



What Do Voices Say in The Garden Party? An Analysis of Voices in the Persian Translation of Mansfield's Short Story

Zohreh Gharaei^{1*}; Azizollah Dabaghi²

¹Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

²Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Received: 13 May, 2013

Accepted: 10 February, 2014

Abstract

This study aims at investigating voices in the Persian translation of Katherine Mansfield's *The Garden Party*. In so doing, after a stylistic analysis of the voices in the original is done, it is argued by the authors that the polyphonous nature of the story is to a great extent due to the deployment of various sociolects in the story as well as the choice of Free Indirect Discourse (FID) as the mode of narration. Then, considering these stylistic features, a comparison is made between the original text and translation. In the light of the comparison, it is revealed that the range of voices heard from the translation is limited compared to the original. This diminishing of the voices in the translation is argued that is partly attributable to the observed decrease in the range of sociolects in the translation as well as the partial failure in reproducing the grammatical features of FID. All in all, this study adds one more piece of evidence to the hypothesis made in the discussions of voices and ideology in translation as to the tendency of translators to bring voices together.

Keywords: The Garden Party; Persian translation; voice; sociolect; free indirect discourse.

INTRODUCTION

Short story has been regarded as a marginal form compared with other longer forms of literary expression. Bates (1988: 10) rejecting the idea of marginality attributed to short story, claims that "short story is the most difficult and exacting of all prose forms". He believes that the illusion fostered by many as to the simplicity of short story which is rooted in its brevity should be weakened. To further elaborate on his remarks, it can be argued that the brevity of this form of narration would add to the burden on the writers, for its brevity necessitates them to be attentive to their choices of appropriate words and structures. In recounting a short story, writers have no ample room for maneuvering around the characters, setting and plot. They, therefore, should be meticulous in every choice and every decision they

make. This is what is supported by Hankin (1983) as he believes that in developing a short story the expansive treatment of characters is not possible and, thus, it imposes a more rigorous pattern compared with a novel. And this is its very shortness that enables it to leave the readers with a distinct impression and to evoke an immediate response among them.

The perceived marginality of short story, however, has paved the way for this form to be a silent voice for crying political and social disturbance; short story has provided a good ground for depicting fragmentation, slipperiness, disruptions and instability. That is why it is thought of as an inherently political form and a site for criticizing social and ideological issues (Day, 2011). Along similar lines, Hanson (1989) believes that short story is the chosen form of the exile. The attributed marginality of this form of literary expression has caused it to be a befitting form in

*Corresponding Author's Email: zohreh.2003@yahoo.com



marginal contexts such as New Zealand and Canada (Lynch, 2001).

Katherine Mansfield as a modern fictionist who was born and brought up in colonial New Zealand chose short story for her literary experimentations, and thereby expressed social criticism and political awareness. As stated by Hanson (1990) there is a connection between Mansfield's position as a woman writer, her position as an inferior colonial, her choice of short story for her literary expression, which is perceived as a minor form, and the emphasis of her work on voices which implies an emphasis on voicelessness: they all share the very element of marginality. On the face of it, Mansfield's *The Garden Party* (1922) is a story of class distinction. But, it is the way in which this distinction is portrayed which is of paramount importance. The story does not have a complex way of expression; her narration is clear but precise. Its shortness, as in any other short story requires every single word and choice to be purposeful; otherwise, it would have given the place to other choices.

The Garden Party is a story of voices: there are many voices in the story, spoken or unspoken. The voices are there to cry class distinction, inequalities, de-identification, and in one word voicelessness. To be provocative among the readers, the polyphonic nature of it should be expressed silently and that is why it is not directly stated; instead, it is implied slyly. The voices can be eavesdropped through grasping the hold of a number of stylistic features deployed by the author. When it comes to analyzing the translation of this story, one more link will be added to this complex chain of marginality formed by the woman writer who was born and bred in New Zealand and chose short story for her literary expression since translation has also been perceived as a second-hand, marginal activity.

2. VOICES IN TRANSLATION

The existence of plural voices in discourse in general and in fiction in particular, has been perceived as a means which gives grounds for destroying deeply-rooted rigid hierarchies and hegemonies, since it requires destabilizing. Bakhtin (1981), as a post-modern thinker, asserting that the language of fiction is dialogic, sees narrative as polyphonic and multi-voiced. Bakhtin believes in the existence of voices in narrative and by offering the concept of "heteroglossia" he confirms it. To him, the essence of novelistic discourse and

heteroglossia is that the boundaries between different forms of consciousness are permeable. Bakhtinian conception of narrative as polyphonic and dialogic and his intrusion of the term "heteroglossia", blur also the boundaries between source text and target text (henceforth ST and TT), and between intra and extra-linguistic features of the text (Munday, 2008). Bakhtin's ideas have inspired May (1994) as he defines translation in practice as replacement of the inner dialogism of the ST with discrete voices. Asserting that "the whole point of a translation is to change a work's ownership and the surrounding culture", he argues that translation changes the voices in the ST (May, 1994: 1). As he believes, language imperatives, translation norms and cultural expectations are among the factors which change the relative force of voices in the ST. He further argues that in a process as such the relationship between the narrator, characters and readers might also change:

The narrator may address the reader differently, or not at all. The characters may or may not interact with the narrator as before. And the author and reader in the text must shift in relation to every other entity there—collapsed together or separated further by the translator's presence. In the end, what a translation *does* is to reconstruct the work at all levels, from bottom to top and from top to bottom. (May, 1994: 1)

All in all, he believes that translation separates out voices in the original and moves the text toward standardization.

Similarly, Hermans asserting that translators do not always function as "gatekeepers" reflecting the voice of authority, believes that the presence and voice of translators cannot be overlooked. In his essay (Hermans, 1996) entitled as "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative", he detects three types of situations in which the translator's voice can be heard: where the text is oriented toward an implied reader and it is to function as a medium of communication, cases of "self-reflectiveness and self-referentiality", and finally cases of "contextual overdetermination". The first case involves the intervention of the translator for the sake of providing more background information for his implied reader. An example can be the further explanation a translator might provide the readers with to smooth the

communication in case of allusions. Self-reflectiveness and self-refrentiality can be best explained in texts within which the linguistic features of the language of the text are referred to. Many cases of untranslatability are among this category; wordplays, puns, polysemous words and so forth are the devices which have the potential to put a text in this category. Finally, when there are features or statements within a text which remind the readers of the fact that they are reading a translation, that there is a voice at play which tries to mimic the original voice, contextual overdetermination occurs. Hermans believes that the voice of the translator is always present, but the order and the size of the names on the title page, the existence of seemingly natural and necessary hierarchies, and our cultural conventions all go hand in hand to make us believe the non-existence of plural voices. This, in turn, gives rise to an ideology for translation which fosters the illusion of transparency; that there is only one voice. In providing an answer for the question he poses as to whose voice we really hear when we read translated discourse, he draws attention to the defects of the existing narratological models for their ignorance of the discursive presence of the translator and consequently the translator's voice (Hermans, 2007).

Along the same lines, Munday (2008) in his insightful discussion on discursive presence, voice and style in translation refers to three elements of narrative fiction in contemporary narratology: story, text and narration. Story is defined as "the basic events and characters", text is "the way these events are presented, ordered, and focused" and finally, narration is defined in terms of "the levels and voices". He, further, asserts that the three elements might be subjected to authorial judgment, but it is only the text which is immediately visible, and, as a result, text in all its manifestations should be delved into and analyzed in depth for the linguistic choices and their consequent effects. That way, the authorial voice, which is called a "manipulating presence" by Booth (1961 as cited in Munday, 2008), can be heard. When it comes to translation, a comparison of the linguistic choices in both ST and TT is required to find the counterpart of the manipulating presence of the author which is termed as "discursive presence" by Hermans (1996). Munday (2008) argues that discursive presence of translators which can be regarded as their voice is easily noticeable on some occasions; the

existence of footnotes, parentheses, commentaries, introductions and prefaces overtly reflect the presence and voice of translators. To him, the three occasions detected by Hermans on which the presence of the translator is felt are limited to those which are noticeable to the readers of the TT, even without comparing it with the ST. Therefore, he extends this presence and voice to include the cases which are more subtle and least immediately visible: where stylistic shifts occur. In cases as such the TT should be analyzed and compared with the ST to formulate an idea as to the manipulating presence of the author along with the discursive presence of the translator. In a comparison as such, any deviation in the voice of the author is regarded as the voice of the translator and subsequently the translator's discursive presence. In short, Munday believes that voices in translation should be approached through an analysis of style.

This study sets as its aim to investigate voices in the Persian translation of Mansfield's *The Garden Party*, translated by Ta'avoni (1995). Since political awareness and social criticism are not stated overtly in the story, but implied through the voices, it is of considerable importance to investigate the voices and their implications in the translated version. In so doing, following Munday's advice as to the importance of a stylistic analysis of the ST and comparing its stylistic conventions with the TT, the story is stylistically analyzed for the ways in which voices are incorporated into it. A comparison between the ST and the TT, then, shows how voices are heard in the translation. This study also makes an attempt to carry out a test on the hypothesis proposed by May (1994) as to the tendency of translators to bring together voices in translations.

3. VOICES IN THE GARDEN PARTY

Mansfield attaches a deep significance to voices throughout the story. Voices play an important role in *The Garden Party* at varying levels. On the face of it, the story is replete with voices and combinations echoing voices. The word "voice" is repeated fifteen times throughout this short story. Besides, it is interesting to know that the story is replete with other words and combinations echoing voices:

"Tuk-tuk-tuk," clucked cook like an agitated hen.

"Do dear", cooed Jose.

Trilled Kitty Maitland.

Voices are sometimes fragmentary, half-heard

and half-imagined implying the inadequacies of language in conveying transparent moments (Feenstra, 2009), and this goes hand in hand with the form of short story which is chosen to reflect the problems of articulation and representation (McDonald, 2005):

Never a more delightful garden-party . . .
The greatest success . . .
Quite the most . . .

At a deeper level, voices are more insinuated but still more penetrating. They are interwoven into the warp and woof of the story through a number of devices. To present a more vivid picture of the voices at this level and subsequently analyze them in both the ST and TT, this study sets out to examine both voices which are pronounced verbally and those unspoken, fleeting in the stream of characters' thought. To fully discuss the voices, the authors put forward a two-partite general classification of the techniques employed by Mansfield to incorporate voices into her story: variations in the sociolect of the characters and the use of FID as the mode of narration.

3.1. SOCIOLECTAL VARIATIONS

Sociolect or social dialect is defined by Trudgill (2003: 122) as "a variety or lect which is thought of as being related to its speakers' social background rather than geographical background". Sociolect, thus, encompasses a number of linguistic features, including syntactic peculiarities, morphological conventions, lexical choices and orthographical deviations, which are closely related to the social position of an individual or a group in the hierarchical structure of status. Factors such as occupation, education, ethnicity, gender and age contribute to the formation of sociolects. In other words, one can claim that sociolect is partly concerned with the question of identity.

In the world of fiction, one way through which characters and their social class are highlighted is their social dialect; sociolect is one means by which the voice of characters is heard. In *The Garden Party*, language or, to put it in exact words, sociolect is emphasized by Mansfield. This claim can be substantiated through the lines of the story, as the story says that Sheridans were forbidden to go to "chocolate brown" cottage of the lower class because of their "revolting language and what they might catch." In this line,

according to the Bakhtinian analysis put forward by Day (2011: 131), "what they might catch" refers to the language of those living in "mean little cottages", since imitating others' voices and assimilating others' discourse can play a role in an individual ideological becoming. As Day rightly believes, here the implication is that language, "like an unwanted disease", can be caught and for that to happen, on some occasions, even no agency is necessary to get involved. Put another way, voicing and accent are introduced as means by which power relations are manifested in language; that is why voicing and accent are emphasized as "transmitters of intention".

The language distinction drawn by Mansfield is a way to highlight class distinction. Working class's speech is full of colloquialism:

(S1) ... you want to put it somewhere where *it'll* give you a *bang slap* in the eye, if you follow me.
(S2) Are you right there, *matey*?
(S3) I'm '*er* sister, miss. You'll excuse '*er*, won't you?
(S4) I'll *think* the young lady.
(S5) '*e* looks a picture. There's nothing to show. Come along, my dear.

As evident, their sociolect is marked with the use of slangs, syntactic features and phonological conventions which are reflected in writing by orthographic deviations. Marginal voices, anyway, are best heard through their own language. However, this is not the way Sheridans use the language:

(S6) My dear child, it's no use asking me. I'm determined to leave everything to you children this year.
(S7) Forget I am your mother. Treat me as an honoured guest.
(S8) Tell her to wear that sweet hat she had on last Sunday.
(S9) Bank them up, just inside the door, on both sides of the porch, please.
(S10) Stop the garden-party? My dear Laura, don't be so absurd. Of course we can't do anything of the kind. Nobody expects us to. Don't be so extravagant.

The difference between these two types of voices is not only in the words or grammar of the language they use; it is also in the force of their utterances: while those in the working class tend to explain, describe or inquire into the convenience of others, the upper class gives orders.

Laura, the main assimilator of the story, is so flexible in assimilating different voices that on some occasions can be "business-like" populating the voice of an adult of her own class:

(S11) "Good morning," she said, copying her mother's voice.

Laura's desire to be a social climber is sometimes manifested through assimilating the prestigious-sound words and practicing the use of such words by repeating them. Day (2011: 131) in his Bakhtinian analysis of the story says some characters "tend to over-wear the words they acquire, as if the new words and ideas have the sheen of new clothes." A case in point is the word "extravagant" firstly stated by Jose ("Don't be so extravagant."), a social climber, and then repeated by Laura several times:

(S12) That really was so extravagant...

(S13) Am I being extravagant?

(S14) Perhaps it was extravagant!

On some other occasions she assimilates the voice of a child, and as a result the sociolect reflects that of a child:

(S15) Daddy darling, can't the band have something to drink?

Sometimes she feels an overwhelming desire to assimilate a workman:

"Matey!" The friendliness of it, the—the—Just to prove how happy she was, just to show the tall fellow how at home she felt, and how she despised stupid conventions, Laura took a big bite of her bread-and-butter as she stared at the little drawing. She felt just like a work-girl.

Certainly, Mansfield uses this variation in sociolect to reflect different voices of different people belonging to different levels of society. Now the question is, does the TT offer the same rich variety of sociolects and, in turn, voices? Or, does it bring the voices together reducing the polyphonic nature of the ST? Considering the fact that voices of the TT and the voice of the translator are not so loud that can be heard without comparing TT with the ST, and following Munday's advice as to the importance of comparing TT with St in such occasions, it seems necessary to analyze the TT stylistically.

As to the TT, it seems that the translator has been aware of the sociolect of the working class:

(T1) آدم دلش می خواهد جایی علم کند که گومب! عینهو

مشت، بخورد توی چشم. مقصودم را می فهمی؟

(T2) حاضری رفیق؟

(T3) من خواهرشم، دختر خانوم. یقین می بخشیش، نه؟

(T4) خودم از دختر خانوم تشکر می کنم.
(T5) عینهو یه عکسه. ظاهرش هیچی نشون نمی ده. بیا جلو عزیز جان.

The choice of words and expressions like "عینهو مشت بخورد توی چشم", "عینهو", "رفیق", "گومب", and the use of broken language to show colloquialism in cases such as "خانوم", "عینهو", "یه", "می بخشیش" and "نشون نمی ده", "هیچی", "عکسه", substantiate the above-made claim about the awareness of the translator. However, inconsistency in the use of conversational style and the varying degree of colloquialism are noteworthy here as well as in most of Persian translated texts and even some originals. Together with the mentioned words and expressions and the broken, conversational style used in the terms reported above, there exists a number of words and expressions typical of written language and rather formal speech. Some cases in point are "می", "مقصودم را", "علم کند", "خواهد".

While the inconsistencies existing in the translation of the sociolect of the working class partially impair their voice, their language in the TT still can be distinguished from that of Sheridans:

(T6) عزیز جان، بیخود از من می پرسی. امسال خیال دارم همه کارها را بسپریم دست شما بچه ها.

(T7) فراموش کنید که من مادرتان هستم. مرا هم بگذارید به حساب یک میهمان محترم.

(T8) بهش بگو همان کلاه ملوس یکشنبه قبلش را سرش بگذار.

(T9) لطفا همانجا دم در، دو طرف ایوان بگذاریدشان.

(T10) گاردن پارتی را به هم بزنیم؟ لورا جانم، پرت و پلا نگو. معلومست که نمی توانیم چنین کاری بکنیم. اصلا کسی چنین توقعی از ما ندارد. اینقدر تند نرو.

When Laura's voice in the ST is perceived as imitating her mother, someone of a high social class, the TT says:

(T11) با تقلید لحن و صدای مادرش گفت: "صبح به خیر."

With regard to Laura's verbal tic shown in repeating the word "extravagant", in the TT in (T12) and (T13) the translator has rendered the word consistently by using /تند رفتن/. In (T13) the source adjective is translated as verb, while in (T12) it is translated as a noun. The last "extravagant" is not translated at all; since it is an immediate answer Laura gives to the question she herself raised in the previous sentence (both (S13) and (T13)), the translator has opted for ellipsis:

(T12) این دیگر تندروی به معنای واقعی بود...

(T13) آیا زیاد تند رفته ام؟

(T14) بعید نبود.

And when she, imitating the voice of a child, tries

to persuade her father to let her give the workmen a drink, the TT's Laura says:

(T15) پدر جان، نمی شود به ارکستر هم نوشابه بدهیم؟

Perhaps the choice of "Daddy" used in the ST is the best clue to the childish voice of Laura, while it is removed from the TT by the choice of /پدر/ which not only gives it an adult voice, but also changes the register of the sentence as in Persian this word is mostly used in formal situations.

3.2. FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE

McArthur (1998) classifies different types of discourse in narration into four categories of direct discourse (henceforth DD), indirect discourse (henceforth ID), free direct discourse (henceforth FDD) and free indirect discourse (henceforth FID). FID which is the concern of this study, encompassing both speech and thought, is one of the techniques used in this short story. FID has some features in common both with DD and ID. Among the features FID shares with DD one can refer to the use of near locatives, temporals, and subjective and emotive expressions, while the absence of quotation marks, the adaptation of pronouns and back-shifting of tenses are from among the features shared with ID. In FID the vocalization of the character and the voice of the narrator are blended (Wales, 2001). Pascal (1977) believes that this blending of characters, author, narrator, subjectivity and objectivity in FID creates "dual voice" and the polyphony heard in the work of Mansfield is, in part, because of the deployment of this technique. Following is some examples:

(S16) What nice eyes he had, small, but such a dark blue!

(S17) Why couldn't she have workmen for her friends rather than the silly boys she danced with and who came to Sunday night supper? She would get on much better with men like these.

(S18) They were like bright birds that had alighted in the Sheridans' garden for this one afternoon, on their way to—where?

(S19) Again, how curious, she seemed to be different from them all. To take scraps from their party. Would the poor woman really like that?

(S20) How quiet it seemed after the afternoon. Here she was going down the hill to somewhere where a man lay dead, and she couldn't realize it. Why couldn't she?

Before analyzing the sentences above to show how FID is used by Mansfield as the mode of narration, it seems useful to give a brief account

of how to recognize FID. In so doing, Gharaei and Vahid, Dastjerdi's classification (2012) for the markers of FID is used. There, the features attributed to FID are extracted and categorized into three categories of lexical markers, grammatical markers and punctuations. Lexical markers include such elements as expressive and emotive items, modal auxiliaries and near locatives and temporals. Grammatical markers include back-shifting of tenses and adaptation of pronouns, and finally, punctuations include markers such as quotation marks, question marks, exclamation marks, dashes and parentheses.

In (S16) the stream of thought is that of Laura. As evident, in this line the use of emotive expressions such as "what nice eyes" and "such a dark blue" are among lexical markers indicative of DD and the voice of the character, Laura in this case. The existence of the exclamation mark is also an evident for this claim since narrators do not exclaim, characters do (Hoff, 2009). On the other hand, no introductory verb is reported, no quotation marks are used and the tense of the sentence is back-shifted to the past; these are all signs of ID. The result is a special kind of blurring of DD and ID which leads to hearing at least two voices: that of the character and that of the narrator.

In (S17) the words "could" and "would" as auxiliary verbs are in the category of lexical markers of FID. Modals show the voice of the character since some sort of personal attitude toward the event is evoked by the use of modals, and this subjectivity is what an objective third person narrator is not expected to have (Verdonk, 2002). The existence of the question mark is also an indicative of the voice of the character. The near locative "these" is also used which is a lexical feature. There are, however, some features of ID within the same utterances which, together with the signs of DD, give rise to FID. Likewise the previous case, here again no introductory verb and quotation marks are existent. As to the grammatical markers of FID, the tenses are back-shifted and the pronouns are adapted. All in all, here again the voices are mingled. By the same token, (S18) to (S20) are also cases of FID.

The above cases are narrated through FID to create polyphony and thus by mingling the voice of character – which might be polyphonic by itself as we can see in the voices populated by Laura – with that of narrator, Mansfield lets us penetrate into Laura's thought. Therefore, it is the mingling of voices which gives us the opportuni-

ty to feel Laura's consciousness about the class distinction and the inequality of the privileges in which she has brought up. To investigate if the same voices are heard in the Persian translation, the corresponding translated sentences were studied to see if the mode of narration is FID:

(T16) چه چشمهای قشنگی داشت! هر چند ریز بود، اما چه رنگمایه کبودی!

(T17) چرا نمی شود به جای پسرکهای لوسی که همراهشان می رقصید و یکشنبه ها برای شام به منزلش می آمدند، با کارگرها دوست شود؟ حتما با این قبیل آدم ها خیلی بهتر می توانست کنار بیاید.

(T18) گویی پرندگان رنگینی بودند که همین یک بعدازظهر را در باغچه ی شریدن ها فرود آمده اند تا به دیار دیگری روند – اما کدامین دیار؟

(T19) شگفتا! از نو چنین می نمود که با همگی آنان فرق دارد. بردن خرده ریزه های میهمانی. برآستی آیا آن زن تیره بخت این کار را خوشایند می یابد.

(T20) بعد از آن بعدازظهر پرهیاهو همه جا چه خاموش می نمود. اینک از فراز تپه رو به جایی می رفت که جنازه ای در انتظارش بود، با این همه نمی توانست آن را احساس کند. چرا؟

چه / (T16) is a good example of FID in Persian: / show the emotions evoked in Laura and consequently her voice. Similarly, the exclamation marks intensify her voice. However, since these features are reported in a discourse other than DD (lack of quotation marks, introductory verbs and the back-shifting of tenses show that it is not DD), one can come to this conclusion that it is FID.

In (T17), as far as lexical markers of FID are concerned, the modes of possibility and certainty represented in the modal auxiliaries "could" and "would" are preserved in the Persian translation by opting for /شدن/ and /توانستن/ respectively. The nearness of the pronoun "these" is also reflected in the Persian pronoun /این/. The only problem is that the grammatical features of FID are not fully represented in the Persian translation: "could" which is the back-shifted form of "can" in ST is translated as /نمی شود/ which is present in Persian. So, although modality – a lexical feature- is represented in the TT, the tense is not back-shifted.

(T18) is another case in which, near deixis are preserved and punctuation marks are as suggestive as in (S18). The past perfect tense of "had alighted", however, which is the back-shifted form of "alighted" is not back-shifted in Persian and is rendered as /فرود آمده اند/ which is present perfect. Similarly, in (T19), everything is suggestive of FID except for the tense of "would" which is translated as /می یابد/ in Persian, a kind of pre-

sent tense which is used for referring to future. In (T20) all markers of FID existing in the ST are reproduced.

4.DISCUSSION OF THE PERSIAN TRANSLATION

As for the variety of the sociolects used in the story, to rather thoroughly discuss the emerged inconsistency in the TT, a review on the norms followed in and, even, rules imposed on Persian colloquial writing seems to be helpful. Farahzad (1990) has put forward an argumentation against most of orthographic deviations from the standard language in colloquial writing. She believes that translators should write conversations of the ST into the TT the way that all Persian speakers can read them quickly and accurately. According to her, reading combinations such as "وختش", "راجب" and "کتابا", in which colloquialism is shown by orthographic deviations, instead of "وختش است", "کتابها" and "راجع به" which are recorded according to standard writing, is demanding on the part of readers and, thus, the use of these deviations and others of the same ilk should be avoided. She extends her argumentation against reflecting colloquialism in writing to include even original, non-translational Persian fiction. Referring to some lines of Jalal Aal Ahmad's *Pink Nail-Polish*, she asserts Jalal's orthographic manner in recording some words misleads readers. She further continues that if the purpose of colloquial writing is to make readers aware of the spoken and colloquial language, there is no need to resort to "wrong spelling". Then, to make further attempt to disambiguate such misspellings, she offers a list of guidelines in which some of the conventions for recording colloquial speech in Persian are advised to be avoided. In sum, she believes that recording conversational use of terms and colloquialism in spoken language, does not provide us with rational justification for deviating from standard orthography and writing. How should we show colloquialism in dialogues, then, if we are not advised to deviate from standards? Is not colloquialism and the use of spoken language deviations from standard language in the sense Farahzad takes it? If it is the case, why not to reflect them in writing by just the same deviations?

To tackle these questions and the like, we have resorted to an opposing view, that of Anvar (2006). He, in an article accompanied his translation of Ibsen's *A Doll's House* discusses the chal-

lenges in his way of translating the work. In a section titled *Venerating Spoken Language* he refers to the challenges in recording the dialogues and conversations. According to Anvar, in recording dialogues, words, sentences and expressions should be, as far as possible, the same as the way they are articulated in speech. His discussion shows that he is, to a great extent, at odds with the rules imposed by Farahzad and believes there should be no insistence on delivering a neat and tidy record of spoken language. According to him, if we, using the enormous potential of our language, start appreciating spoken language with the colloquialism inherent in it the way it is, then readers will certainly read it as easily as they read the artificial words of formal language. He believes that venerating spoken language by recording it the way it is helps us vividly represent pragmatic aspects of language including social relations, social class, situations, time, and so forth. That way, he believes, in addition to extending the potentials of Persian, new devices will be revealed which smooth the path toward penetrating into seemingly inaccessible layers of language and stylistic meaning.

The immediate relevance of these opposing ideas to our present discussion is interesting. A part of our concern for transferring voices in the TT will be alleviated by drawing a borderline between the way we record the language spoken by the high class of the society and that spoken by the working class. In so doing, attempt should be made to reflect colloquialism, conversational style and even slangs the best way possible. As mentioned earlier, the translator seems to be aware of the difference in the sociolect of these two classes of the society, but the problem is that the use of colloquialism is not consistent and is limited only to some words. This is what Farahzad is in favor of and Anvar is opposing to. Since in this short story the language spoken by the characters implicitly serves as a means to the creation of voices and polyphony, which is central here, its reformulation in the TT seems to be of utmost importance if polyphony is intended to be conveyed. It seems that the language spoken or even thought by the characters in *The Garden Party* provides a compelling evidence confirming Anvar's idea as to the importance of venerating spoken language and recording it in writing the way it is. The polyphony heard in this story seems to be one of seemingly inaccessible layers of language which is only possible to grasp hold

of through a stylistic analysis of the ST and making use of the potentials of Persian in this regard. Mention should be made that this argumentation by no means intends to reject Farahzad's idea in its totality, since her justification holds true on some occasions; the aim is, however, to show how venerating spoken language in its written record can occasionally survive the polyphonus nature of a work.

With regard to the use of FID, it seems that the grammatical features especially back-shifting of tenses, are the most problematic areas of translation into Persian. This finding is in agreement with some other studies investigating the degree of reproducing FID in Persian translations (Horri, 2010; Delzendehrooy, 2010; Gharaei & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2012). One question might arise here: What is the reason for deviation from the grammatical features of FID in TTs? Horri (2010) in providing an answer to this question and justifying the results of his study about the use of FID in the Persian translations of Woolf's **To The Lighthouse** claims that the mismatches in the translations are in line with the norms of Persian language. Delzenderooy (2010) also makes a similar claim asserting that the deviations are due to the domesticating strategies used by the translator. Gharaei and Vahid Dastjerdi (2012), however, rejecting these claims, prove that the stylistic features of FID have been employed in original Persian works of fiction and cannot be considered as alien to Persian. As a result, they attribute such deviations to unfamiliarity of translators with the stylistic techniques and devices employed in Persian fiction, or/and their unfamiliarity with the stylistic features of the ST. In this study, however, in addition to the two reasons mentioned, one more plausible reason is set out and that is what Wang (2001 as cited in Ziman, 2008) refers to as the clash in the choice of language between writers and translators. The gist of his idea is that the clashes between the choice of writers and translators are partly due to the fact that writers mostly feel free to be poetic and to focus on the aesthetic aspects of language, while translators feel more restrained and have a propensity to focus on the informative function of language which, in turn, results in choosing a way of expression which best conveys the information in the ST. By the same token, it is natural that translations move toward standardizing the STs and nullifying their stylistic features to differing degrees.

Deviations in the TT from the sociolectal variations and the features of FID present in the ST not only impair the stylistic peculiarities of **The Garden Party**, but also lead to lower the voices in the TT compared with those heard in the ST. In fact, sociolects and FID are used in the ST as stylistic techniques to create polyphony and any defect in fully presenting them in the TT will result in diminishing the voices. In the translation of this short story, although the translator seems to have been partially aware of the sociolects and FID used in the ST and although she has made an attempt to reproduce them in the TT, the partial failure in reflecting the voices which are represented in different sociolects in the ST, as well as in back-shifting the tenses have damaged the polyphonic nature of the ST. This finding is exactly in tune with May's assertion about the tendency of translators to bring voices together (1994).

5. CONCLUSION

The present study was an attempt to explore the degree of polyphony in the Persian translation of *The Garden Party*. The study reports some deviations from the sociolectal variations present in the ST as well as some mismatches in reflecting the features of FID. The deviations from the features of each sociolect are mostly because of the resistance against the use of orthographic conventions marking spoken language of different social classes, and the deviations from the grammatical features of FID are attributed to the unfamiliarity of translators with the stylistic techniques and devices employed in Persian fiction, or/and their unfamiliarity with the stylistic features of the ST. The latter, the study suggests, might be also owing to the clash in the choice of language between writers and translators. The immediate effect of deviations from the stylistic features of ST on the TT is, no doubt, impairing the style of the original writer. Since each literary work has a creative form which is represented in its style (Bennett, 2003), the success of a literary translation partly lies in the ability of the translator to transfer not only the content of the work, but also the stylistic features of it. That way, literary translation can serve its role which is, according to Lefevere (2003: 237), "the evolution of literatures". The more profound effect of deviations as such is, however, bringing the ST voices together and nullifying the effect of the polyphony of the ST which, in turn, is at the service of portraying distinctions and inequalities. In the light of the find-

ings of the study and the analysis put forward, the paper finally argues that it might be the time to add one more piece of evidence to the assertion made by May (1994) as to the translators' tendency to separate out voices in the TT and move them toward standardization.

References

- Anvar, M. (2006). *Venerating Spoken Language*. Tehran: Karnameh Publication.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. (Ed. M. Holquist, Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bates, H. E. (1988). *The Modern Short Story from 1809 to 1953*. London: Robert Hale.
- Bennett, T. (2003). *Formalism and Marxism*. London: Routledge.
- Day, T. (2011). The Politics of Voice in Katherine Mansfield's 'The Garden Party'. *English*, 229 (60), 128-141.
- Delzendehrooy, S. (2010). Adequacy or Acceptability? Toward Making the Style of the Author Known. *Translation Studies*, 30 (2), 27-42.
- Farahzad, F. (1990). *ABC of Translating*. Tehran: Nashr Daneshgahi.
- Feenstra, E. (2009). Circling the Self: The Short Story Innovations of Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf. *Leading Undergraduate Work in English Studies*, 2.
- Gharaei, Z. & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Free Indirect Discourse in Farsi Translations of Woolf's Ms. *Dalloway*. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 14 (1).
- Hankin, Ch. (1983). *Katherine Mansfield and Her Confessional Stories*. London: Macmillan.
- Hanson, C. (1987). *The Critical Writings of Katherine Mansfield*. London: Macmillan.
- Hanson, C. (1989). *Rereading the Short Story*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hanson, C. (1990). Introduction to Katherine Mansfield (1888–1923). In B. Scott and M.Lynn Broe (Eds.), *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hermans, T. (1996). The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target*, 8 (1), 23-48.
- Hermans, T. (2007). *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hoff, M. (2009). *Virginia Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway: Invisible Presences*. Clemson: Clemson University Digital Press.
- Horri, A. (2010). Translating Personal Deixis as

- Point of View Indexes in Three Persian Translations of Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*. *Translation Studies*, 30 (2), 5-20.
- Lefevere, A. (2003). Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Lynch, G. (2001). *The One and the Many: English-Canadian Short Story Cycles*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mansfield, K. (1922). *The Garden Party and Other Stories*. New York: Modern Library.
- Mansfield, K. (1995). *The Garden Party and Other Stories* (Trans. Sh. Ta'avoni). Tehran: Cheshmeh Publication.
- May, R. (1994). *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- McArthur, T. (1998). *Concise Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald, R. (2005). Irish Writing since 1950. *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 35, 249-263.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Pascal, R. (1977). *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and Its Functioning in the Nineteenth Century European Novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics: Oxford Introduction to Language Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wales, K. (2001). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman.
- Ziman, H. (2008). Sex Taboo in Literary Translation in China: A Study of the Two Chinese Versions of *The Color Purple*. *Babel*, 54, 1, 69-85.

Zohreh Gharaei

is a Ph.D. student of Translation Studies at the University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. She holds an M.A. and a B.A. both in Translation Studies from the same university. She currently teaches translation related courses to undergraduate students at the University of Isfahan as well as Sobh Sadegh Institute of Higher Education, Isfahan, Iran. Her areas of interest in research include issues concerning literary translation as well as topics in translator training. Her last published article appeared in *Comparative Literature and Culture* (2012), a quarterly published by Purdue University, USA.

Azizollah Dabaghi

holds a Ph.D. in TEFL from the University of Auckland, New Zealand. He is an assistant professor at the University of Isfahan, Faculty of Foreign Languages, where he teaches graduate and post-graduate courses. His areas of interest are Second Language Acquisition, Teaching English in EFL and ESL Contexts and Translation Studies. He has published and presented a number of articles in these areas. His book, *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition* was published by Lambert Academy Publishing in 2010. Dr. Dabaghi is currently the head of Language Center at the University of Isfahan.