences and voices in fiction. The idea is envisaged in his concept of "heteroglossia". To him, the core idea in the concept of heteroglossia is that the boundaries between different consciousnesses are permeable.

In translation studies, Bakhtin's ideas inspired May (1994, as cited in Munday, 2013) who defines translation as the replacement of the inner dialogism in the source with discrete voices. Stating that translaion changes a work's ownership, he argues that translation makes changes in the voices of the source text. In this process, "the narrator may address the reader differently, or not at all. The characters may or may not interact with the narrator as before. And the author and reader in the text must shift in relation to every other entity" (May, 1996, p. 1). All in all, May contends that translation tends to standardize the source text.

In the same vein, Hermans (1996) pointing out that translators are not the "gatekeepers" who reflect the author's voice, explains three situations in which the translator's presence can be felt: (a) where the text addresses an implied reader, (b) cases of "self-reflectiveness and self-refrentiality", and finally (c) cases of "contextual overdetermination". The first occasion tells of the intervention of the translator for providing his/her implied reader with more background information. *Self-reflectiveness* and *self-refrentiality* are present when the linguistic properties of the text are in focus. Finally, contextual overdetermination happens when the text includes some elements which remind the readers of the fact that what they are reading is a translation. As Hermans (2007) holds, the translator's presence can be always felt; however, such norms and conventions as deeply rooted hierarchies, and the size and order of the names of the author and translator, nurturing the idea that there is only one voice, make us believe in the illusion of transparency.

A number of scholars in the field have resorted to narrative models in order to give an account of voices in translation. To this effect, they have first recognized a need for modification in the existing models on the grounds that translation is absent in these models. The idea as to the misleading tendency of narratology to treat authored texts the same way as translated texts seems to be first pointed out by Schiavi (1996) and Hermans (1996) in their complementary and thematically related papers. Schiavi (1996) asserting that the application of existing narratological models is a tacit confirmation of voicelessness of translators, proposes a modification as follows:

Author—implied author—narrator—narratee—implied reader—real translator—implied translator—narrator of translation—

narratee of translation—implied reader of translation—reader of translation

As evident, in this revised model, there is room for the "real translator" and the "implied translator" who is, in effect, an implied reader of the source text. Munday (2013), while admitting that the introduction of the concept of implied translator is a positive move per se, believes that the schema proposed by Schiavi is not helpful because it does not make it possible to understand the process of translation. To take corrective steps, he proposes "two parallel narratological lines linked by the identification of the real translator as a real reader of the source who interprets presuppositions concerning the implied reader of the ST" (Munday, 2013, p. 13):

For ST

Author—implied author—narrator—narratee—implied reader—ST reader

For TT

ST reader/ real translator—implied translator—TT narrator—TT narratee—TT implied reader—TT reader

He argues that a parallelism as such, in the first place, identifies the real translator with a real reader of the source text; moreover, it highlights the links between the implied author and the implied translator on the one hand, and between the author and the translator on the other hand. Munday underscores such links:

This is critical for the interpretation of linguistic analysis of style as well as for any suggestion of manipulation and distortion in translation: the translated text is a mix of source and target, an amalgam of author and translator, a ST mosaic overlaid with TT tesserae that is the result of the translator's conscious and unconscious decision-making (Munday, 2013, p. 13).

Along the same lines, Munday refers to story, text and narration as the three elements of narrative fiction. He argues that, among these three elements, it is only the text which can be deeply and stylistically analyzed as it is the only visible component. Such an analysis, according to him, makes it possible to eavesdrop the authorial voice. Applied to translation, it is possible to find the "discursive presence" –as termed by Hermans (1996)—of the translator through a comparison between the source and target texts. There are a number of signals making the presence of translator conspicuous, including translator's prefaces, footnotes and commentaries. However, there are some occasions on which translator's presence is subtler. Such cases are usually marked with stylistics shifts. In such cases, as Munday argues, a comparison between the source and target texts helps to trace the author's presence as well as the translator's discursive presence.

Empirical studies

The presence of translators has been the topic of investigation in a number of studies. Tomaszkiewicz (2016), as an instance, analyzed the presence of translator in

specialized texts. She argued that considering the tendency of translators to use a range of explicating techniques in specialized texts to make concealed information more pronounced, a special kind of translator's intervention and presence can be felt. Therefore, as she holds, the translator's presence is not limited to such creative forms as literature.

Spoturno (2017), recognizing the role of the Implied Translator in translated fiction, believes that translated text is autonomous in that it has a creator different from that of the source text; this shows itself at both textual and extratextual levels. She argues that translator's ethos represents the discursive image of the Implied Translator, who is the agency "directing the reading of translated narrative discourse" (p. 191). In the analytical part of her study, she investigated the Spanish translation of Cisneros' novel *Caramelo* and found evidence for the translator's ethos. In light of the findings of her study and in line with her theoretical assumptions, she argued that translation is a first order activity in which the Implied Author's ethos and intent are changed; hence the presence of the translator is proved. In the context of Iran, there are few studies in which the presence of translators has been discussed through analyzing translated texts. Horri (2009) in his article, directs readers' attention to the presence of a translator in translated texts. He (2011), reviewing the contributions of such figures as Hermans and Schiavi to introducing this concept, majorly elaborates on Leuven Zwart's shifts, arguing that translation shifts are telling evidence of the presence of translators (2011). There are also

studies that do not investigate the presence of translator directly; their discussion and outcomes are tightly related to such presence. A case in point is Gharaei and Dabaghi's (2014) study which is based on the comparison of the voices in the source text with those in the translation. Although they did not explicitly discuss the presence and voice of the translator, their finding as to the tendency of the translation to reduce the voices of the source text could be taken as the sign of the presence of the translator. Fakharzadeh and Dabagh (2021), in a recent work, investigated the style of Saleh Hosseini through the analysis of his translations of two novels in terms of morphology, choice of words and expressions and found that Hosseini's tendency to use such stylistic features as archaic literary words and Arabic terms is evident in his translations. As in the previous case, although the researchers made no explicit reference to the presence of the translator, the investigation of the style of a translator can be taken as an obvious attempt to prove such presence.

Considering that there are few studies directly investigating the presence of translator in the context of Iran, this study was designed to address this issue. In so doing, a framework for the analysis is decided on comprising three levels. The first two levels are based on Hermans and Munday's recommendations. To enrich the findings and discussions, a third level of analysis was added at which the voice of the earlier translator(s) was traced in the retranslator(s) work. Besides, the findings were discussed in light of Bakhtin's ideas.

METHODS

The corpus of the study

In order to study multiple presences in translation, the three Persian translations of James Joyce's *The Dead* were chosen as the corpus of the study. *The Dead* is the last and longest story in Joyce's collection *Dubliners* (1914), consisting of fifteen short stories. The stories of the collection form a coherent whole starting from stories of youth, moving on toward progression and reaching their zenith of ripeness in *The Dead*. As in other stories of the collection, the search for finding the self, gaining awareness and illumination is thematically central, a search marking the heyday of Irish nationalism and a fight for national identity. What sets this story apart from other stories in the collection and makes it an appropriate candidate for such analyses is its narrative mode; the use of modernist techniques to represent non-linearity, characters' consciousness and the exploration of characters' thoughts makes the existence of multiple presences possible in the story. For further detail on the story, see section 4.

In addition to the English story, its three Persian translations constitute a part of the corpus of the study. The first translation was published in 1967 by Parviz Dariyush, in Asatir Publication, Tehran. The second translation is Mohammad Ali Safarian's, published in 1993 by Nilufar Publication, Tehran. Finally, the third translation is by Ahmad Golshiri, published in Negah Publication, 2009.

Framework for analysis

To study translator's presence and its possible interactions with other voices, as the first level of investigation, following Hermans' suggestion, an account of the noticeable presence of translator to the target readers is given for which no comparison with the source text is needed. Then, following Munday's advice, the second level of investigation was aimed at which requires a stylistic analysis to be conducted by way of a comparison between stylistic features of the source text and translations. Moreover, in this study a further level of analysis is put forward at which translations are compared with one another to see the possible interactional voice of translators.

Procedures

In this study, three levels of analysis were aimed at. First, translations were gone through without considering the source text for the noticeable presence of translators. As the next stage, translations were compared with the source text to find stylistic shifts which are indicative of the presence of the translator and consequently his/her voice. To this effect, a stylistic analysis was conducted centering on the features of free indirect discourse (henceforth FID). That way, the interaction between the voices in the source was compared with those in the translations. Besides, in light of this comparison, the hypothesis proposed by May (1994, as cited in Munday, 2013) concerning the tendency of translators to

standardize and reduce voices was tested. Finally, as the third level, translations were compared with one another to see if any other type of presence could be identified. Then the findings were discussed in terms of Bakhtinian concepts of "dialogism", "heteroglossia" and "assimilation".

Notes on Voices in *THE DEAD*

The Dead is the last and longest story in *Dubliners* (1914), a collection that portrays middle-class Irish life at the outset of the 20th century. It is claimed that *The Dead* marks the culmination of Joyce's work in this collection. The story marks a stylistic perfection. Unlike other Dubliners, which are more realistic and do not present much formal and linguistic innovations (Corseuil, 2001), in The Dead, more modernist techniques such as non-linearity, exploration of the character's thought, penetration through the character's consciousness can be traced. This story, or as many put it "novella" (see Fargnoli & Gillespie, 2014), and the techniques used in it bear apparent resemblance to his later works such as *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), a novel written in FID style, *Ulysses* (1922) which is considered to be one of the most important modernist works (Beebe, 1972) and finally *Finnegans Wake* (1934) with its stream of consciousness style. It can be argued that THE techniques experimented in *The Dead* are employed in his later works in a more developed way. That is why Daiches (1960) believes that using "expansive technique" is

one guiding principle that sets this novella apart from other fourteen stories in the collection.

In *The Dead*, the question of identity and self-discovery interwoven into the warp and woof of the story is addressed through the voices, pronounced or unpronounced, of the characters among whom Gabriel is the main focalizer. He is in search of his identity and this, in turn, is mainly represented by a voice seemingly of the narrator but profoundly reflective of the consciousness of Gabriel, the character. What makes it possible for Joyce's implied reader to hear the voice of characters seeking for their identity is mostly his third person narration in the form of FID —one of the four types of discourse classified by McArthur and McArthur (2005)— encompassing both pronounced speech and silent inward thought (henceforth FIS and FIT). In FID the character's voice and the narrator's voice are blended (Wales, 2001). Pascal (1977) believes that simultaneous presence of the author, narrator, and characters in FID creates "dual voice". Thus, the polyphony in Joyce's story is, partly, because of this technique. Here are some examples:

(1) He was trembling now with annoyance.
(2) Why did she seem so abstracted?
(3) He did not know how he could begin.
(4) Was she annoyed, too, about something?

These sentences reflecting the inner thought of Gabriel about his wife, Gretta, are examples of FID; though the first sentence seems to be mainly that of the narrator, in the coming sentences the character's voice is mingled with that of the narrator giving rise to FID. In (2),

the use of an emotive expression such as "so abstracted" as a lexical marker of FID along with the question mark shows the subjectivity of the character; in (3), back-shifting of the tense and adaptation of the pronouns –features of ID—along with the use of modals, *could* in this case, which is a lexical feature of FID, make the whole sentence an example of FID; in (4), although the back-shifted tenses and adapted pronouns are signs of ID, the subjective voice of the character, Gabriel, is heard through his self-questioning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In what follows, to answer the three parts of the first research question, the presence of the translator(s) is discussed at three levels of analysis: (a) considering each translation in isolation, (b) comparing the translations with the source text, and (c) comparing the translations with one another.

Level one: No comparison with the source text

Dubliners was first translated in 1967 by Parviz Dariyush as *Dubliniha*. Dariyush has written an introduction to the collection in which he tries to formally introduce, perhaps for the first time, James Joyce and his works to Iranian readers. The translation contains no footnotes or endnotes. Therefore, the introduction to the book with the name of the translator appearing in the end seems to be a clue to the visible presence of the translator.

Mohammad Ali Safarian presented the second translation of *The Dead* in 1993 as the last story of the collection called *Dubliniha*. The translation, one can claim that, even without any comparison with the original, makes the presence of the translator felt. This presence can be felt at least in two ways: the footnotes and endnotes. Footnotes mainly inform the implied reader of the original spelling of the names of the characters, places and events. There is one footnote, however, which explains the original wordplay lost in the translation into Persian. There are also, as stated, some endnotes appearing in the end of the book clarifying some proper names, providing the reader with more explanation, giving further details about the locations and indulging the readers in the English songs in the novella.

The third translation of *The Dead,* by Ahmad Golshiri in 2009, has appeared in a collection comprising the same 15 stories but titled *James Augustin Joyce: Behtarin Dastanhaye Kutah* (James Augustin Joyce: The Best Short Stories). The number of footnotes in this translation is limited compared with the second one and they are not used for recording the English spelling of proper names; they are, rather, used to inform the readers of the parts in the original story which are in Irish accent, give more information about the technical musical terms used in the story, clarify the wordplay used in the story, and introduce the Persian translator of the English songs –who is not the translator of the collection. There are no endnotes.

Level two: Translations compared with the source text

Such analysis has, at its heart, the aim of investigating the interaction of voices in source compared with those in the translation, which consequently leads to tracing the possible alterations. As stated above, among the three elements of story, text and narration, text, being the concrete manifestation of the other two, paves the ground for such an analysis. Since text is the result of author's choices of words and structures, this analysis is, for the most part, stylistic in nature. For the present study, the stylistic analysis should, by large, center on the device employed in the work to foster polyphony: FID. Since FID is used by the author to let the reader hear the voice of the characters along with that of the narrator, it can be argued that whatever peculiarities of FID in the source text, consciously or unconsciously, tampered with in the translation will end with

altering the voices which, in turn, is taken as the presence of the translator.

In what follows, some cases of FID in the source text are compared with the corresponding parts in the translations to see how the translator's presence might affect the existing interactions in the original voices. The study revealed that this presence, or added voice, has changed the interactions between the source voices in two ways discussed below.

Suppressing the voice of the character, empowering that of the narrator

Failure to reproduce the features of FID in Persian has, on some occasions, given rise to hiding the voice of characters behind that of the narrator. Some excerpts from the text together with their Persian translations help clarify the point:

(S1) Lily, the caretaker's daughter, was literally run off her feet.

(T1) لی لی، دختر سرایدار، واقعا از پا درآمده بود. (۱۵۹)

(T2) لی لی، دختر سرایدار، دیگر از پا درآمده بود. (۳۲۳)

(T3) لی لی، دختر سرایدار، به راستی از پا افتاده بود. (۳۱۵)

In this much-quoted opening line of the novella, along with the third person narrator, the voice of Lily, the character, is heard (Richardson, 2006); one of the clues to this second presence is the idiomatic expression "run off her feet" (Millán-Varela, 2004). Another is the hyperbole which cannot be conceived as the expression of the narrator's voice. Above all, misusing the word "literally"

–instead of "figuratively"—is an indication of Lily's level of education (Aubry, 2006). In the Persian translations, however, Lily's presence is suppressed; in T1, T2 and T3 there is no misuse of any words. Besides, in T3 the use of the formal adverbial expression /be rasti/ for "literally" seems to have silenced Lily's voice.

Suppressing the voice of character in the translation is sometimes the result of the

translator trying to clarify the source. This clarification is, at times, in the form of making the relation between clauses explicit by adding conjunctions to highlight the logical reasoning, a feature lacking in the presentation of thought or speech in the source text:

(S2) Of course they had good reason to be fussy on such a night. And then it was long after ten o'clock and yet there was no sign of Gabriel and his wife.

(T1) البته در یک چنین شبی حق داشتند ایرادگیر و پردقت باشند. و آنوقت مدتی از ساعت ده می‌گذشت و هنوز خبری از گابریل و زنش نبود. (۱۶۰)

(T2) البته در چنین شبی حق داشتند ایرادگیر باشند. آخر مدتی از ساعت ده می‌گذشت و هنوز خبری از گابریل و زنش نبود. (۲۲۴)

(T3) البته در چنین شبی حق داشتند ایرادگیر باشند. مدت‌ها بود از ساعت ده گذشته بود و هنوز از گابریل و همسرش خبری نبود. (۳۱۷)

This excerpt, which is an example of FIT, bears the voice of the aunts along with that of the narrator (Millán-Varela, 2004). As evident, in the English story, there is no explicit cause-effect relationship between the first and the second sentences in consideration of reflecting the anxiety of the characters while uttering their oral speech. To reiterate the non-existence of an explicit logical relation, the author has, rather, gone for the repetitive use of the conjunction *and* (Millán-Varela, 2004). In T2, however,

since the translator has opted for /آخر/ meaning "since", there seems to be an attempt on his part to clarify the relationship between sentences. This has, in turn, resulted in suppressing the voice of the characters. S3 is another example of the same type:

(S3) Gabriel asked himself was he the cause of her abrupt departure. But she did not seem to be in ill humour: she had gone away laughing.

(T1) گابریل از خود می‌پرسید که آیا او باعث این عزیمت ناگهانی شده است. اما میس آیورز ظاهرا اوقاتش تلخ نبود——با خنده رفته بود. (۱۸۲)

(T2) گابریل از خود پرسید نکند من باعث رفتن ناگهانی اش شدم؟ اما میس آیورز ظاهرا اوقاتش تلخ نبود——خندان رفته بود. (۲۴۷)

(T3) گابریل از خود می‌پرسید که آیا او عامل رفتن ناگهانی میس آیورز نبوده است. اما ظاهر زن نشان نمی‌داد که عصبانی باشد؛ زیرا چهره خندان از آن‌ها جدا شده بود. (۳۴۵)

While in the novella the last two sentences bear the voice of Gabriel, in T3 the addition of the conjunction /زیرا/ meaning "because" has overtly made the logical relation between clauses explicit. This makes the voice of

narrator be the only voice heard from the last clause in T3.

The explicitation made by the translators has sometimes taken different forms:
(S4) But that will not make him a West Briton, surely.

(T1) اما این کار او را انگلیسی این طرف یعنی طرفدار حکومت انگلیسیها در ایرلند نمی کرد. (۱۷۳)

(T2) اما مسلما این کار او را انگلیسی زده نمی کرد. (۲۳۸)

(T3) اما این کار دلیل نمی شد که او خود را انگلیسی جا بزند. (۳۳۳)

The sentence reflects the stream of thought in the mind of Gabriel, and "west Briton" is exactly the term used by Miss Ivors in her earlier address. In fact, Gabriel remembers what Ivors had told him prior to this scene and reassures himself that he is not a "West Briton", an internal reassurance. The adverb *surely* in this sentence, as an expressive item, shows the voice of Gabriel which is nullified in T1 and T3. What is certain is that Gabriel, while thinking, does not explain the meaning of "West Briton" to himself. However, this is ignored in T1 and the explanation offered in T1 has silenced the voice of Gabriel and overrides the voice of the narrator.

Alterations in address terms used to represent characters' thought have sometimes been the source of changes in the interaction of voices:

(S5) He was trembling now with annoyance. Why did she seem so abstracted? He did not know how he could begin. Was she annoyed, too, about something? If she would only turn to him or come to him of her own accord! To take her as she was would be brutal. No, he must see some ardour in her eyes first.

(T1) اکنون از طغیان ناراحتی می لرزید! چرا گرتا اینقدر دور و بی اعتنا به نظر می آمد؟ گابریل نمی دانست چگونه موضوع را شروع کند. آیا گرتا نیز از چیزی ناراحت بود؟ کاش می شد که گرتا به میل و رغبت خود به طرف او بیاید، (T2) اکنون داشت از ناراحتی می لرزید. چرا گرتا این همه بی حواس می نمود؟ نمی دانست چگونه می بایست شروع کند. آیا گرتا هم از چیزی ناراحت بود؟ کاش می شد گرتا به میل و رغبت خودش به طرف او بیاید! کام گرفتن از گرتا در این حالت عملی وحشیانه بود. نه، اول باید اشتیاقی در چشمانش ببیند. (۲۷۰)

کام گرفتن از گرتا با حالتی که اکنون داشت عمل وحشیانه ای بود. نه، اول باید آتش اشتیاق را در چشمان گرتا ببیند. (۲۰۶)

(T3) گابریل حالا از شدت خشم می لرزید. زن چرا این اندازه مشوش به نظر می رسید؟ مرد نمی دانست چگونه شروع کند. آیا زن نیز از چیزی عصبانی بود؟ چه می شد اگر زن رو به سوی او می کرد. می خواست بر حال عجیب او تسلط پیدا کند. (۳۷۴)

In the English sentences, which are examples of FIT reflecting what goes on in Gabriel's mind, the pronoun "she" is used to refer to Gretta. In Persian, an attempt to preserve the pronoun as it is might lead to ambiguity since there is no distinction between feminine and masculine third person singular pronouns; both are referred to as /او/. To solve the problem, the first and second translators have opted for the proper noun "Gretta", while the third one has translated it as /زن/ meaning "the woman". The third translator in one of the sentences even has opted for /مرد/ meaning "the man" as an equivalent for "he" referring to Gabriel. What is lost here in the third translation is the presence of the character, Gabriel: Gabriel in his thought does not refer to Gretta as "the woman"; most probably the narrator

does that. A choice as such indicates the presence of the translator. This, nullifying the voice of the character, makes the distance between the reader and the character wider by augmenting the voice of the narrator.

Suppressing the voice of narrator, empowering that of character

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that silencing the voice of characters partly happened when the translators stopped reproducing lexical markers of FID. This happens mostly due to the fact that lexical markers of FID include the idiosyncrasies of the characters, their expression of feelings, attitudes and modes. On the contrary, failure in reproducing the grammatical features of FID prompts the suppression of the voice of the narrator. Grammatical features of FID include back-shifting of tenses as well as adaptation of

pronouns (for a more detailed discussion of the features of FID and their reproduction in translation see Gharaei & Dabaghi, 2014; Gharaei & Dastjerdi, 2012). As for back-shifting of the tenses, it can be argued that when direct speech or thought is turned into FID, along with the character's voice the voice of the narrator is also heard. Therefore, if these transitions, due to any reason, are not reflected in translation, alterations in the voices heard seem to be inevitable resulting in the conclusion as to the presence of the translator as the agent of such alterations. To further elaborate on this type of translator's presence, the following lines from *The Dead* are chosen:

(S6) Why did they never play the grand old operas now, he asked, Dinorah, Lucrezia Borgia? Because they could not get the voices to sing them: that was why.

(T3) و پرسید، حالا به چه دلیل از آن اپراهای بزرگ قدیمی، مثل دینورا یا لوکرزیا بورژیا خبری نیست؟ و خودش پاسخ داد که چون دیگر از آن صداها خبری نیست. (۳۴۸)

(T2) آنگاه پرسید چرا حالا دیگر آن اپراهای بزرگ قدیمی مثل دینورا یا لوکرتزیا بورجیا را اجرا نمی کنند؟ برای این که از آن صداها برای خواندن آن ها خبری نیست. علتش این است. (۲۵۰)

(T1) آنگاه پرسید: "حالا چطور شده که دیگر آن اپراهای بزرگ قدیمی مثل دینوراه یا لوکوتزیا بورجیا را نمایش نمی دهند؟ برای اینکه دیگر آن صداها را گیر نمی آورند، علتش این است. (۲۸۶)

The FID with introductory verb used in these sentences mingles the voice of the character with that of the narrator leading to polyphony. One linguistic device used for mixing the voices in these lines, as in any other cases of FID, is back-shifting the tenses: when tenses are back-shifted what we hear is not merely the quoting character's voice; but the voice of the narrator is also heard. In the above

sentences, the existence of the present temporal "now", the modal "could" and the punctuation marks highlight the character's voice while, at the same time, the back-shifted tenses –from the present to the past—reveals the presence of the narrator. The translators, using present tenses, have not back-shifted the tenses, which, in turn, leads to lowering the voice of the narrator. The following sentences provide one more example:

(S7) But Miss Ivors, who had put on her hat and was buttoning her cloak, would not stay. She did not feel in the least hungry and she had already overstayed her time.

(T1) اما میس آیورز که کلاهش را به سر گذاشته داشت تکمه هایش را می انداخت، نمی خواست بماند. می گفت هیچ گرسنه نیست و اصلا بیش از مدتی که می توانسته مانده است. (۱۸۲)

(T2) اما میس آیورز که کلاهش را به سر گذاشته بود و داشت تکمه های روپوشش را می انداخت، نمی خواست بماند. یک ذره هم احساس گرسنگی نمی کرد و بیش از مدتی که می توانسته مانده بود. (۲۴۶)

(T3) اما میس آیورز، که کلاهش را به سر گذاشته بود و دکمه های روپوشش را می بست، می گفت که نمی ماند. می گفت ذره ای گرسنه اش نیست و دیگر دیرش شده است. (۳۴۴)

In these two sentences, apart from the excerpt enclosed in commas which is the narrator's description, FID is employed to reflect the narrator's voice mingled with the character's—Miss Ivors' in this case. But T1 and T2, refraining from back-shifting the tenses, have lowered the voice of the narrator.

In addition to back-shifting the tenses, changing the first-person pronouns into third-person is a sign of the narrator's presence and her/his voice:

(S8) Gabriel asked himself was he the cause of her abrupt departure.

(T1) گابریل از خود می پرسید که آیا او باعث این عزیمت ناگهانی شده است. (۱۸۲)

(T2) گابریل از خود پرسید نکند من باعث رفتن ناگهانی اش شدم؟ (۲۴۷)

(T3) گابریل از خود می پرسید که آیا او عامل رفتن ناگهانی میس آیورز نبوده است. (۳۴۵)

As evident, in the English sentence the pronoun "he" is the adapted form of "I" referring to Gabriel. In T2, however, no adaptation is made as the first-person pronoun /من / meaning "I" is used. This choice of the translator, consciously or unconsciously, has augmented Gabriel's voice and, instead, toned down the narrator's voice. S9 is one more example:

(S9) Of course it was very fine, she said, but it made her think of poor Georgina Burns.

(T1) مری جین می گفت که البته اپرا خیلی خوب بود، اما تماشای آن او را به یاد جورجینا برنز بیچاره می انداخت. (۲۸۶)

(T2) مری جین گفت که راستش اپرا، خیلی خوب بود، ولی تماشای آن مرا به یاد جورجیانا برنز بیچاره انداخت. (۲۵۰)

(T3) گفت که اپرای خوبی است. اما او را به یاد جورجینا برنز بینوا انداخته. (۳۴۸)

While in English third-person pronouns are used to let the voice of the narrator be heard along with that of Mary Jane, the character, in T2 the use of the first-person pronoun /مرا/ - meaning "me"—has suppressed the narrator's voice.

The analysis carried out at this level not only proves the possibility of showing the presence or voice of the translator through a stylistic

analysis, but also adds one more evidence to May's hypothesis stating that translators tend to standardize the marked features of the source text and, thereby, bring the voices of the source

Level three: Comparing translations with one another

In the course of comparisons made, another voice, non-existent in the original, was also detected: the voice of the preceding translator carried over into the work of the following one. This voice can be heard firstly through the striking similarities in choice of words made by

(T2) همچنین از زمانی گفت که طبقه بالای رویال هر شب از تماشاچی پر می شد، و یک شب هم خواننده تنور ایتالیائی مجبور شده بود آواز خود، بگذار مثل سرباز بمیرم، را پنج بار تکرار کند ... (۲۵۰)

While in the source text no mention is made of the Italian tenor being *forced* to sing, the first translator has made a mistake in rendering the sentence, a mistake repeated by the retranslator. Following is another example:

"Factor" in "corn-factor" has nothing to do with "factory" and its owner. However, the first translator has mistakenly translated "corn-factor" as /صاحب کارخانه ذرت پاک کنی/ meaning "the owner of a corn factory", a mistake repeated by the second translator.

text together. Nullifying the features FID explained above can be regarded as the translators' move toward standardization.

the first translator and the second one. Secondly, and more importantly, it is felt because of the mistakes made by the first translator and repeated by the second:

(S10) He told too of how the top gallery of the old Royal used to be packed night after night, of how one night an Italian tenor had sung five encores to Let Me Like a Soldier Fall …

(T1) بعد از وقتی که طبقه بالای رویال هر شب از تماشاچی پر می شد، و از اینکه یک شب خواننده تنور ایطالیایی مجبور شده بود پنج بار آواز خود را تکرار کند،... (۲۸۶)

(S11) … to live with them in the dark, gaunt house on Usher's Island, the upper part of which they had rented from Mr. Fulham, the corn-factor on the ground floor.

(T1) ... به خانه تاریک و رفیع واقع در آسترزآیلند آمده و طبقه بالای آن را از آقای فولهام، که کارخانه ذرت پاک کنی داشت و در طبقه پایین منزل کرده بود، اجاره کرده بودند... (۱۶۰)
(T2) و به آن خانه تاریک و بیقواره در آشروزآیلند آمده بودند که طبقه بالای آن را از آقای فولهام، صاحب کارخانه ذرت، که در طبقه پایین می زیست، اجاره کرده بودند... (۲۲۳)

In addition to similarities or mistakes, which are revealing of the presence of the preceding translator in the work of the following one, differences, at times, unveil a dialogue between the two translators. The second translator in a dialogue with the first one accepts many of his translational choices while at the same time

some are rejected. Many excerpts can serve as examples illuminating this point. One example is the following:

(S13) A murmur in the room attracted his attention. Mr. Browne was advancing from the door, gallantly escorting Aunt Julia, who leaned upon his arm, smiling and hanging her head. An irregular musketry of applause escorted her also as far as the piano and then, as Mary Jane seated herself on the stool, and Aunt Julia, no longer smiling, half turned so as to pitch her voice fairly into the room, gradually ceased. Gabriel recognised the prelude. It was that of an old song of Aunt Julia's –Arrayed for the Bridal. Her voice, strong and clear in tone, attacked with great spirit the runs which embellish the air and though she sang very rapidly she did not miss even the smallest of the grace notes. To follow the voice, without looking at the singer's face, was to feel and share the excitement of swift and secure flight. Gabriel applauded loudly with all the others at the close of the song and loud applause was borne in from the invisible supper-table. It sounded so genuine that a little colour struggled into Aunt Julia's face as she bent to replace in the music-stand the old leather-bound songbook that had her initials on the cover.

(T1) پچ پچ در اطاق توجه او را جلب کرد. آقای برون، در حالی که با تظاهر به جوانمردی همراه خاله جولیا بود، و خاله جولیا به بازوی او تکیه کرده لبخند می زد و سرش را به پایین آویخته بود، وارد اطاق شد. تا کنار پیانو دست زدن نامنظم و نامرتبی نیز خاله جولیا را مشایعت کرد و بعد وقتی ماری جین پشت پیانو نشست و خاله جولیا، که دیگر لبخند نمی زد نیمرخ ایستاد تا صدایش بهتر به اطاق برسد، دست زدن بند

آمد. گابریل پیش درآمد را شناخت. این پیش درآمد یک آواز قدیمی خاله جولیا بود به نام "آماده عروسی". صدای او، که قوی و صاف بود روح و حالت تحلیل می داد و با آنکه تند می خواند اندکی هم از اصل خارج نمی شد. شنیدن صدا، بدون نگاه کردن به صورت خواننده، در حکم اشتراک در هیجان ناشی از پرواز سریع مصونی بود. گابریل نیز همراه دیگران در پایان آوازبه شدت دست زد، و از سر میز شام ناپیدا نیز صدای دست زدن آن قدر اصیل بود که هنگامی که خاله جولیا خم شد تا دفترچه کهنه جلد چرمی نت را که حروف اول اسمش روی آن بود باز در محل نت بگذارد اندکی سرخی به صورتش دوید. (۱۷۹)

(T2) پچ پچی در اتاق توجهش را جلب کرد. آقای برون که خاله جولیا را همراهی می کرد و خاله جولیا به بازوی او تکیه داده بود و لبخند می زد و سرش را پائین انداخته بود، وارد اتاق می شد. دست زدن نامرتبی خاله جولیا را تا کنار پیانو مشایعت کرد و بعد، وقتی مری جین پشت پیانو نشست و خاله جولیا، که دیگر لبخند نمی زد، نیمرخ ایستاد تا صدایش را بهتر به همه اتاق برساند، دست زدن بند آمد. گابریل پیش درآمد را شناخت. آواز قدیمی خاله جولیا بود به نام آراسته به جامه عروسی. صدای او، که قوی بود و صاف، با شوری عظیم به تحریر هایی می پرداخت که به آهنگ حالت می دهد، و با آنکه تند می خواند حتی از کوچکترین نت آرایشی خارج نمی شد. شنیدن صدا، بدون نگریستن به صورت خواننده، به احساس اشتراک در هیجان ناشی از پروازی سریع و مطمئن می مانست. گابریل هم همراه دیگران، در پایان آواز به شدت دست زد، و از سر میز ناپیدای شام هم صدای دست زدن شدیدی شنیده شد. آن قدر اصیل بود که وقتی خاله جولیا خم شد تا دفترچه کهنه جلد چرمی نت را، که حروف اول اسم او روی آن دیده می شد، در جای خود بگذارد اندکی سرخی به صورتش دوید. (۲۴۳)

As evident, choices of the second translator, to a great extent, bear resemblance to those of the first translator and this similarity is pervasive all over the translation. Using Bakhtinian terminology, the second translator has *assimilated* the voice of the first one. The

differences, however, are indicative of a dialogue in which the second translator has finally rejected the choices of the first one. The limited autonomy shown by the second translator is mainly reflected in changing those words or sentences of the first translation which after the passage of 26 years seem a bit out of date or strange to the present readers. On other occasions, the changes are made in those sentences of the first translation which needed Persian editing. Considering this, the differences in the second translation seem to be majorly made in a dialogue with the first one, and not the source text. However, a number of changes target the accuracy of the content.

In light of this last level of analysis at which the voice of the previous translator in the translation of the following one is accounted for by way of such Bakhtinian concepts as "dialogism", "heteroglossia" and "assimilation" (Bakhtin, 1981), a question might arise as to the limits of assimilation and the ethics of dialogism in retranslation. Are all degrees of assimilation and dialogism welcome due to the fact that they are accountable by Bakhtinian ideas and by dint of seeing the whole situation as a dialogue between the two translators in which the second accepts some of the choices of the first while dismisses some others? What if most of the choices of the first translator, reasonably or unreasonably, are accepted by the second one? In that case, what is the purpose of translating a work for a second time if the language is to be borrowed from others? Won't it be regarded as a useless imitation? What is the significance of *originality* and innovation on the part of the retranslator?

In providing an answer for these questions, and in fact the second research question of this study, the discussion is built on another Bakhtinian concept: the way he defines "originality" (Bakhtin, 1981). As he holds, even when a single perspective is assumed to be adopted, many elements of the language used draw on the history of their past uses; each of the words used bears the history of all the meanings associated with it. Whatever language produced is a response to its precedent utterances on the one hand, and is uttered in anticipation of upcoming utterances on the other. Dialogue and heteroglossia are, therefore, indispensable. Within this dialogic scene of give-and-take and within this multiplicity of voices, many elements are borrowed but, as Bakhtin argues, the way through which these elements are combined together serves as the test of originality, not the elements per se. Originality is attainable through *selectively* assimilating others' voices. Applied to translation, not all assimilations are considered as worthy; only that part of the voices carried over to translation is considered to be in keeping with the ethics of dialogue which is wisely selected. This wise selection helps the translator move in the direction of "becoming" and "maturation".

This final part of the discussion, focusing on the voice of the first translator carried over to the second one, by no means intends to prove the superiority of one of the translations to the other two. For sure, adopting a Bakhtinian approach toward the issue requires the third

translation to be in dialogue with the first two as well. Since this section aims to show the presence of the antecedent translator in the work of the following one, discussing the first two translations in this regard seems to provide enough evidence.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study argues that if voices and their interactions are to be studied in a translated work, analysis should be conducted at least at three levels: (a) the translated work should be analyzed without any comparison with the source text, (b) the translated work should be compared with the source text, and finally (c) the translated works should be compared with one another. It has been also argued that since in the process of translation the translator enters into dialogue with, on the one hand, the source text and context and, on the other hand, the target community, alterations in the interactions between the original voices are not far from expectation. As such, this study in an attempt to analyze interactions between the voices in James Joyce's *The Dead* and its Persian translations reveals that such alterations which have their roots basically in the presence of the translators are traceable at the three mentioned levels. As for the first level, all superficial clues as to the presence of the translator such as footnotes, endnotes and prefaces written by the translators are among the elements letting the readers feel the presence of the translator. As for the second level, the researcher, for the purpose of comparison, focused on the features of FID. In light of the comparison made with

the source text, it is maintained that the presence of the translators has altered the original voices mainly in two ways: on some occasions the voice of character is suppressed and, instead, the narrator's voice overrides; on other occasions the voice of the narrator is toned up while the character is silenced. With regard to the third level, it is argued that the retranslators have the voice of the earlier one(s) carried over into their translations. This can be justified, in Bakhtinian terms, by means of the concept of "dialogue", considering that the subsequent translator comes into dialogue with the preceding one(s): a process in which some choices of the previous translator are confirmed and reused, while some are rejected.

This case study is an evidence supporting the undeniable presence of the translator. The Bakhtinian perspective adopted helped the author put forward her argumentation aimed at justifying the existence of the voice of the translator through the ubiquitous notion of dialogue in all linguistic products. This is the conclusion that other studies on the topic have reached at: it is not possible to handle an object and do away with the fingerprints (Baker, 2000). This study, by investigating the interaction of voices in the translations of Joyce's *The Dead* at three levels, tried not only to add another piece of evidence to the claims made in the field, but also to put one step forward extending the use of Bakhtin's ideas in the study of voices in translation to include the notion of "originality" and thereby to introduce the ethics of dialogism in retranslation, an aspect in Bakhtin's ideas which has received

less attention, if any, in the literature of translation studies.

References

André, J. S. (2011). Metaphors for translation. *Handbook of translation studies, 2*, 84-87.

Aubry, T. (2006). *Reading as therapy: What contemporary fiction does for middle-class Americans*: University of Iowa Press.

Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 12*(2), 241-266.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Vol. 1): University of Texas Press.

Beebe, M. (1972). Ulysses and the Age of Modernism. *James Joyce Quarterly, 10*(1), 172-188.

Corseuil, A. R. (2001). John Houston's Adaptation of James Joyce´ s "The Dead": the Interrelationship between Description and Focalization. *Cadernos de Tradução, 1*(7), 67-79.

Daiches, D. (1960). *The Novel and the Modern World. Revised Edition*: University of Chicago Press.

Fargnoli, A. N., & Gillespie, M. P. (2014). *Critical Companion to James Joyce: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*: Infobase Publishing.

Gharaei, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2014) .What Do Voices Say in The Garden Party? An Analysis of Voices in the Persian Translation of Mansfield's Short Story. *Journal of Language and Translation, 4*(1), 91-100.

Gharaei, Z., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2012). Free indirect discourse in Farsi translations of Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, 14*(1), 13.

Hermans, T. (1996). The translator's voice in translated narrative. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 8*(1), 23-48.

Hermans, T. (2007). The Conference of the Tongues. Manchester: St. In: Jerome Publishing.

House, J. (2009). *Book*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

McArthur, T. B., McArthur, T., & McArthur, R. (2005). *Concise Oxford companion to the English language*: Oxford University Press, USA.

Millán-Varela, C. (2004). Hearing voices: James Joyce, narrative voice and minority translation. *Language and Literature, 13*(1), 37-54.

Munday, J. (2013). *Style and ideology in translation: Latin American writing in English* (Vol. 8): Routledge.

Pascal, R. (1977). *The dual voice: Free indirect speech and its functioning in the nineteenth-century European novel*: Manchester University Press.

Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories* (2 ed.). London & New York: Routledge.

Richardson, B. (2006). *Unnatural voices: Extreme narration in modern and contemporary fiction*: Ohio State University Press.

Schiavi, G. (1996). There is Always a Teller in a Tale. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 8*(1), 1-21.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1990). Linguistic transcoding or cultural transfer? A critique of translation theory in Germany. *Translation, history and culture, 82*.

Wales, K. (2001). A Dictionary of Stylistics. London, New York. *Reading, San Francisco: Pearson Education Longman*.

منابع فارسی

حری, ا. (۲۰۰۹). بررسي حضور مترجم به واسطه تبدیلها در متون روایي ترجمه شده با نگاهي به دیدگاه لوون-زوآرت (بخش اول). مطالعات ترجمه, ۶(۲۴), ۳۳-۵۱.

حری, ا. (۲۰۱۱). بررسي حضور مترجم به واسطه تبدیل ها در متون ترجمه شده با نگاهي به دیدگاه لوون زوارت: الگوي توصیفي. مطالعات ترجمه, ۸(۲۹), ۲۵-۷.

فخارزاده, م., & دباغ, ا. (۲۰۲۱). نمود عادتواره مترجم در سبک ترجمه: موردپژوهی سبک ترجمه صالح حسینی. مطالعات زبان و ترجمه, ۵۴(۱).

Biodata

Dr Zohreh Gharaei is an assistant professor at the University of Kashan. Her research interests mainly lie in issues concerning translator training and literary translation. She has various publications in different academic journals and a book published by SAMT.

Email: zgharaei@kashanu.ac.ir