

## Translation of Culturally Sensitive Concepts in Literary Texts from the Perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis and Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies

Samad Mirza Suzani <sup>1</sup> 

1. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Marvdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran.  
*smirzasuzani@yahoo.com*

### Abstract

The present study aims to investigate the translation of culturally sensitive concepts from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (DETS) in literary texts. It examines the existing data based on the internal relationship of dominant ideologies, power relations, and censorship laws with the translator's choices to find out whether these they can help researchers establish a relationship between literary translation and constraining factors of social origin. The research data consist of translations of culturally sensitive concepts relating to unconventional relationships in three translated literary texts. To this end, a socio-cognitive theoretical framework with an emphasis on the dialectical relationship between society and discourse is used. The theoretical approaches that are found applicable are Wodak's (2001) discourse-historical CDA model and van Dijk's (1998) socio-cognitive CDA model. The study also employs a diachronic retrospective methodology based on Toury's (1980, 1995) comparative model. The findings show that translators' choices in literary texts are governed by the constraints of social origin and that literary texts, both original and translated, like non-literary texts, contain a lot of information about the relationship between ideology, power relations, and discourse.

**Keywords:** Culturally sensitive concepts, Critical Discourse Analysis, Literary translation, Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies

**Citation:** Mirza Suzani, S. (2024). *Applications of Language Studies*, 2(1), 128-151.

Received: 2023-12-01

Revised: 2024-02-24

Accepted: 2024-04-25

Article type: Research paper

P-ISSN: 2588-6975

E-ISSN: 2588-6983

Publisher: Hazrat-e Masoumeh University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/jals.2024.713341>

## **1. Introduction**

Over the past thirty-five years, Translation Studies (TS) has undergone a significant evolution and along with the changes in the scope, its themes and topics have also changed. As Munday (2022) maintains, Translation Studies, introduced by Holmes in 1972, originates from one of the functionalist theories of description-based translation commonly known as descriptive translation studies (DTS). In this study, however, this process is referred to as descriptive-explanatory translation studies (DETS), because it is intended to pay attention to the descriptive dimension proposed by Toury (1995, 1998). According to Toury (1995, 1998), in DETS, the historically changeable socio-cultural/political context of target texts (TT) is considered as an integral factor in the creation, description, and explanation of translation. In this vein, it can be claimed that in a given society, translation evolves based on changes in the socio-cultural/political context.

In addition, as Schaffner (2003, p. 23) argues, “translation is an ideological socio-cultural/political endeavor”, and hence any translation is ideological, because the choice of a source text is influenced by the interests, goals, and intentions of social agents (cf Torrey’s preliminary norms, 1980, pp. 54-53, 1995, p. 58).

In addition to the selection of the source text, the function of the translated text in the target culture or society is also a determining factor, which is influenced by the restricting factors (Mirzasuzani, 2009). Apart from these externally imposed limitations, translators’ views, values, prejudices, and ideological orientations, acquired from the societies in which they live, are also effective factors, which will be examined in the present study as the internal factors. In this vein, the study examines the combination of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and descriptive-explanatory translation studies (DETS) aiming to establish a connection between the dominant ideologies in social contexts and the translated literary texts in the societies in which they are produced.

In this regard, four main postulations can be made. First, translation in general, and literary translation in particular, is an ideologically-loaded endeavor (see Schaffner, 2003). Second, CDA can be applied in DETS in general and in translated literary texts in particular at both theoretical and practical levels. Third, if a translation researcher wishes to approach

translation within a CDA framework, he or she must adopt a target-oriented approach, that is, focus on a perspective that sees translation as the "facts or products of the target culture" (Torrey 1995, p. 29) into which the source text (ST) is translated. Finally, translators rarely have the power to introduce new ideologies or challenge existing ideologies through their translation decisions. However, there are exceptions to this tenet, such as when the translated texts help to develop or enhance the original works. For instance, the introduction of new genres such as novels, tragedies, comedies, and western poetry in the Turkish literary system during the reform period is a notable example from the central position of translated literature in the literary system of a given culture.

In the present study, the changing process of translation in Turkish society is examined as a result of changes in the socio-cultural/political context. This review has been done through the analysis of different translated texts from the same source texts to show the benefits of applying a CDA approach to DETS in general, and translated literature in particular. Since this research deals with the historical, cultural, political, and ideological progress or changes of Turkish society and its effects on translation, the model used should be diachronic in nature.

Wodak's discourse-historical model specifically focuses on external (social) variable factors affecting translation. Also, van Dijk's socio-cognitive model is used to examine the internal (cognitive) factors that determine certain choices of the translator in the translation process. In this research, by creating a connection between the translator's discursive solutions (socio-cognitive/political level of translation) and the ideological environment (social/external level), an attempt is made to reveal the importance of external factors in determining internal factors.

There are several social theories or models in DETS, including feminist theory, gender studies theory, and postcolonial theory, but they relate translation to society from a particular viewpoint. As a whole, the CDA perspective complements these theories as it provides a comprehensive theory and thus expands translated texts in the direction of a critical social theory.

More specifically, Wodak's and van Dijk's models have more explanatory power in relation to socio-historical factors and socio-cognitive processes. However, it should be noted that the opposite of this approach is also true. Critical analysis of language use in translated literary texts can be considered a rich source for critical social research in the field of ideology and power relations. Therefore, these two approaches complement and enrich each other.

## **2. Review of Literature**

### **2.1. CDA and DETS**

Social-cognitive and discourse-historical approaches of critical discourse analysis are closely related to translation as a socio-ideological activity. According to Fairclough (2001, p. 16), the CDA analyst should not only look at the texts themselves, but also at the processes of their production and interpretation and how they change. It should be noted that these cognitive processes are influenced by social and historical factors. In other words, the critical study of the use of language in texts should be related to the changing social conditions throughout history that affect the processes of production and acceptance of texts, as well as the cognitive process of the author's role in the production of texts and the reader's role in understanding, interpreting, and reacting to them.

Among the diverse range of functionalist approaches, descriptive translation studies (DTS), poly-system theory, and particularly descriptive-explanatory translation studies (DETS) seem to be compatible with socio-cognitive and historical theories or models of CDA.

The primary reasons for this compatibility are, first, that both CDA and TS models emphasize the socio-political and cultural background as the governing factor in text production and consumption; second, they consider translation as both a product and a process, without favoring one over the other; and finally, both are descriptive and explanatory in nature.

The most important difference between DETS, whose main premise is that "translations are facts of the target culture" (Toury, 1995, p. 29), and DTS and poly-system theory, is the strong emphasis on translation explanation.

In other words, while poly-system theory and DTS relate the description of [literary] translation to the target culture and try to answer the question of "how to translate a text", DETS (in addition to description) explains translation in relation to the context of the target culture, and tries to find an answer to the problem of "why the text is translated thus". This is the common point of TS with CDA, because the answer to this question inevitably links the phenomenon of translation with ideology and power relations.

According to Fairclough (2004, p.104), the text provides "a balanced interpretation (or a variable version) of objective reality". Based on this, it can be said that based on CDA, translated texts are considered a suitable and reliable source for research in the field of ideology and social and political conditions of a particular society in certain historical periods. In addition, according to Fairclough, changes in language use have a dialogical relationship with broader social and cultural processes; that is, society influences discourse and discourse influences society (Choliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1992), and this relationship itself is influenced by ideology (van Dijk, 1998).

Looking at translated literary texts rather than any other text type as the source of data demonstrates that literary texts are no different from non-literary ones in reflecting and construing social reality, either by conforming to or challenging it. Thus, they can offer as much information for CDA analysts as non-literary texts.

There have already been studies of CDA on fiction (e.g., Talbot on fictional texts, 1995, 1997; Sunderland on gender, 2004; Brissett on play translation, 1990; Isboga-Earl on literary translation, 2008 a, 2008 b; Vakuzetzi in the field of fictional texts, 2007, 2008), but it seems that literary works, including translated literary texts, have not been widely analyzed in the field of CDA.

Regarding the relationship between ideology and translation, Mason (1992, p.23) believes that "ideology affects the translation process in subtle ways", adding that text users

consciously or unconsciously bring their own assumptions, tendencies, and worldviews into text processing. They interfere at all levels, including the choice of vocabulary, connection relations, syntactic rules, and type of text. The translator, as the reader as well as the producer of a text has “the double duty of perceiving the meaning potential of particular choices within the cultural and linguistic community of the ST and relaying that same potential, by suitable linguistic means, to a target readership” (ibid.).

Based on the argument that “translators perform their task in specific socio-political contexts to produce TTs for specific purposes as identified by their clients (Schäffner, 2003, p. 24), and also consciously or unconsciously rely on their personal ideological presuppositions acquired from society in the translation process”, it can be claimed that it is inevitable that ideology permeates this process which will end up with systematic shifts from the ST.

Given this ideological intervention in all levels of text production (from lexical choices to text type), it can be concluded that the examination of the surface psychological processes in the target texts, that is, the translator’s final choices or decisions, can reveal the prevailing ideology or ideologies. In particular, this intervention will be able to help determine the social effects conditioned by ideology on the translator's knowledge and through it on his decision-making process, which at the same time takes into account the expectations and desires of the target readers.

van Dijk (1998) takes a multidisciplinary approach to the concept of "ideology" that incorporates concepts from cognitive and social psychology, sociology, and discourse analysis. He uses a three-part approach to ideology analysis: social analysis, cognitive analysis, and discourse analysis.

While social analysis in this model examines "overall societal structures" (the non-linguistic context), discourse analysis is mainly text-oriented. However, the uniqueness of van Dijk's approach is due to his cognitive analysis. According to van Dijk (1998, p.126), to explain the correct nature of ideologies and their relationships with society and discourse, one must first understand their mental or cognitive dimensions. The main point here is that

ideologies have an indirect influence on the personal understanding of group members in understanding and producing discourse.

In addition, van Dijk basically considers discourse analysis to be the analysis of ideology, and argues throughout his works (1995, 1998) that one of the crucial social activities influenced by ideology is discourse, which, in turn, influences how we acquire, learn, take on, change and reproduce ideologies. Therefore, through the analysis of the discursive dimensions of ideologies in the texts, it is possible to prove how they can influence the society and its members and at the same time be reproduced or challenged in the society.

For van Dijk (1998), a text or discourse means the original. In contrast, in translation it is difficult to claim such a two-way relationship because translated texts are weaker than the originals in challenging or changing the prevailing ideologies; hence, most of the time, they reproduce or legitimize the prevailing ideologies.

It is this peripheral status of translation, which, as Even-Zohar (1990) believes, imposes restrictions on translators, leading to the modification of the source text in order to conform to the dominant ideologies in the target culture. In addition, this is the reason why translation is regarded as an ideologically embedded socio-cultural and political practice. Similarly, Bassent and Lefevere (1992, p. vii) argue that “translation is the rewriting of the original text, which, like any other rewriting is a manipulation in the service of power, thereby reflecting a certain ideology”. Thus, van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, which emphasizes the cognitive interface between discourse structures and social structures, is used to explain the influence of ideology on the translation process. In particular, the model considers how ideology is reproduced or legitimized and/or challenged through the discursive manifestations which are the outcome of the mediation by individual translators who manipulate the ST under the constraints of their own personal cognitions governed by their own assumptions, worldviews, values, goals, beliefs and (ideological) predispositions (which are socially and ideologically conditioned and shared).

Therefore, in the current study, the effects of external factors on internal factors are examined. Uncovering these interrelationships is only possible by creating links between

observable and unobservable data. The observable data in the present study are discourse expressions in the translated texts, which are the superficial and apparent realization of the translator's final decisions as a consequence of several socio-cognitive processes.

Data with less observability or unobservable data are several socio-cognitive processes dominated by assumptions, worldviews, values, goals, beliefs, and ideological presuppositions of the translator, as well as the ideologies that shape and govern them. Therefore, it is expected that this analysis inspired by Van Dijk's society-cognition-discourse triangle will contribute to a better understanding of the ideological conditions of translation as a social activity.

Translations are far more exposed to constraints than original texts. Thus, they are more productive when analyzing particular discursive usages and ideologies, in reaching an understanding of the intricate interrelationship between discourse and ideology in general. The advantage of translated literary texts in such research is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the extent of the cognitive and social processes occurring in the production and consumption of the translated discourse is two times higher than that in original literary texts. When we consider the whole course of action in the production and consumption of an original literary text, we can identify a number of processes that take place as follows:

- (i) the author's interpretation of the real world, controlled by his/her personal experience of social manifestations and the world in his/her mind;
- (ii) creation of discourse or literary text by the author;
- (iii) interpretation of the literary text or discourse by its readers;
- (iv) reception, by the reader, of the effects of the meaning intended by the author.

These phases are repeated for the production and consumption of the literary translated text or discourse. In other words, the translator as the reader goes through phases (i) to (iv), during which the meaning intended by the ST author is located in the reader-translator's subjective reading. The process of production or translation then begins,

governed by the translator's own personal experience of the real world and the social representations in his or her mind which differ from those of the ST author. Thus, during and after the processes of interpretation [of the ST] and production [of the TT], which are organized, coordinated and regulated by the social representations peculiar to him or her, the translator will have manipulated the reality in the ST discourse, itself already a version of reality manipulated by the ST author (a repetition of step i). In addition, this new version of reality is expressed by the translator in a new, imaginary way (repeating step ii).

The course of action is completed when the TT reader interprets and receives the meaning intended both by the ST author and the translator (a repetition of steps iii and iv, but this time in step iii, the meaning is negotiated between the TT reader and both the ST author and translator).

Although van Dijk's model is a good explanation of the translators' decisions as the products of the social manifestations in their minds (especially ideologies), it seems that it lacks the necessary historical dimension for a diachronic study to explore the influence of changes in socio-historical and political conditions on translation.

Among CDA researchers, Wodak has been noted for focusing upon the historical dimension of discourse emphasizing that it is necessary to include a historical dimension in CDA because "social processes are dynamic, not static" and this "has to be reflected in the theory and the methodology" (Wodak, 1989, p. xvi). In addition, Wodak and Ludwig (1999, pp. 12-13) considering language as a medium to combine and represent these processes and dynamic social interaction, claim that:

- (i) discourse "always involves power and ideologies. No interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role."
- (ii) discourse is unavoidably historical or historically produced and interpreted, that is, "it is connected synchronically and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before" (ibid.), so it is not produced without context and cannot be understood without taking the

context into consideration. In this respect, intertextuality and sociocultural knowledge are at work within the concept of context.

(iii) readers and listeners might have different interpretations of the same communicative event, depending on their background knowledge and information, and position and role within the society. In other words, “THE RIGHT interpretation does not exist; a hermeneutic approach is necessary. Interpretations can be more or less plausible and adequate, but they cannot be true” (emphasis in original).

Like van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, Wodak's model, in addition to these three principles, demands the methodological interdisciplinarity of CDA by combining historical, socio-political, and linguistic perspectives in the study of a given discourse. Such a triangulation is based on the concept of context (Risigel and Wodak, 2001, p. 41; Weiss and Wodak, 2003, p. 22), which involves intertextual, intratextual, and extratextual contexts (Wodak, 2001, pp. 68-67).

Therefore, the discourse-historical model is well-suited with the nature of the present study. In this vein, in the present study, the translations of two extracts of STs are investigated, and for each ST, two TTs from two different periods of the Turkish history are selected.

Considering this, the diachronic dimension of changing social context is deliberated, aiming to explain how ideology is reconstructed through translated literature by impinging on both the process during which the translator interprets the ST (cf. hermeneutic quality) and the process of translation (cf. ideologically-generated discourse).

## **2.2. Socio-political Status in the Turkish Republic Context**

Considering the importance of the historical background in the discourse, the knowledge of the historical context of the Turkish society seems essential in understanding the societal constraints, particularly censorship, imposed on translators. During the translation process, these factors influence translators' decisions regarding mental social representations, which in turn become internalized versions of the socio-political context of the society of which the

translators are members. Therefore, a brief explanation of the Turkish context is provided below.

The Law for the Establishment of Public Order, which came into force in 1925, gave the government unlimited power to restrict the freedom of the press and the publication of any newspaper (Kabacalı, 1992, pp. 964-963). However, censorship was not limited to the press and affected radio, television, films, plays, and books as well (Yayla, 1992).

From the second half of the 1940s—during the transition from a one-party system to a multiparty system—extraordinary restrictions, martial law, and authoritarianism spread across the political arena. Many newspapers were banned because of comments that were not approved by the government. As mentioned in *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı* (1999, p. 223, 244), after the establishment of the General Directorate of Press and Publications under the direction of the Prime Minister, the government increased its control over the press.

In addition, during the war years, the then regime not only restricted political thinking, but also interfered in every area of daily life, and the world of literature was not spared from the government's scrutiny.

Thus, for example, the translation of Pierre-Louis' *Afrodite*, which is about ancient rituals, faced legal challenges in 1940 due to its obscene content. In addition to the publisher and translator of the book, Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel, a writer and journalist, was also prosecuted for her article about the trial, in which she criticised the pressures imposed by the government on the writers, publishers and translators (see also *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, 1999, pp. 227, 250-252).

The authoritarian policy of the Democratic Party (1950-1960), which was economically liberal and culturally conservative, led to the creation of various educational and cultural policies (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2003, p. 125) and finally ended with a military coup on 27 May 1960.

According to Kabacalı (1992, p. 965), the National Unity Committee that came to power after that agreed to the quick release of imprisoned journalists and abolished most of the undemocratic provisions related to Crimes Committed through Publications and Radio

and in the Press Law. Thus, the era that began with this coup is considered a turning point in the history of the Turkish Republic.

After the military coup, a new constitution was accepted by the majority of voters in 1961. While a more comprehensive explanation of standard and political rights was provided, articles guaranteeing freedom of the press and prohibition of censorship were also added, and thus, a real process of democratization of social and political life was beginning (see *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, 1999, pp. 480-481). However, this era also ended with another coup in 1980. During these nineteen years (1961-1980), a multi-party system was set up, society achieved some degree of autonomy, and a process of urbanization began (Insel, 1999, p.476).

As Yayla (1992, p. 956) points out, “the civil conflicts which broke out throughout the country after 1970 started to threaten the unity and democratic nature of the state.” Martial law was introduced until the military again seized power on 12 September 1980. The coup led to another new constitution. The Constitution of 1982 gave lawmakers an opportunity to re-examine the laws pertaining to freedom of the press and publication. While the basic principle of freedom of the press and prohibition of censorship remained as set out in the 1961 Constitution, the issuing and releasing of news that might threaten national unity or national security, and that might incite offences and revolt, was to be prevented by the decision of the authorized administrative court (see also Yayla, 1992, p. 956). Prosecutions for books branded ‘obscene’ or ‘pornographic’ started to decline noticeably from the late 1980s. From then on, and particularly during the 1990s, the books subjected to confiscation decisions under the propaganda ban in article 142/1 of the Turkish Criminal Code were mostly socialist classics (for an extensive list of these books, see Tanör, 1997, p. 88) and their Turkish translations.

A consideration of the current decade shows how far the political atmosphere in Turkey has undergone transformation since the 1940s. The transformation of political life as a result of completing the democratization process has also led to changes in social life. Turkey has already faced serious problems in the field of freedom of the press and publications, freedom of speech, and freedom in science and art, and it is still like this. However, remarkable progress has been made in all these areas, mainly as a result of the

Constitutional amendments introduced in 1995 as part of the European Union adjustment program. In fact, people and media most often interpret enhanced freedom of thought and expression, along with freedom of the press and publication as an attempt to compensate for the mistakes of governments in the past. On the other hand, it doesn't mean that books or movies are no longer banned for obscenity, and such cases still happen, albeit much less often. Overall, all these terms have started a new stage of democratization in Turkey.

### **3. Methodology**

In the current study, the CDA approaches of van Dijk (1998) and Wodak (2001) are employed as they seem to be most appropriate for the systematic analysis of coherent textual representations of ideology in translated literary texts. In this vein, the aforementioned approaches are combined and employed together with Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (DETS) to demonstrate the effectiveness of translated literature as a practical source of information for CDA researchers.

In addition, Toury's (1980, 1995, 1998) comparative microanalysis model, which has a retrospective and diachronic nature, is used. This model seems to be compatible with the approaches of van Dijk (1998) and Wodak (2001).

#### **3.1. Corpus**

The corpus of the study comprises three novels from 20<sup>th</sup> century British and American literature and their translations into Turkish, as follows:

ST1: Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932/1993);

TT1: Pertinent Turkish translations in 1945 and 2000;

ST2: Nabokov's *Lolita* (1955/1992);

TT2: Pertinent Turkish translations in 1959 and 2000;

ST3: Orxin Caldwell's *God's Little Acre* (1933/1995)

TT3: Pertinent Turkish Translation in 1949 and 1986.

### **3.2. Procedures**

The analysis of some selected parts taken from the above-mentioned source texts is presented at the level of words, expressions, and concepts that were considered culturally sensitive concepts according to the ideologies and social norms of the 1940s and 1950s in Turkish society. Some of the prohibited topics are any vulgar or slang words and expressions with erotic connotations.

After reconstructing some of the rules of translators' choices, they are related with ideologies as "sets of beliefs in our minds" (van Dijk, 1998, p.48) and "mental representations" (van Dijk, 1998, p. 9) acquired from and shared within society, which govern the successive cognitive processes in the translator's mind at the time of the translator's decision about the translation. The comparison consists of two stages. First, two different TTs produced in different historical periods by individual translators are compared. Then, the translations are compared with the ST.

### **4. Results**

Considering the Turkish society's historical and socio-political status in the 1940s and 1950s, there were a series of social and moral values, the violation of which caused social punishments.

The family was one of the most prestigious institutions, and references to unconventional relationships were unacceptable to the Turkish public. In addition, the most effective ideologies limiting the press and publications were conservative, spiritual, nationalist, and anti-communist in nature. For instance, adultery was considered a public crime, while it still is. However, despite the fact that in the 1940s and 1950s adultery was a completely forbidden word and its victims kept their experience as a secret, in recent years its victims are under the unquestionable protection of the law, and as a result, they have more freedom to sue the assailants. In Tables 1-5, a number of culturally sensitive concepts in the source text (English) and their translations in Turkish are presented.

**Table 1:**

*the culturally sensitive concepts in the ST and translations in the TL*

No.	Source Text	Earlier form of the ST	Back Translation	Later form of the ST	Back Translation
1	Incestuous	-	Adulterous	Ensest	Incestuous
2	Incest	-	Adultery	Ensest	Incestuous

As seen in Table 1, "incest" appears as "zina" (adultery) in both examples of the early translation. The translator's decision to change the source text can be based on the fact that in the 1940s, people avoided talking about incest or even thinking about it. However, the later translator not only preserves the meaning of the source text

**Table 2**

*culturally sensitive concepts in the ST and translations in the TL*

No.	Source Text	Earlier form of the ST	Back Translation	Later form of the ST	Back Translation
3a	the normal girl is usually extremely anxious	Segment Omission	-	genellikle hoşnut etmek içinçırpınırlar	healthy little girls usually make a great effort
3b	She feels forerunner	Segment Omission	-	geçirilmez erkeğin öncülüolarak görürler	These girls see themselves as the forerunner

In the examples presented in Table 2, the protagonist of the story describes an unconventional relationship between in the source text. By this description, he means to justify the behavior. As can be seen, while this entire part of the source text is removed in the earlier translation.

**Table 3:**

*the culturally sensitive concepts in the ST and translations in the TL*

No.	Source Text	Earlier form of the ST	Back Translation	Later form of the ST	Back Translation
4	I might have ... produced eventually ... with my blood ... Dr. Humbert,	Segment Omission	-	-	I produce eventually a second ... with my blood. Dr

	practising on the art of being a granddad...				Humbert ... practicing the art of being a granddad
--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 3 illustrates another example of culturally sensitive concepts. The source text refers to Humbert's dream. While the earlier translator completely omits this section, the later translator remains faithful to the source text.

**Table 4**

*Example 5 of the culturally sensitive concepts in the ST and translations in the TL*

No.	Source Text	Earlier form of the ST	Back Translation	Later form of the ST	Back Translation
5	getting right down there and then and (doing) something	Yere çöküp bir şeyler elamak istermiş gibi bir his duydum	sitting down and then doing something	hemen oracıkta ..... de oranı istedim	sitting right down there and do ...

As shown in Table 4, the earlier translator tries to divert the reader's mind from a certain part by using the equivalent of "something"; however, the later translator, by using "there" as the equivalent of "something" in the original text, directly refers to the same part.

**Table 5**

*Example 6 of the culturally sensitive concepts in the ST and translations in the TL*

No.	Source Text	Earlier form of the ST	Back Translation	Later form of the ST	Back Translation
6	Humbert was perfectly capable of it with ..., but it was... he longed for.	Segment Deletion	-	-	It was of course possible for Humbert ..., but it was ... he longed for.

Indeed, the part containing this allusion to the Bible has been removed by the earlier translator, but the later translator has replaced it. Probably, the translator intended to provide guidance for target readers who are not familiar with the context.

## **5. Discussion and Conclusion**

Given the data obtained from the above examples, it is revealed that there is some regularity governing the strategies used by different translators when dealing with culturally sensitive concepts in the source text. In all the above examples, it seems that the translator of the early target text has deliberately changed/deleted/paraphrased words, phrases, or sentences related to unconventional relationships.

This refers to some restrictions imposed on the translators of the earlier target text when translating the source text units that directly or indirectly imply unconventional relationships. Alternatively, it seems that the translators of the later target text have tried to be faithful to the original text and even in some cases, compared to the original text, they have made a clearer reference to the issue of unconventional relationships. In this vein, it is likely to conclude that although the Turkish society has still a high sensitivity towards family relationships and values, talking about unconventional relationships is no longer an absolute taboo, and this can be partly a consequence of the spread of liberal ideology in today's Turkish society.

Another point to consider is that although religious forbidden words are not the main subject of investigation in this study, the example in Table 5 refers to culturally sensitive concepts as well as violating the ideals of Biblical themes as part of the sacred scriptures.

The way the early translator dealt with the text, which contains negative references to religious figures, can be directly related to the conservative and spiritual ideologies ruling the Turkish society in the 1940s and 1950s. In that period, no one dared to criticize religious figures or speak against them. However, nowadays, despite the fact that religion is considered very respectable in the Turkish society, literary texts containing such things, will not cause harassment to the readers of literary works.

It can be assumed that those changes made in the source text that indicate the rules governing the work of the early translator did not happen by accident and are actually the optional choices of the translator himself. Some reasons for these changes from the point of view of translators can be personal ideological presuppositions, concerns about not meeting

readers' expectations, fear of legal action against authors, translators, or publishers, and fear of facing government censorship due to the presence of "obscene" or "immoral" expressions in novels, plays, films, etc.

The factors above may force translators to impose "self-censorship" in order to avoid the negative reaction of clients, readers, or authorities and to remain faithful to their ideological and moral assumptions. For this purpose, they may have to change the linguistic content of the source text by imposing the effects of the target culture and society. This is possible through rewriting parts of the text by changing, deleting, or paraphrasing .

Considering the strategies of translators from the late 1980s to 2000s, it can be seen that all the linguistic content of the source texts has been preserved in their translation. The reason for such loyalty to the source text can be explained again through the socio-political/cultural conditions of the era.

Readers of recent years in Turkey have become more enlightened and aware of the freedom of thought and expression compared to the audiences of the 1940s and 1950s, and have sought to eliminate culturally sensitive concepts. More importantly, they belong to a generation that grew up and promoted freedom of thought and speech. Hence, it can be assumed that newer translators probably have no reason to worry about moral prejudices, censorship, and legal encounters. Finally, the differences in the type and range of choices or changes of the early and later translated texts/targets (discourse of translated texts) can be related to different social representations in the minds of translators, which are internalized cognitive versions of specific social structures and processes.

In addition, political and social conditions can undoubtedly encourage or hinder cultural and artistic creation. Based on this fact and considering the principle that the translated literature cannot be separated from the internal works of the target culture, it can be said that the original and translated literary works are under the control of the social and political situations specific to the society in which they were produced. This, in turn, requires the translation researcher to adopt a target-oriented approach that is able to link translation with social structures and processes in general, and ideologies and power relations in

particular, in the target society. This point explains why, from a target-oriented perspective, translations are considered a useful source of information for critical research on ideology.

For the most part, the findings from the analysis of different translations of a genre in the original language indicate that literary works, such as non-literary works, whether they are original or translated, can contain a lot of information about the society that produced them and the characteristics of the society concerned. In the same vein, considering the fact that CDA studies have often been conducted on non-literary texts, one of the reasons for choosing translated literary texts as a source of information is to obtain evidence that they can also be examined through CDA. Accordingly, it is possible to learn how ideologies influence the text production process, and how ideologies are challenged or reflected by literary texts such as non-literary texts. Nevertheless, this function in translated literary texts is often a reflection or justification of ideology, and due to the mostly secondary position of literary translations in the body of written works of the target culture, it is rarely challenged.

Given the nature of social processes and how these processes are transformed and expressed in language, critical research about the link between society and discourse should contain historical, social, and cognitive dimensions. In this vein, in the current study, an attempt was made to establish a relationship between the solutions/decisions made in the translation process (textual functions) with ideological reasoning, translators' personal assumptions (cognitive processes), and dominant ideologies in a certain period in a given society that affect translators' cognitive processes and consequently affect the final product (TT) as well as the relationship between ideology and text production. By revealing this relationship in this study, it was revealed that the integration of van Dijk's socio-cognitive model and Wodak's discourse-historical model in the form of a new, more comprehensive model can help researchers in examining ideology and the relationship between society-cognition-discourse. Moreover, the present study provided evidence for the claim that there is no clear reason for the non-applicability of CDA in DETS in general, and in (translated) literature in particular.

**Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) certify/certifies that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in the present research paper.

## References

- Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (1992). 'General editor's preface,' in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds.), *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London: Routledge, pp. vii-viii.
- Brisset, A. (1990). *Sociocritique de la traduction. Théâtre et altérité au Québec, (1968-1988)*. [Transl. Rosalind Gill and Robert Gannon]. Toronto and Buffalo etc.: University of Toronto Press.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı (75th Anniversary of the Republic)* (1999). vol. II and III, İstanbul: YKY
- Eagleton, T. (1998), 'Literature and History' (1976) in D. Keeseey (ed.) *Contexts for Criticism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, London: Mayfield, pp. 460-467.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990), 'Polysystem Theory,' *Poetics Today*, 11(1), 9-51.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2004). 'Critical Linguistics/Critical Discourse Analysis,' in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge, pp.105-106.
- Holmes, S. J. (1972/2000). 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies,' in L. Venuti (ed.) *The translation studies reader*, London: Routledge, 172-185.
- Insel, A. (1999). 'Demokrasinin Sancılı Yılları' (Distressing Years of Democracy), *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, vol. II, İstanbul: YKY, pp. 476 – 478.
- Isbuga-Erel, R.F. (2008a). *Translating taboo and ideology: a socio-cognitive diachronic Critical Discourse Analysis framework for translations of English and American novels*. PhD Thesis, Norwich, UK: University of East Anglia.

- Isbuga-Erel, R.F. (2008b). 'Where Translation Meets Critical Social Theory,' in R.H. Parker and K.G. Garcia (eds.) *Thinking translation*, Florida: Brown Walker, pp. 69-85.
- Kabacalı, A. (1992). 'Türkiye'de Basın Sansürü' (Censorship in the Press in Turkey) *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 959-966.
- Kosetzi, K. (2007). *Representatives of women in terms of gender roles and ... practices in Σχεδόν Ποτέ (ΣΠ) ('Almost Never'): the text and the audience*. PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.
- Kosetzi, K. (2008). 'Harnessing a Critical Discourse Analysis of Gender in Television Fiction,' in K. Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson, and J. Sunderland (eds.) *Gender and Language Research Methodologies*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mason, I. (1992). 'Discourse, Ideology and Translation,' in R. de Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, M.H. Heliel (eds.) *Language, discourse and translation in the West and Middle East*, Masterdam: John Benjamin, pp. 23-34.
- Mirza Suzani, S. (2009). *Translation of simple texts (tarjomeye-motune sadeh)*. Tehran: SAMT.
- Munday, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
- Schäffner, C. (2003). 'Third Ways and New Centres: Ideological Unity or Difference,' in M. Calzade-Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation studies*, Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 23-41.
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2003). 'The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol,' in M. Calzada-Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation studies*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 113-129.
- Talbot, M. (1995). *Fictions at work*. London: Longman.
- Talbot, M. (1997). "'An Explosion Deep Inside Her": Women's Desire in Popular Romance Fiction,' in K. Harvey and C. Shalom (eds.), *Language and desire: Encoding sex, romance and intimacy*. London: Routledge. pp. 106-122.
- Tanör, B. (1997). *Perspectives on democratization in Turkey: Progress report*. İstanbul: TUSİAD
- Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetic and Semiotics.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (1998). 'A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms',' in C. Schäffner (ed.) *Current issues in language and society: Translation and norms*, 5 (1&2), 9-31.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993a). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1993b). 'Discourse and cognition in society,' in D. Crowley & D. Mitchell (eds.) *Communication Theory Today*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 107-126.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). 'Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis,' in C. Schäffner and A. L. Wenden (eds.) *Language and Peace*, Dartmouth: Aldershot, pp. 17-33.
- Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (2003). 'Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis,' in G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds.) *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 1-32.
- Wodak, R. & Ludwig, C. (1999). *Challenges in a changing world: Issues in critical discourse analysis*. Vienna: Passagenverlag.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. (2001). 'What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments,' in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, London: Sage, pp. 1-13.

Yayla, Y. (1992). 'Sansür' (Censorship), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 954-958.