A critical semiology of "*the Scarlet Letter"* and its Persian version

Hassan Arefi[1], Ahmadreza Mohebbi[2]

[1]Allame Tabatabaii University Faculty of Persian Literature Foreign Languages, Tehran, Iran
[2]Kharazmi University Faculty of Humanities, Social sciences & Foreign languages, Tehran, Iran

Email address:

hssnarfi@gmail.com (H. Arefi), ahmadreza_mohebi@yahoo.com (A. Mohebbi)

To cite this article:

Hassan Arefi, Ahmadreza Mohebbi. A Critical Semiology of "*the Scarlet Letter*" and its Persian Version. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 2, No. 4, 2014, pp. 273-282. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20140204.15

Abstract: Translating symbolic literary masterpieces into another language has long been a thorny bottleneck to those involved in translational endeavors. The aim of this study was to explore the translation strategies used for the transference of the *Scarlet Letter* (1850), written originally in English by Nathaniel Hawthorn, to Persian, namely *Daghe Nang* (1990) done by the well-known Persian writer and translator Simin Daneshvar. Investigation of the fundamental requirements for an effective transference of literary semiotics presupposes a thorough grasp of the source and target languages and their respective cultures. The findings of this study indicated that the translation strategies employed for such transference were: (cultural) adaptation, addition, assimilation, domestication, expansion and modulation. According to the authors, this study certifies that *Daghe Nang* constitutes an interlingual and intersemiotic version, as its translator transferred many different signs (linguistic, cultural, societal, religious and ideological) from English system of signs to Persian sign system.

Keywords: Semiotics, Sign (Symbol), the Scarlet Letter, Daghe Nang, Translation Strategy

1. Introduction

Translation has been commonly utilized to transfer the meaning, form and semiotics of the source text(s) to a target language. All in all, the aim of translation is to render various types of texts—including religious, literary, scientific, and philosophical texts—into a second language to avail it to wider readers.

If languages were solely a categorization of a set of general or universal concepts, it would be simple to translate from a first language to a second language. Culler (1976) states that "languages are not nomenclatures and the concepts of one language may differ radically from those of another, since each language articulates or organizes the world differently, and languages do not simply name categories; they articulate their own" (Culler, 1976: 21–2). From what Culler puts, it could be concluded that a troublesome issue in translation is the disparity among languages and lack of one-to-one equivalent among language parts, additionally culture-specific items add to difficulties of translation, the aforesaid differences create wide gaps among languages. The wider the gap between the source and the target language, the more complicated the transference of message and semiotics from the former to the latter will be.

The discrepancy between a source and a target language and the dissimilarity in their cultures complicate the process of translation. Among the efforts involved in translation such as transferring linguistic and cultural items, the present paper, different from other analyses previously done on two works (which have mostly made comparisons between literary stylistics[1], and some attempted to analyze semiotics of two respective works, however they lost their path and solely compared stylistics of the works[2]),is to focus mainly on the procedures of transferring symbols and signs in general and on the strategies of rendering semiotic elements in particular. To this end, the researchers analyzed how the Persian translator, Simin Daneshvar (1921-2012) managed to transfer the semiotic elements of *the Scarlet*

---

[1]See for example Araghi, 2012: *Literary translations and their impacts on the contemporary style, focusing on Simin Daneshvar and Bahman Sholevar's works*, Birjand University, Iran.

[2]See for example Vahid dastjerdi and Maddah 2011: *Word choice and symbolic language: A case study of Persian translation of the Scarlet Letter,* Isfahan University, Iran.

Letter (1850), a symbolic fiction written originally in English by Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864) into Persian.

To render a work of art (for instance a fiction) from language one into the second language, translators need to be well acquainted with those possible methods, procedures and strategies, otherwise literally rendering symbols into the second language, the work of the translator results in absurdity. Translation between two different languages having different cultural repertoires connects those languages and cultures involved, this connection has many effects on the receiving languages, to name but a few, ideological, stylistic[3], and semiotic.

The present study pins down the difficulties of translating a grand symbolic fiction, *the Scarlet Letter*. The first difficulty lies in *the Scarlet Letter* writing style. *The Scarlet Letter,* with a pompous style of writing was written in 1850, and was translated into Persian 50 years later. By the emergence of translations in that era, the Persian writing style, that used to be too grandiloquent with a combination of Arabic and Persian terms, started its continuous and rather quick shift toward simplicity. Many translators imported literary works (fictions, short stories and etc.) from the American literature into Persian and it affected Persian literature formally, figuratively, structurally and ideologically. Via translating foreign works, Iranians became familiar with different styles of various writers in different countries. However in Hawthorne's work, Daneshvar faced a grandiloquent style and had to render it into Persian with a much simpler manner of writing and it does not sound to be an easy task.

Additionally there are an abundance of culture-specific items present in Hawthorn's work and due to the dissimilarity/distance between the Persian language and culture; Christianity and Islam, carrying those cultural, ideological and societal issues into Persian will assuredly call for much effort, creativity and knowledge. As an example, a case absolutely different in English and Persian contexts, could be the senses and concepts that colors imply. For instance the *scarlet* color in English implies immorality and unfaithfulness (especially by women), as Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary defines a scarlet woman is "a woman who is considered to be *immoral* because she has sex with a lot of men". However the Persian equivalent of *scarlet,* "سرخ" does not have such implications and this term is not used before the name of women at all to imply such a sense. Therefore if the translator faces such issues in English, as Daneshvar faced in the title of the story, they should appropriately make this implication explicit in the target language so that the reader will not be misled or find the translation absurd.

However the present research mainly focuses on the semiotic aspects of *the Scarlet Letter* and it is finally

expected to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the role of the translator's presuppositions about translation in the transference of signs and symbols of the Scarlet Letter by Simin Daneshvar?

2. What has been the main requirement for rendering semiotic elements in translation of *the Scarlet letter* by Simin Daneshvar?

3. What are those methods/strategies applied by the translator in transference of cultural signs and symbols of the Scarlet Letter into Persian?

4. To what extent, do Jacobson's categories of translation, interlingual and intersemiotic translation apply to the present data?

2. Origins of Semiotics and Signs

Semiotics, as its name speaks for itself, is the scientific study of signs. The first scholars who discussed signs were two Greek philosophers, Aristotle (384-322) and Plato (428-348). Around the third century, the third philosopher, Philodemus (110- 35) from Athena, introduced two types of signs (natural signs and conventional sings) that were used to identify symptoms of certain diseases. In the next century many scholars such as St. Agustinus (354-430), William of Ockham (1285-1349), and Locke (1632-1704) paid a deeper attention into conventional signs.

Though the earliest origins of semiotics could be traced back to Aristotle (384-322) and Augustine (354-430), it didn't begin to be thoroughly developed till the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. In many documents, it is mentioned that the semiotics was found by the Swiss linguist De Saussure (1857-1913) and the American philosopher Peirce (1839-1914). "Note that Saussure's 'semiology' is sometimes used to refer to the Saussurean tradition, whilst 'semiotics' sometimes refers to the Peircean tradition, but nowadays the term 'semiotics' is more likely to be addressed as an umbrella term to embrace the whole field"(Nöth 1990, 14) .

The first figure after De Saussure and Pierce was "the American semiotician, Morris (1901-1979) who categorized three separate semiotic branches; the study of the relations between a sign and other signs called *syntactics*, the study of relations between signs and their basic meanings called *semantics* and the study of relations between signs and the users called *pragmatics*. The second figure after the founders of semiotics is Jakobson (1896-1982) who proposed the essential idea of "motivated signs". The third semiotician is the French scholar, Barthes (1915-1980) who showed the power of using semiotics to unravel the meaning structures hidden in everyday routines. The work of Barthes led to a semiotic approach toward cultural issues in the late 1960s. The translation of his papers into English much developed scholarly acquaintance with the approach. Writing in 1964, Barthes declared that "'semiology' aims to take in any system of signs, whatever their substance and limits; images, gestures, musical sounds, objects, and the complex associations of all of these, which

---

[3]Those works by Daneshvar written after translating *the Scarlet Letter* can be analyzed for whether and how her writing style and translation manner was affected by the writing style of *the Scarlet Letter*.

form the content of ritual, convention or public entertainment: these constitute, if not *languages*, at least systems of signification" (Barthes 1967, p. 9). Sebeok (1920-2001) is the fourth semiotician who introduced the study of animal signaling systems, which he named it zoo-semiotics, and the comparative study of symptoms, signals and signs in all living things known as biosemiotics. Finally, the Italian semiotician, Eco (1932) has contributed significantly to an understanding of the relation between signs and reality.

In the upcoming period, semiotics underwent a division; semiotic signification and semiotic communication were developed. Semiotic communication is focused on the production of signs while semiotic signification deals with the meaning of signs and their procedures. The semiotic communication encompasses the sender, the receiver, encoding and decoding, the source, the sign, and the medium but semiotic signification strives to understand the meaning of the signs and their processes. The semiotic model by De Saussure is semiotic signification since it copes with the study of the meaning of signs and how they are utilized. The man makes senses and even thinks through reproducing and interpreting signs. Signs can be in form of words, images, sounds, odors, flavors, acts or objects. Every issue maybe a sign for a certain group of people, though those signs have no sense for another group of men.

In *the Course in General Linguistics* (De Saussure, 1916), De Saussure describes the sign as "a binary structure, a structure that is made up of two parts: (1) a physical part, which he named the signifier, and (2) a conceptual part, which he called the signified. "The sign is the whole that results from the association of the signifier with the signified" (Saussure 1983, 67; Saussure 1974, 67). If it were transformed in mathematic formula, it could be said that: Sign=signifier+signified, sign must have both a signifier and a signified. The relation between the signifier and the signified is known as signification. That is why, De Saussure's concept of sign is called semiotic signification. The correlation between signifier and signified to form a sign is very strong. De Saussure stresses that they are inseparable like sides of a piece of paper" (De Saussure 1983, p. 111 and De Saussure 1974, p. 113).

3. Denotation and Connotation

In semiotics, generally two types of meaning are studied; *denotative meaning* and *connotative meaning*; other literatures discuss *first order semiotics and second order semiotics*. As Barthes notes, "De Saussure's model of the sign focuses on denotation" (Barthes 1967, 89ff). "Connotation and denotation are often described in terms of levels of meaning. Barthes says that "there are different orders of signification" (Barthes 196,114ff). The first order of signification is denotation: at this level, there is a sign consisting of a signifier and a signified. Connotation is a second order of signification which uses the denotative sign (signifier and signified) as its signifier and attaches to it an additional signified. In this framework, connotation is a sign which derives from the signifier of a denotative sign.

Denotation tends to be described as "the definitional, literal, obvious, grammatical or commonsense meaning of a sign. In the case of linguistic signs, the denotative meaning is what the dictionary attempts to provide. The term connotation is used to refer to the socio-cultural and 'personal' associations (ideological, emotional etc.) of the sign. These are typically related to the interpreter's class, age, gender, and ethnicity and so on" (Panofsky 1970a, 51-3).

4. Translation, Intralingual, Interlingual and Intersemiotic

In a general dictionary, as Munday put it, we find the following definitions for the term *translation;* (1) The act or an instance of translation (process); (2) A written or spoken expression of the meaning of a word, speech book etc. in another language (product) (Munday, 2001, pp. 4-5)". A translator thus deals with transferring the meaning, form and the semiotics of a source language text in the process of translation to import them into the target language. Jakobson, the scholar who dealt with both translation and semiotics, distinguishes three types of translation: "(1) Intralingual translation, or *rewording* (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language). (2) Interlingual translation or *translation proper* (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language). (3) Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems)" (Munday 2001, p. 5).Therefore from what mentioned above, it could be claimed here that for Jakobson, translation is the means for transferring signs between different sign systems.

5. Rendering Signs and Symbols in Interlingual and Intersemiotic Translation

Translating a symbolic literary fiction such as *the Scarlet Letter* into a second language (Persian) requires much effort and care, as every language and culture has its own specific system of signs and symbols. In the first language a sign may have some signified concepts, however if the same sign is literally transferred into the second language, it will not signify the same concepts due to differences between code units of languages and their cultures and how those units deliver meaning denotatively and connotatively. This will cause translators numerous problems and requires them to have comprehensive knowledge of that language, culture and their given semiotic systems. Accordingly finding equivalents or similar signs in the target language for the source language sign will be a thorny task for translators. Such an effort to translate a symbolic fiction, as *the Scarlet Letter,* to a totally different language, Persian,

with an overly dissimilar culture is definitely an interlingual and intersemiotic attempt.

6. *The Scarlet Letter* in Persian (*Daghe Nang*)

Being qualitative in nature, this research study performs a comparative analysis between the elements of, *the Scarlet Letter,* written originally in English by Nathanial Hawthorne (1850) and its Persian translation, *Daghe Nang* done by Simin Daneshvar in 1990. The analysis firstly searches for the related signs and symbols (cultural, societal, ideological and religious) in *the Scarlet Letter* and defines their denotative and connotative meanings along with their functions. The mentioned procedure is followed on the Persian translation and finally those related English and Persian signs are compared in order to determine:

1. The Persian translator's strategies for transferring signs and symbols from English into Persian.
2. Whether or not the Persian signs and symbols have the same effect as the English ones had.

7. Semiology of *the Scarlet Letter*

In *the Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne utilizes symbolism as a unique literary device to convey his opinions upon the reader's mind in an efficient and concealed manner. The art of symbolism involving the use of objects or images which represent an idea, meaning, philosophy or entity beyond them, expands the plot of the novel to include human society and human interactions. Nathaniel Hawthorne weaves an interesting web of characters into a plot criticizing Puritan ideals and ways of life. The most effective way he does this is through the use of subtle symbolism throughout the story. In *the Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne manages to use his symbols to show humanity's attitude towards those outcast from society, and the products of such isolation. Symbols force the reader to analyze each element and object in *the Scarlet Letter* to determine its unique meaning to the whole tale.

7.1. Symbolic Characters

The Scarlet Letter, a classic romantic novel of suspense and intrigue, takes on the themes of pride, sin and vengeance with a burning passion that made it the controversial novel of its time. *The Scarlet Letter* begins with a long preface about how the book came to be written. The anonymous narrator is the surveyor of the customhouse in Salem, Massachusetts. In the customhouse's attic, he discovers a number of documents, among them a manuscript that is bundled with a scarlet, gold-embroidered patch of cloth in the shape of an "A". The manuscript, the work of a past surveyor, details events that occurred some two hundred years before the narrator's time. When the narrator lost his customs post, he decides to write a fictional account of the events recorded in the manuscript. *The Scarlet Letter* is the final product.

The main four characters in the fiction are Hester Prynne, Roger Chillingworth, Pearl and Arthur Dismmesdale. Each one in the story is a symbol of the time, the society and the ideology that the story set in. The research briefly introduces all four above mentioned characters to follow them in the subsequent sections and to show how the mentioned story figures in their place represent a symbol. During the nineteenth-century, many male authors, including Hawthorne, at best created two-dimensional female characters in their novels and at worst, failed to include feminine heroines. Hawthorne, however, created female characters that became legendary figures in American fiction because of his unique representation of women. The women in Hawthorne's family, particularly, the women from his maternal side of the family, the Manliness, are the basis of what are, arguably, the most distinguishable, dynamic characters in Hawthorne's fiction. *The Scarlet Letter* is about Hester Prynne and her life, but the fiction is not so much a consideration of her innate character as it is an examination of the forces that shape her and the transformations those forces effect.

In *the Scarlet Letter,* Hester becomes a kind of compassionate maternal figure as a result of her experiences. Hester moderates her tendency to be rash, for she knows that such behavior could cause her to lose her daughter, Pearl. Hester is also maternal with respect to society: she cares for the poor and brings them food and clothing. By the novel's end, Hester has become a proto-feminist mother figure to the women of the community. The shame attached to her scarlet letter is long gone. Women recognize that her punishment stemmed in part from the town fathers' sexism, and they come to Hester seeking shelter from the sexist forces under which they themselves suffer. Throughout the novel, Hester is portrayed as an intelligent, capable, but not necessarily extraordinary woman. It is the extraordinary circumstances shaping her that make her such an important figure.

The second symbolic figure, as his name suggests, Roger Chillingworth is a man deficient in human warmth. His twisted, stooped, deformed shoulders mirror his distorted soul. From what the reader is told of his early years with Hester, he was a difficult husband for Hester. He ignored his wife for much of the time, yet expected her to nourish his soul with affection when he did condescend to spend time with her. Chillingworth's decision to assume the identity of a "leech," or doctor, is fitting. Unable to engage in equitable relationships with those around him, he feeds on the vitality of others as a way of energizing his own projects. Chillingworth represents true evil. He is associated with secular and sometimes illicit forms of knowledge, as his chemical experiments and medical practices occasionally verge on witchcraft and murder. He is interested in revenge, not justice, and he seeks the deliberate destruction of others rather than a redress of wrongs. His desire to hurt others stands in contrast to Hester and Dimmesdale's sin, which had love, not hatred,

as its intent. Any harm that may have come from the young lovers' deeds was unanticipated and inadvertent, whereas Chillingworth reaps deliberate harm.

The third symbolic character, Arthur Dimmesdale, like Hester Prynne, is an individual whose identity owes more to external circumstances than to his innate nature. The reader is told that Dimmesdale was a scholar of some renown at Oxford University. His past suggests that he is probably somewhat aloof, the kind of man who would not have much natural sympathy for ordinary men and women. However, Dimmesdale has an unusually active conscience. The fact that Hester takes all of the blame for their shared sin goads his conscience, and his resultant mental anguish and physical weakness open up his mind and allow him to empathize with others. Consequently, he becomes an eloquent and emotionally powerful speaker and a compassionate leader, and his congregation is able to receive meaningful spiritual guidance from him.

Ironically, the townspeople do not believe Dimmesdale's protestations of sinfulness. Given his background and his penchant for rhetorical speech, Dimmesdale's congregation generally interprets his sermons allegorically rather than as expressions of any personal guilt. This drives Dimmesdale to further internalize his guilt and self-punishment and leads to still more deterioration in his physical as well as spiritual conditions. The town's idolization of him reaches new heights after his Election Day sermon, which is his last. In his death, Dimmesdale becomes even more of an icon than he was in life. Many believe his confession was a symbolic act, while others believe Dimmesdale's fate to be an example of divine judgment.

The fourth symbolic character, Hester's daughter, Pearl, functions in the story primarily as a symbol. She is quite young during most of the events of this novel—when Dimmesdale dies she is only seven years old—and her real importance lies in her ability to provoke the adult characters in the book. She asks them pointed questions and draws their attention, and the reader's, to the denied or overlooked truths of the adult world. In general, children in *the Scarlet Letter* are portrayed as more perceptive and more honest than adults, and Pearl is the most perceptive of them all.

Pearl makes readers constantly aware of her mother's scarlet letter and of the society that produced it. From an early age, she fixates on the emblem. Pearl's innocent, or perhaps intuitive, comments about the letter raise crucial questions about its meaning. Similarly, she inquires about the relationships between those around her—most importantly, the relationship between Hester and Dimmesdale—and offers perceptive critiques of them. Pearl provides the text's harshest, and most penetrating, judgment of Dimmesdale's failure to admit to his adultery. Once her father's identity is revealed, Pearl is no longer needed in this symbolic capacity; at Dimmesdale's death she becomes fully "human," leaving behind her otherworldliness and her preternatural vision.

In addition to the symbolic characters, Hawthorne has used many natural and social items symbolically to point to (or criticize) some social facts and rules. Symbolic natural and social items in *the Scarlet Letter* include rose bush, meteor, the structure of houses, manner of behavior, manner of speech, kind of dressings and so on.

8. The Semiotics of *the Scarlet Letter's* and Daneshvar's Translation Strategies

The analyses mentioned in the methodology section clarifies that the most frequent strategies applied by Daneshvar for transferring symbolic elements into Persian are: *addition, adaptation, assimilation, domestication, Explicitation, expansion* and *modulation*. However in many points, the Persian translator had to apply more than one strategy to transfer a single symbol from English into Persian and this fact once more shows the difficulty of rendering signs into a second language. The study also, based on its detailed analyses, proves that in many points *unit* and *rank shift* have been occurred in the process of rendering some signs and symbols into Persian. According to Catford (1965), unit or rank shift is when the translation equivalent in the target language is at a different rank compared to the source language. *Rank* here refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of sentence, clause, group, word, and morpheme (qtd. In Munday, 2001: p. 61). An example is the English *hence* where the Persian translation is "به همین دلیل".

In the following sections each strategy is firstly introduced, the symbol along with the paragraph encompassing it will be set forth to be compared to its Persian translation:

8.1. Adaptation

Adaptation, as Vinay and Darbelnet put it, is "an oblique translation technique that occurs when something specific to one language culture is expressed in a totally different way that is familiar or appropriate to another language culture. It is a shift in cultural environment. It involves changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture" (Fawcett, 1997).

The first and foremost symbol in the story is the story title, *the Scarlet Letter,* composed of two words, the adjective "scarlet" and the noun, "letter". *Scarlet* in English is "bright red colour" (*Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary*). However "scarlet" carries some implications over it, "if the adjective "scarlet" is used before the name of a woman; it means a woman who is considered to be "immoral "because she has relations with a lot of men (*Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary*)". The term "letter" in the story title accounts for an "A" referring to "Adultery" that Hester Prynne, the protagonist of the story, committed with an unknown lover, a filthy relation that resulted in the birth of a baby girl. "*the Scarlet Letter*" is a

symbol of infamy and shame that Hester Prynne has been branded with to introduce her to the society as an immoral or unfaithful to the religion, a spouse or family.

Translating the title of grand literary works is always an arduous challenge even for professional interpreters. The Persian equivalent of "scarlet" does not have the same implications along with itself, "scarlet" in Persian simply means "سرخ" or "ارغوانی", Consequently, the story title, if it were translated *literally* into Persian, the rendering would be so ambiguous and unattractive, it would become " حرف سرخ".Simin Daneshvar creatively has done a linguistic *adaptation*, she has analyzed the denotative and connotative meanings of the two words, "scarlet" and "letter", then she has looked up in Persian language and culture for some similar items, "نشان رسوایی" and "داغ ننگ", eventually she has ingeniously chosen "داغ ننگ", if this is back translated *literally* into English, it will be "The Mark of Shame".

In another section of the fiction, people's appearances are described by the author very delicately as following:

"The age had not so much refinement, that any sense of impropriety restrained the wearers of petticoat and farthingale from stepping forth into the public ways..." (*the Scarlet Letter*, p. 48, l 5).

"در آن روزگار هنوز تمدن آنقدر به جلو نرفته بود که لچک به سرها را از بعضی اعمال ناشایسته باز دارد"(*Daghe Nang*, p. 18, l. 8).

The underlined words in the English paragraph portray kinds of dressings that women used to wear in the 17th century in Boston. "Petticoat and farthingale" are some tokens of the puritan society. Translation of this section demands skill, creativity and a cultural *adaptation*. These two English words would sound so strange in Persian if they were transferred directly into Persian, accordingly the translator, via cultural adaptation, has *domesticated* the concepts of these words through the use of "لچک", which is a kind of hat used in some parts of Iran by women. This word is referred to women. This translation has a good effect on the Persian readers of the story as they know "Lachak" and it is a part of Persian cultural repertoire.

8.2. Assimilation

Assimilation according to Venuti is "a conservative reduction of the foreign text to dominant domestic values of the target language". (Venuti 1999, p. 11).

A nature-related symbol in *the Scarlet Letter* is "wilderness". In addition to its existence as a physical and spiritual symbol, the wilderness assumes importance in the novel as the setting for Hester's private confrontation with Dimmesdale. It symbolizes a haven for Hester. The section below along with its translation shows the Persian translator's translation strategy:

"I know neither Lethe nor Nepenthe,'' remarked he; but I have learned many new secrets in wilderness." (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 67, l 7)

"من از نوشداروی فراموشی و گیاه ضداندوه اطلاعی ندارم اما در صحرا خیلی اسرار تازه را آموختهام."(*Daghe Nang*, p. 40, l. 18)

As obvious, wilderness is translated to "صحرا"that if it is back translated *literally* into English it will be "Desert", in Persian there is no exact equivalent for the word "wilderness", thus Daneshvar has used the *assimilation* technique to assimilate the notion of wilderness to domestic values of Persian.

8.3 Explicitation

Explicitaion, as Vinay and Darbelnet mention, is "the method of introducing into target language clarifications/details which are implicit in the source language, but which becomes clear from the context or the situation" (Vinay&Darbelnet 1958/1977, p. 9).

Scaffold in *the Scarlet Letter* is the platform on which those wrong-doers stood to be shown to the society for their misdeeds, this platform symbolizes the Puritan Boston society and how they dealt with those who were recognized guilty, the paragraph below and its translation symbolically show what the function of the scaffold was in Boston in the 17th century and how it brought ignominy to the wrongdoer:

"The very idea of ignominy was embodied and made manifest in this contrivance of wood and iron." (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 52, l. 27)

"در این اختراع مرکب از چوب و آهن، بدنامی و انگشت نمائی تجسم مییافت و به نمایش گذارده میگشت(23 .Daghe Nang, p. 21, l)."

The word "ignominy" in English has been translated to "بدنامی و انگشتنمائی" in Persian, two Persian words are synonymous and use of synonyms is common among Persian speakers. Translation strategy applied on this part is *explicitation* as the Persian translator tried to make the notion of 'ignominy' more explicit in her work.

8.4. Domestication

Domestication, firstly introduced by Venuti, in simple terms, refers to a translation strategy whereby the translator adopts a transparent and fluent style to minimize the foreignness of the foreign text for target language readers," (Venuti, 1999:7, 155, 184).

Another symbol in *the Scarlet Letter* is how people treated each other and how they talked in the 17th century. The word matron in the example below is the symbol of a married woman in the puritan society of Boston:

"There was, moreover, boldness and rotundity of speech among these matrons, as most of them seemed to be, that would startle us at the present day, whether in respect to its purport or its volume of tone." (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 48, ll. 24-27)

"در آهنگ صدای این والده مخدرات نوعی گستاخی و بیچشم و روئی گوش را می آزرد که ما امروزه اگر با چنان بی حیائی، چه در آهنگ کلام و چه در مفهوم و معنای بیان، مواجه بشویم یکه می خوریم." (*Daghe Nang*, p. 18, ll. 25-28)

In the above paragraph, the word 'matron' is a cultural and societal sign. "Matron is a married woman regarded as staid or dignified, especially a middle-aged woman with children" (*Collins English Dictionary*). The word "matron" is a usual word in English, but the translator has changed the value of the meaning and has used "والده مخدرات" in Persian that is somehow negative in meaning. It is a kind of *domestication*, as "والده مخدره" is a domestic concept for the Iranian reader.

8.5. Addition

Newmark introduces *addition* as "when a translator may have to add to his version some cultural or linguistic items" (Newmark 1988, p. 38).

In *the Scarlet Letter,* Hawthorne beautifully describes people's appearance which those descriptions symbolically imply what the 17th century residents of Boston used to wear and how their appearance was different from people's appearance in the current time, the examples underneath introduces the aforesaid symbol and its Persian translation reflects how this symbol was carried into Persian:

"The bright morning sun, therefore, shone on broad shoulders and well-developed busts, and on ruddy cheeks, that had ripened in the far-off island."*(The Scarlet Letter*, p. 48, ll. 21-24)

"بنابراین آن روز صبح، آفتاب درخشان بامدادی روی شانه های پهن و سینه های برجستهی آن زنهای همنژاد الیزابت میتافت و گونه ی قرمز و گردشان را روشن می کرد. گونه هایی که بسان سیب های سرخ در آن جزیره ی دور دست رسیده بود." (*Daghe Nang,* p. 18, ll. 22-24)

In this paragraph, people's cheeks are described as "ruddy cheeks that had ripened in the far-off island", these symbolic descriptions of people in Persian translation are pictured through a simile, and those ruddy cheeks are compared to "red apples". Simin Daneshvar attempted to carry these symbolic concepts into Persian via a descriptive and explicitative strategy of translation. It is obvious that She used an *addition* in her work on this part of the story as she added "apple" into the Persian translation that is absent in the original work.

8.6. Expansion

Newmark defines expansion as "when the translator elaborates on the meaning and does illumination" (Newmark 1988, p. 90).

17th century residents of Boston used to talk about a wrong-doer woman, such as Hester, harshly, as one of those women present in Hester's trial session uses "Hussy" to refer to Hester Prynne. It symbolically refers the reader of the story to men and women's way of regarding an adulterous person.

"If the hussy stood up for judgement before us five ..." (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 48, l. 34).

"اگر این زنکهی شلخته جلو ما پنج تا میایستاد." (*Daghe Nang,* p. 19, l. 5)

"Hussy" in English means "a woman or girl who is *immoral"* (*Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary*). If "Hussy" is translated into Persian *literally*, its equivalent will be "فاحشه" or "دختر گستاخ", Daneshvar has translated Hussy with two words "زنکهی شلخته" that if it is back translated *literally* into English, its rendering will be "the inferior woman". This rendering once more shows the creativity of Daneshvar. What happened in translation is a kind of elaboration or *expansion* and explicitation along with *a shift in rank/unit*. It is an efficient translation and gives a good effect to the Persian reader.

The paragraph below along with its Persian version, reflects the symbol(s) introduced through Pearl and the translation strategy applied for rendering the semiology of the paragraph into Persian:

"She saw the children of the settlement, on the grassy margin of the street, or at the domestic thresholds, disporting themselves in such grim fashion as the Puritanic nurture would permit" (*The Scarlet Letter*, p.84, l. 14).

"مروارید بچه های مهاجرنشین را میدید که روی علفزار کنار کوچه ها یا در آستانهی در خانه ها تا آنجا که تربیت پرستانهای خشکه مقدس اجازه میداد و رسم تیرهی زمان بود به تفریح مشغولند" (*Daghen Nang,* p. 64, l. 20).

Hawthorne in this part beckons symbolically to the grim customs and principles that were common in 17th century in Boston for treating and nurturing children, "grim fashion" is a symbol of the puritan society. In translation, Daneshvar provides her readers with exact equivalents to present puritanism and its grimness, grim fashion is translated by the translator as 'رسم تیرهی زمان' which in English will be 'the dark custom of time', in this section there is some degree of *addition* and *explicitation* as in the original paragraph the word *time* has not been used.

8.7. Modulation

According to Vinay and Darbelnet, "modulation is a strategy that "consists of using a phrase that is different in the source and target languages to convey the same idea. It changes the semantics and shifts the point of view of the source language". (qtd. In Munday 2001, p. 57)

Hester Prynne is the central symbol of isolation and alienation throughout *the Scarlet Letter*. As a symbol of evil and darkness, Hester is viewed by strict Puritan town's residents as an outsider. But as the story goes on, she managed to convert the opinion of town's people; through helping the needy and those in trouble, she changed the implication of the scarlet letter from 'Adultery' into 'Able'.

"Such helpfulness was found in her, - so much Power to do, and power to sympathize, -that many people refused to interpret the scarlet "A" by its original signification" (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 141, ll. 9-10).

"چنان کمکی به دیگران می کرد، چنان نیروئی در خدمت به خلق بکار می برد، آنقدر قدرت همدردی داشت که دیگر غالب مردم داغ ننگ را که عبارت از حرفAبود نشانی از رسوائی نمیشمردند" (*Daghe Nang,* p. 136, last line).

In this paragraph, "Such helpfulness was found in her" has been translated into Persian as " چنان کمکی به دیگران می‌کرد", what is reflected in Persian is not the same as its English form, the English phrase has been shifted in Persian, the strategy used for translating this part is *modulation,* it is an optional selection that has been chosen by the Persian translator.

What people wear in a country betokens that society, people's clothes are different in different situations; people have public wearing, in-house wearing and night-time wearing. What they wear in a given situation depends on their culture, the nature where they live in and many other factors.

"...with a lamp in hand, a white night-cap on his head and a long white gown enveloping his figure" (*the Scarlet Letter*, p. 130, ll. 32-33).

"... چراغی در دست، شبکلاه سفیدی بر سر و لباس خواب سفید و بلندی برتن... " (*Daghe Nang*, p. 123, ll. 7-8).

The above paragraph depicts the kind of clothes that were worn by an official of Boston during sleep time; it is evidently different from what he wore in a public occasion. Therefore it is another symbol of Boston People, this night-time wearing was "a white night-cap on his head, and a long white gown enveloping his figure", Daneshvar has translated this part as " شبکلاه سفیدی بر سر و لباس خواب سفید و بلندی برتن", the translation carries the main concept of dressings into Persian, but in the translation of "enveloping his figure", there are some changes in the meaning of these three words, the Persian translator does not mention the meaning of 'enveloping' in her work which means to cover his body, Persian translation says to its reader "he had a long night-time gown on his body", it is obvious that a shift has happened in translation, the shift happened here implies that Persian translator's technique of translation was *modulation.*

9. Shifts

The study based on its detailed analyses proves that in many points shifts occurred in the process of rendering some signs and symbols into Persian. Catford defines shift as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the source language to the target language" (Munday 2001, p.60). The shifts mostly occurred in the process of rendering signs and symbols of *the Scarlet Letter* into Persian are *unit* or *rank shift.*

A unit or rank shift is "what when the translation equivalent in the target language is at a different rank compared to the Source language. *Rank* here refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of sentence, clause, group, word, and morpheme (Munday, 2001, p. 60).The below example shows a shift occurred in the process of rendering:

"Sometimes, a light glimmered out of the physician's eyes, burning blue and ominous, like the reflection of a furnace, or, let us say, like one of those gleams of ghastly fire that darted from Bunyan's awful door-way in the hill-side, and quivered on the pilgrim's face" (*The Scarlet Letter*, p. 113, ll. 17-19).

"گاهی در چشمان پزشک برقی آبی رنگ و مشئوم می درخشید. این برق شباهت به انعکاسی آتشی داشت که در کوره می سوخت یا می توان گفت که این برق شباهت بانوار آتش مخوفی داشت که از در خانه ی وحشتناک «بونیان» به بیرون میتافت، خانه‌ای که بر تپه بنا شده بود و نوری که روی صورت زائر گمگشته ای می لرزید" (*Daghe Nang*, p.100, ll. 17-19).

The word "furnace" means "a container which is heated to a very high temperature, so that substances that are put inside it, such as metal, will melt or burn (*Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary*)",furnace has undergone some changes in transference process, its Persian form "نوار آتش مخوف" does not provide the meaning of a burning container, in English it will be "horrifying fire band", the word furnace has been expanded into three words with degrees of change in its meaning. As in the process of translation the word "furnace" has been converted into a phrase, *the unit/rank shift* has noticeably taken place.

10. Conclusion

Every translator has some preconceptions in her work, no matter they are professionals or not. They may have chosen a technique or method of translation and the chosen method will gradually become their idiosyncrasy. The foremost demanding requirement for a translator wishing to translate a sumptuous symbolic literary work such as *the Scarlet Letter,* is enjoying an absolute mastery of the original story, source and target languages, cultures, societies and belief systems (religion), connotations and denotations, broad knowledge of translation methods and techniques and acquaintance with semiology of the texts.

Finding proper equivalents in the process of translation of a literary text is too painstaking a task, yet when a literary text containing many symbols is chosen to be translated, this will add to the difficulties of the translator's task. They should find some symbolic equivalents in the receiving language that connotatively refer the target readers to issues that the original writer implicitly attempted to point to using first language surface structure.

Comparing the original text and its Persian translation, it could be concluded that the Persian translator's method of translation is definitely oriented toward the Persian culture and the product of her work is target language oriented. Thus many issues of the first language have not been *literally* translatable into Persian, Daneshvar had to *domesticate* many culture-specific and context-related items of the original in the second language, the techniques applied by Daneshvar are mostly (cultural) *adaption, addition, assimilation, explicitation, expanding* and *modulation* in a *domesticating* method of translation.

Jacobson's *interlingual and intersemiotic* categories of translation (ibid) applies to Daneshvar's *Daghe Nang* as *the Scarlet Letter*, a literary masterpiece in English that talks to its reader through a symbolic tongue, has been rendered

into Persian, and symbols have been carried from English into Persian (two different sign systems) via many different procedures. Symbols are beholdable both in English and Persian; symbols such as, the scarlet letter have got their own proper equivalent in Persian with their exact inferences.

The detailed comparative analysis of *the Scarlet Letter* and its Persian translation showed that the Persian translator's applications of the aforementioned translation strategies in rendering signs and symbols into Persian were effectively carried out and because of her thorough acquaintance with two languages/cultures, she managed to choose, in most cases, the best equivalents possible for those symbolic items of the original work. Accordingly the Persian translation, namely *Daghe Nang* is a successful work and the Persian reader reading the translation, finds themselves in the context in which *the Scarlet Letter* set, without being a stranger to the concepts and issues of the English setting, as all the foreign items were accurately adapted into her mother tongue.

References

[1]   Araghi, F. (2012),Literary translations and their impacts on the contemporary style, focusing on Simin Daneshvar and Bahman Sholevar's works, Birjand University, Iran.

[2]   Baker, M.(1992), In Other Words, London and New York, Routledge.

[3]   Barthes, R. (1964/1967), Elements of Semiology (trans. Annette Lavers & Colin Smith). London: Jonathan Cape.

[4]   Bassnett, S. (ed.) (1997), Translating Literature. London: Boydell and Brewer.

[5]   Bassenett, S. (2002), Translation Studies. Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York: Routledge.

[6]   Catford. J. C. (1965), A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press.

[7]   Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, third edition. Cambridge University Press.

[8]   Collins English Dictionary, Fifth edition. Glasgow: Harpercollins.

[9]   Culler, J. (1976), Saussure, Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

[10]   Daneshvar, S. (1990), Daghe Nang, Tehran: Kharazmi Press.

[11]   De Saussure, F. (1916/1974), the Course in General Linguistics (trans.Wade Baskin). London: Fontana/Collins.

[12]   De Saussure, F. (1916/1983), Course in General Linguistics.Trans. Roy Hariris.London: Duckworth.

[13]   Eco, U. (1976), A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington, IN: Indian University Press/ London: MacMillan.

[14]   Fawcett, P. (1997), Translation and Language, St. Jerome, Manchester.

[15]   Hatim, B. &Munday, J. (2004), Translation: An Advanced Research Book. London and NewYork: Routledge.

[16]   Hawthorn, N. (1850), The Scarlet Letter. York Press.

[17]   Jakobson, R. (1959), On Linguistic Aspects of Translation, in R.A. Brower (ed.), On Translation, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

[18]   Jakonbson, R. (1971), Selected Writings, v. 2, Word and Language (7 Vols.). The Hague &Paris: Mouton.

[19]   Martin T. (1965), Nathaniel Hawthorne, New Haven, Conn.

[20]   Munday, J. (2001), Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application. London and NewYork: Routledge.

[21]   Newman, L. (1979), A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne. Boston: Mass.

[22]   Newmark, P. (1988), A Textbook of Translation. UK: Prentice-hall.

[23]   Nöth, W. (1990), Handbook of Semiotics. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

[24]   Noth, W. (2001), Towards a Semiotics of the Cultural Other. American Journal of Semiotics. v. 17, no. 2.

[25]   Panofsky, E. (1970a), *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

[26]   Peirce, Charles S. (1931-58), Collected Writings (8 Vols.) (ed). Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss and Arthur W. Burks). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[27]   Sebeok, T. A (ed.) (1960), Style in Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[28]   Sebeok, T. A (ed.) (1977), A Perfusion of Signs. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

[29]   Shipley, J. (Ed). (1955), Dictionary of World Literary Terms, Criticism, Forms, Techniques. London: Allen &Unwin.

[30]   Shuttleworth, M. & M. Cowie, Eds. (2007), Dictionary of Translation Studies (Farahzad.Tajvidi.Bolouri Trans). Tehran: YaldaGhalam Press. (Original Work Published in 1997).

[31]   Snell-Hornby, M. (1988), Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[32]   Sojudi, F. (2007), Practical Semiotics, Second ed. Tehran: Elm Press.

[33]   Sojudi, F. (2007), Intercultural Relations: "a Semiotic Approach", Semiotics: Theory and Practice. Tehran: Elm Press.

[34]   Tobin, Y. (1990), Semiotics and Linguistics. London and New York: Longman.

[35]   Torop, P. (2002), Translation as Translating as Culture, Sign Systems Studies 30, Torop, Peter; Lotman, Michail, & Kull, Kalevi (eds.). Tartu: Tartu University Press.

[36]   Toury, G. (1995), Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[37]   Vahid dastjerdi H. and Maddah E.(2011), Word choice and symbolic language, a case study of Persian translation of the Scarlet Letter, Isfahan, Iran.

[38]   Venuti, L. (1999), The Scandals of Translation, Second ed. London and New York: Routledge.

[39] Venuti, L. (2004). Translation Studies Reader, Second ed. London and New York: Routledge.

[40] Vinay, J.-p. and Darbelnet, J. (1958/1977), Stylistique comparee du francais et de l'anglais: method de traduction, Paris: Didier, translated and edited by J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel(1995) as *comparative* stylistics of French and English*: A* methodology for Translation, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins