

Are pseudotranslations translation-like? The case of Persian crime fiction

Mehdi Vahedikia

Arak University

Abstract

The present paper is an attempt to study the textual makeup of Persian pseudotranslated texts in comparison to translated and original ones. To this end, a corpus was formed comprising three sub-corpora of translational, authorial, and pseudotranslational Persian books in crime fiction. To analyze the translational behavior of the texts, they were checked against some of the most prominent tendencies of translated literature that allowed examining the text without recourse to any source text, including explicitness, simplification, and interference. All in all, and with respect to the hypotheses constructed based on the literature, translated and pseudotranslated works were in broad agreement regarding the translational characteristics examined, yet the data did not support the claim that pseudotranslations exaggerate translational features.

Keywords

expectancy norms, pseudotranslation, pseudo-transfer, tendency, translation universals

1. Introduction

The term ‘pseudotranslation’ was first used in 1823 in a review journal to mean ‘free translation’ (Rambelli, 2009). Since then, the term has been used in a number of fields, including automated translation and localization, yet with different meanings. The term was first operationalized in ‘Translation Studies’ by Anton Popovič (1976), seeing it as a metatext. Following Popovič, other scholars in the field have provided different definitions for the term each focusing on an aspect of the phenomenon: some on its imitative resemblance, some on the explicit allusion to a source text, some seeing it as an ethical lapse, some as a reading technique, some as a site of transmissis, i.e., as a site for depiction of translation process or translators (see Beebee & Amano, 2010), some as a collusion between the readers and the author, some as a site of polylinguality, etc. However, the most widely used definition has so far come from Gideon Toury (1995, p. 40) taking pseudotranslations as “texts which have been presented as translations with no corresponding source texts in other languages ever having existed—hence no factual ‘transfer operations’ and translation relationships”.

Toury’s (1995) premise is that as persons-in-the-culture, text producers, including translators, are aware of the position of translations and translators as well as the functions that these serve in the host culture. Such consciousness usually manifests itself in behavioral patterns, including the textual-linguistic makeup of the text, i.e., its surface realization. Once this consciousness is manipulated in form of textual choices on the paper, original literature can be passed off as translational, thus Toury’s ‘disguise hypothesis’, postulating that pseudotranslators fill their products with translational characteristics so that the fake nature of the product does not create suspicion, and so long as the veil has not been drawn, the text enjoys the status of a genuine translation in the host culture.

In addition to the original texts presented with fully translational appearance, i.e., as a translation both textually and paratextually—as discussed by Toury (1995, 2012), some scholars have also discussed cases of pseudotranslation where a text is presented as an authored one paratextually yet creates the impression of a translated work textually. This is usually conveyed by the author’s opting for foreign setting and characters for the story. One of the most fertile grounds for such products in many literatures has been crime fiction. For instance, Sohár (1998) discussed the case of Hungarian fictitious translations in crime fiction, where the pseudotranslators used borrowed characters and international patterns, such as a highly magical pre-industrial society, as the main elements of the stories. Her thorough analysis (2000) of *Tűzvarázs*, a detective story by Vavyan Fable, showed how the authors of the book had used alien toponyms for locations or had left locations unnamed, presented a multicultural scene conjuring up the U.S., and made extensive references to international writers and characters. The work also benefited from a lot of linguistic innovations, loan words and idioms, and in some cases a blend of Hungarian and English words. The author tampered with the linguistic features of Hungarian, using many new word formation techniques for making new verbs and suprasegmental features such as bold types for some of the suffixes to highlight exoticism in the text, all giving the reader the impression of reading a translation. Gürçağlar (2010) reported such appropriations of the foreign by hosting famous crime fictional characters such as Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin in original Turkish crime stories in the post-reform Turkey. Kemal Tahir wrote series of Mike Hammer stories, with his pen name, F.M. İkinci, appearing as the writer on the book cover. To provide an impression of translation, though, Tahir opted for foreign lexical and syntactic elements, i.e., signs of translationese. Besides borrowing characters from Mikey Spillane, he used many loan words and used several references to New York and its whereabouts, to the extent of exaggeration. Gürçağlar further discussed a similar attempt by Aziz Nesin in his ‘Modern Sanat’, which unfolded in Paris and used French characters and extensive use of French words.

Maher (2013) studied the case of English novels written for English readers but within the Italian milieu, i.e., with Italian main characters and in Italy. Exoticizing elements abound in the text with the application of Italian culture-specific items including customs, culinary names, newspaper names, and glossaries for organizational, social, and political concepts along with Italian formulaic expressions, terms of address, titles, swear words, and greetings which already have rough English equivalents. Some of the English terms also seem to have been calqued from Italian. Inclusion of language games, i.e., dialects and mix of languages, is yet another linguistic complexity prevalent in these pseudotranslations, e.g., some characters are shown to be unable to speak in the language of the book. In addition, there are interpreting activities in one of the texts, where one character interprets for the other characters and for the police. These strategies signal the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural nature of the dialogues in the text. Altogether, these elements repeatedly remind the English readers they are in Italy and reinforce a “sense of place” (p. 154).

Vahedikia (2018) compared a group of Persian authored, translated, pseudotranslated crime fiction in the second Pahlavi era (1941–1978) with respect to syntactic complexity. His analysis of syntactic intricacy measures indicated that translations and pseudotranslations were both significantly different from authored works with respect to clauses per sentence, T-units per sentence, and verb phrases per T-unit (a T-unit being an independent clause together with a dependent clause or a non-clausal structure). In addition, translations were significantly different from authored works regarding length of production unit, including mean lengths of sentence, T-unit, and clause, and pseudotranslations were significantly more complex than authored texts for past participles per sentence. For all the other measures analyzed, there were no significant differences between any group pairs, yet for the majority of the measures, pseudotranslations occupied a place in-between translated and authored texts.

By and large, many studies, *inter alia*, (Du Pont, 2005; Gürçağlar, 2014, 2017; Kupsch-Losereit, 2014; Logie, 2017; Lombez, 2017; Méndez-Oliver, 2017; Raleigh, 2017; Toury, 2005, 2012), have shown that pseudotranslations make an effort to benefit from the textual-linguistic features peculiar to translated texts. Yet, some scholars have claimed that pseudotranslations apply such features even to the point of exaggeration (Gürçağlar, 2010; Maher, 2013; Toury 2012).

The present study aims to test these assumptions for the case of Persian pseudotranslational crime fiction. On that account, it initially hypothesizes that Persian pseudotranslations show translation-like behavior in their textual-linguistic realization, and if so, it further hypothesizes that pseudotranslations overemphasize such imitation.

Translational textual behavior can potentially be best observed by analyzing the features characteristic of translated texts. Baker (1993) encouraged inquiring into attributes which might be universally evident in translated texts but not original utterances, which she outlined under ‘universals of translation’. Her tentative agenda included explicitation, simplification, conventional TL grammaticality (leveling out) (chiefly in interpreting), overrepresentation of TL features (normalization), and avoiding repetitions. A surge of investigations has swept through translation research thenceforth to study these hallmarks in various languages and more peculiarities have been put forward throughout (see Bernardini & Kenny, 2020; Laviosa, 2021, pp. 33–35). Seeing that there have been numerous studies on these alleged common features, the relevant inquiries and findings will be presented in the related sections in lieu of presenting a review of literature thereof.

To the best of our knowledge, translational surface realization of pseudotranslations has not yet been examined with reference to alleged translation universals.

2. Materials and Methods

In order to test the hypotheses developed, a corpus comprising Persian authored, translated, and pseudotranslated works in crime fiction was selected with each group encompassing eight books. The last few decades could not yield sufficient data for the study given that transformation into global village, stricter copyright regulations, rise in investigative journalism, and more conspicuously, new inquiry facilities and communicative breakthroughs have made concealment of fictitious works all but impossible in the recent decades (see also Toury, 2012). Therefore, the corpus was selected from within a time span when pseudotranslating was more common in Persian. To this end, Persian pseudotranslation heyday, i.e., 1960s, was selected for data collection. Besides, crime fiction was chosen as the area of focus since it was one of the most prolific areas of pseudotranslating meanwhile—and potentially served as one of the most prototypical. Although some of the authors and translators were fairly prolific in their oeuvres, only one book from each author, translator, and pseudotranslator was incorporated into the corpus to minimize the effect of their personal style. Grab sampling as the population is, it allows for the most homogenous and yet the largest corpus possible for the case of Persian pseudotranslations among all genres.

The type of pseudotranslation examined in this study was Persian crime fiction representing authored texts paratextually but representing translations textually, i.e., books originally written in Persian bearing Persian names for the author(s) on the front cover yet featuring both foreign characters and non-Iranian settings for the story (see Maher, 2013; O'Sullivan, 2005). The first 10,000 words from each book were analyzed for the purpose of the study, forming a corpus of 240,000 words overall from 24 books. It should be noted that given that the corpus would be both automatically analyzed and manually annotated, the corpus size could not be large. The details of the books serving as the data are presented in Table 1.

	Title	Author/translator	Date	Publisher
Pseudotranslations	Yek Ghaddam ta Jahannam	Amirahmad Razavi Arjmand	1965	Aflatoun
	Rahi be Souye Jahannam	Mohammad Barfar	1971	Alborz
	Hayoola-ye Marg	Jafar Ebrahimi	1975	Sha'bani
	Khashm-e Maik Hamer	Asghar Akhlagi	1969	Stare-ye No
	Mard-e Shomarh 1	Mohammad Deljoo and Amir Mojahed	N. D.	Shahriyar
	Ghateli ba Abrou-haye Lengeh be Lengeh	Parviz Ghazi Saeed	1966	Kanoon Marefat
	Ghatl-e Sevvom	Amir Rezaee	N. D.	Asia

Translations	In cold Blood/Ba Khoonsardi	Truman Capote/Bahereh Rasekh	1968	Ketab-haye Jibi
	Nightmare/Kabous	William Irish/A. Haddad	1962	Donya-ye Matbo'at
	The Green Stone/Sang-e Sabz	Suzanne Blanc/Iraj Gharib	1964	Ketab-haye Jibi
	The Thirty-nine Steps of the Ladder/39 Pelleh	John Bokan/Mirkarimi	1967	Ketab-haye Jibi
	The Postman Always Rings Twice/Postchi Hamisheh Do Bar Zang Mizanad	James M. Cain/Soroud	1962	Kanooun-e Donya va Honar
	Goldenfinger/Panjeh Talaei	Ian Flemming/Ali Aminnia	1964	Golchin
	My Gun Is Quick/Tapanche-ye Man Sari' Ast	Mickey Spillane/Georgis Aghasi	1962	Golchin
Authored books	The Looking Glass War/Jang-e Ayeneh	John le Carré/ Hessam Emami	1965	Golchin
	Emshab Madari Mimirad	Jamshid Sedaghat Nezhad	1967	Morid Hagh
	Jenayat-e Bashar ya Adamfroushan-e Gharn-e Bistom	Khameh Rabi' Ansari	1966	Naseri
	Sharab-e Kham	Ismaeel Fasih	1968	Ketab-haye Jibi
	Khoun va Aftab	Manouchehr Motiei	N. D	Kanoon Marefat
	Yek Adamkosh Ejareh Dadeh Mishavad	Arvanaghi Kermani	1966	Kanoun Marefat
	Shahin: Khabarnegar-e Havdaes	R. Etemadi	1965	Arastou
	Siakhan	Amir Ashiri	1971	Kanoun Marefat
	Yek Mard va Seh Chehreh	Sadreddin Elahi	N.D.	Tehran-e Mosavar

Table 1. Books Comprising the Corpus

The data were then analyzed for some of the common translation tendencies which allowed mere target-oriented study, including interference, explicitness, and simplification (lexical variation=[types/tokens]*100; lexical density=[content words/total words]*100). The alleged translation universals, initially hypothesized by Baker (1996), served as the basis for the analysis since they are the prime typifying features of translated texts. It should be noted that these tendencies have been much debated since their introduction, yet they were selected for our examination as they can best serve the purpose of a target-oriented analysis and for testing the hypotheses formulated in this study.

As already mentioned, simplification, explicitness, and interference were selected from among the translation tendencies as they could be studied without recourse to a source text, enabling us to examine these features in translated but also equally in authored and pseudotranslated works, for which no specific source text exists.

Elaboration on some of these measures seems necessary here. Unlike ‘explicitation’, which is “a *relationship* and a *process* between instantiated and aligned pieces of translated or otherwise registerially closely related texts” (Steiner, 2005, p. 2; my emphasis), ‘explicitness’ has been regarded here as a contributing feature of a *product*, which could be studied independently of the source text (ST) or a closely related text. On the same basis, from among the different types of explicitness, those not requiring source and target texts comparison were examined. This included explicitness of conjunctions (syntactic), explicitness of the optional complementizer THAT (in Persian expressed by که [/keh/] (syntactic), and explicitness of cultural information where general knowledge would be required for proper understanding of the aspects of the text not understandable by the readers without cultural explanations (pragmatic), e.g., addition of a general phrase to help readers distinguish rivers, villages, drinks, foods, etc. as with addition of the word ‘river’ to ‘the river Zayandehrood’ (see Klaudy, 1998). Other aspects of explicitness could not be pinpointed without a bilingual comparison.

Interference has been considered as an omnipresent tendency in translated works (e.g., Hopkinson, 2007; Teich, 2012; Toury, 1995) and one of the most distinctive translational features (e.g., Halverson, 2017; Mauranten, 2004; Parks, 2007). It has been defined by Franco Aixelá (2009, p. 75) as “importation into the target text of lexical, syntactic, cultural or structural items typical of a different semiotic system and unusual or non-existent in the target context, at least as original instances of communication in the target language”. The term has been regarded as synonymous with ‘translationese’ by some scholars (e.g., Franco Aixelá, 2009; Hopkinson, 2007), yet others have viewed translationese as the final and tangible outcome of interference (e.g., Yue & Sun, 2021). To avoid the pejorative connotations of the term ‘translationese’ and also its overlap with simplification, normalization, and leveling out, as assumed by some scholars in the field (e.g., Chen, 2020), ‘interference’ will be used throughout this study.

The data for interference and explicitness were gathered manually through coding by annotators. Three annotators were recruited to identify instances of these measures in the corpus. The annotators were all postgraduates of Translation Studies at a public university in Iran. They underwent two hours of intensive analysis training, which included four stages: introduction, exposure, calibration, and independent analysis. At the introduction stage, the annotators were introduced to the operationalized definition of interference. In the current study, interference in Persian was defined as any case comprising collocational clash, strange calque, uncommon dummy subject, awkward syntax, odd indirect speech, and unnatural proverb or idiom according to the literature on Persian including Farahzad (2018), Manafi Anari (2017), and Mollanazar (1990). In the exposure stage, the annotators reviewed the various forms of interference in Persian along with a few examples for each. In the calibration stage, the annotators analyzed and coded two short translated texts (208–254-words long) heavily including instances of interference presented above and compared their coding with those of the author, and any cases of disagreement were discussed and resolved. This stage was important in training the annotators to have similar notions of interference and its manifestations. The same process was also carried out for explicitness with two sample texts of 215–241 words. In the independent coding stage, after having completed the previous coding stages, the annotators analyzed all texts in the corpus for any instances of interference and explicitness. To investigate the reliability of the coding among the three annotators, i.e., to examine the inter-annotator agreement, Fleiss’ kappa was run. Tables 2 and 3 list the Fleiss’ kappa reliability, level of significance, and 95% CI (confidence interval) for interference and explicitness in authored books, translations, and pseudotranslations. The Fleiss’ kappa ranged from $k .80$ to $.89$, which represented good to very good agreement.

Text	<i>k</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Authored books	.89	<.001	.77	1.02
Translations	.87	<.001	.76	.99
Pseudotranslations	.81	<.001	.66	.96

Note. 95% CI represents a range of values within which the true population value is likely to be found.

Table 2. Inter-Annotator Agreement for Interference

Text	<i>k</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Authored books	.87	<.001	.83	.90
Translations	.85	<.001	.81	.88
Pseudotranslations	.80	<.001	.76	.84

Table 3. Inter-Annotator Agreement for Explicitness

The data for simplification were gathered by AntConc (v.4.1.0), a corpus analysis toolkit developed by Laurence Anthony (2022). The data gathered were then analyzed in IBM SPSS Statistics (v. 27.0.1.0), both descriptively and in a series of one-way ANOVAs with groups (i.e., authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts) as the independent variable and explicitness (including cohesive and logical ties, optional THAT, and pragmatic information), interference (comprising collocational clash, awkward syntax, uncommon dummy subjects, odd indirect speech, calque, and unnatural proverbs or idioms), and simplification (encompassing lexical density, lexical variety, and sentence length) as the dependent variables. In cases where the test of homogeneity of variances was violated, the non-parametric Kruskal–Wallis was used. A Bonferroni adjusted alpha of $p = 0.007$ was used for all the analyses. The Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) test was applied for post hoc analyses for each statistically significant relationship. Finally, Plonsky and Oswald's guidelines (2014) were used for interpretation of the effect sizes (Cohen's d values) in the post-hoc comparisons, with $d = 1.00$ considered as a large effect, $d = 0.70$ as a medium effect, and lower thresholds of $d = 0.40$ as a small effect. The null hypothesis for all the elements was that the groups are identical in the given element (H_0 = There is no statistically significant difference between the groups for the measure being tested).

3. Results

The mean percentage for explicitness of conjunctions for authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 55.01 ± 29.94 , 86.43 ± 17.64 , and 84.56 ± 15.10 , respectively. No significant differences were found between the groups regarding explicitness of conjunctions $F(2, 23) = 5.35$, $p = 0.013$. The mean percentage for explicitness of the optional complementizer THAT in authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 65.03 ± 25.87 , 27.50 ± 13.87 , and 29.17 ± 11.73 , accordingly. There was a significant difference in the use of complementizer THAT between the groups $F(2, 23) = 10.79$, $p = 0.001$. The post hoc test demonstrated a difference between authored and both translated ($d = 1.81$, $p = 0.001$) and pseudotranslated books ($d = -0.700$, $p = 0.002$). Lastly, the mean percentage for explicitness of cultural information for authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 30.09 ± 31.25 , 68.01 ± 18.00 , and 58.28 ± 18.79 , respectively. The difference between the groups was not statistically significant for this variable $F(2, 23) = 56.26$, $p = 0.01$.

The mean percentage for interference in authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 0.00 ± 0.00 (based on empirical observation), 11.87 ± 9.29 , and 7.00 ± 6.09 , accordingly. Since the test of homogeneity of variances was violated for this variable, the non-parametric Kruskal–Wallis was applied for the analysis of the data, which indicated a significant difference between the groups $F(2, 23) = 15.14$, $p = 0.001$. A subsequent pairwise analysis showed significant and large differences between authored texts and both pseudotranslated ($d = -1.63$, $p = 0.05$) and translated texts ($d = -1.81$, $p = 0.000$).

For lexical variation, the mean percentage for authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 27.05 ± 3.34 , 27.16 ± 3.19 , and 25.67 ± 2.57 , respectively. No significant differences were found between these groups $F(2, 23) = 5.89$, $p = 0.56$. For lexical density, the mean percentage for authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 82.72 ± 1.55 , 82.45 ± 0.94 , and 82.69 ± 1.10 , respectively. No significant differences were found between the groups $F(2, 23) = 0.11$, $p = 0.89$. For sentence length, the mean percentage for authored, translated, and pseudotranslated texts was 13.11 ± 2.89 , 15.94 ± 4.42 , and 15.74 ± 1.64 , respectively. No significant differences were found between the groups $F(2, 23) = 1.94$, $p = 0.16$ here as well.

With respect to the results, no significant difference was observed between the groups, including authored, translated, and pseudotranslated books, regarding explicitness of conjunctions, explicitness of cultural information, and elements of simplification, including lexical variety, lexical density, and sentence length. However, regarding effect size, the Tukey HSD post hoc analyses for the groups revealed statistically significant differences with large effect sizes for explicitness of THAT between authored and translated texts and with medium effects between authored and pseudotranslated texts. For interference, the post hoc analyses showed significant differences with large effect sizes between authored and pseudotranslated texts and authored and translated texts, demonstrating a very strong difference between authored and both translated and pseudotranslated texts.

4. Discussion

Studies conducted on simplification have provided a rather inconsistent picture of this tendency across different languages or even in the same language for translated and original works as various and contradictory rates of type-token, lexical density, and sentence length have been reported, thus, potentially undermining the universality of this hypothesis in translated literature. With respect to Persian, for instance, Taghavi and Hashemi (2021) indicated that Persian translations show higher lexical variety and density compared to authored Persian texts in their analysis of Persian sociology and psychology corpora. The analysis in our study showed a very close similitude between Persian crime fiction translations, original works, and pseudotranslations in terms of lexical variety and lexical density, implying close levels of information load and lexical richness across these texts. This was also true of sentence length as there were no significant differences between neither of the pair groups. Thus, the findings in this study failed to substantiate the claim that translated works have lower lexical density and lexical variety (Chesterman, 2011; Laviosa, 2002) and a smaller mean sentence length than non-translated works (Laviosa, 1998, 2002). Fokin (2013) attributes such inconsistent findings on the ‘simplification claim’ to SL and TL typological characteristics as well as the direction of translation rather than translationality, Yuan and Gao (2008) to the grammar and vocabulary of each particular language, and Alibabaei and Salehi (2012) to the specific text types selected as the data or the particular data collection and analysis procedures. Regarding the case of Persian, some scholars have argued that Persian translations avoid repetitions present in the source texts “not out of carelessness nor out of linguistic constraints, but out of normative, stylistic considerations”, catering for amplification and embellishment of translation (Taki *et al.*,

2012, p. 111; see also Alibabaei & Salehi, 2012). This last assertion may stand up for the case of pseudotranslations as well, as the examples from our corpus suggest.

With reference to explicitness, the books in all groups examined proved to be virtually as explicit regarding use of conjunctions and supplementing proper nouns with explanatory cultural information; however, optional complementizer *THAT* was significantly less abundant in translations and pseudotranslations in comparison to the authored texts. The latter is particularly counter-intuitive regarding a vast majority of studies on explicitation as they have generally reported higher propensity for insertion of complementizer *THAT* in translated works compared to authored ones (e.g., Olohan, 2001, 2004). The same tendency has been shown in interpreting settings by Kajzer-Wietrzny (2012, 2018) and Sandrelli and Bendazzoli (2005) as well. Olohan and Baker (2000) have reported on lower frequency of optional *THAT* following *SAY* and *TELL* in British National Corpus (BNC) than Translational English Corpus (TEC) and similarly Roos (2009) has shown a lower rate of occurrence of optional complementizer after certain verbs in authored than translated texts in Afrikaans newspapers, and so has Kenny (2005) for reporting *THAT* in a German-English corpus of literary works. For the case of Persian, the language in focus in the present study, Vahedikia and Pirnajmuddin (2011) have reported a higher propensity for inclusion of complementizer *THAT*, as an optional syntactic element, in translated literature in contrast to non-translated literature in their analysis of a Persian parallel literary corpus. In the same line, Esfandiari, Mahadi, Jamshid, and Rahimi (2012) have indicated more extensive use of optional *THAT* in English translations of Sa'di's *Golestan* than its Persian original. Notwithstanding, spelling out the optional complementizer in the current study showed an opposite proclivity as optional *THAT* was twice as frequent in authored works in comparison to pseudotranslated and translated.

Many studies have revealed that translated texts are more explicit than authored works with respect to clausal ties, including conjunctions and logical links, e.g., Qian (2016); Magalhães and Batista (2002); Chen (2006); Englund Dimitrova (2005); Séguinot (1998); Øverås (1998); Pápai (2004); Xiao and Yue (2009); and Sipayung, Lubis, Setia, and Silalahi (2017). Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis (1986, p. 300) notes "an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved." Numerous inquiries in Persian have likewise indicated that Persian translations tend to explicate conjunctions much more than non-translated literature, including Masoumi Tadayyon (2012); Rahbar (2014); Mousavi (2011); Beikian, Yarahmadzahi, and Karimpour Natanzi (2013); Vahedikia and Oliaeinia (2016); Esfandiari, Mahadi, Jamshid, and Rahimi (2012); Yalsharzeh (2011); Khorshidi Mehr (2010); Jafari (2009); Monshi Toussi and Jangi (2013); Reazi (2011); Baleghizadeh and Sharifi (2010); and Jalali (2011) (cf. Taghavi & Hashemi, 2021). Similar findings have been announced for presence of pragmatic cultural information. Some studies have found explicit cultural information to be more abundant in translations in contrast to original works, e.g., Olk (2013); Safari (2012); Mansour, Al-Sowaidi, and Mohammed (2014); Vahedikia and Oliaeinia (2016); Pápai (2004); Englund Dimitrova (2005); Qian (2016); Olahan (2004); and Moradi, Rahbar, and Olfat (2015). That being said, the findings in the current study failed to indicate a significant difference between pseudotranslated, authored, and translated literature for insertion of cultural information beside proper nouns.

In our corpus, interference was a prevalent feature in all the translated works, yet intriguingly, it was also present in the pseudotranslations although not to the same extent as translations. The consensus view seems to be that interference is an 'unintentional' phenomenon (Thorovský, 2009). Correspondingly, Toury (2012) emphasizes that interference is an integral component of translation unless a deliberate attempt is made to avoid it. Notwithstanding, for pseudotranslations in our study, the contrary appears to be at work, i.e., it might be the

case that interference has been applied rather willfully, i.e., probably as a *deliberate 'strategy'* (see Veisbergs, 2016). Accordingly, and given that interference has been potentially used as a positive instrument in this case, i.e., as a strategy, it would be more logical to view it as a 'transfer' operation, not as interference (see also Mauranen, 2007; Øverås, 1998) and more specifically as 'pseudo-transfer' inasmuch as there was no source text to function as the genesis of transfer in this particular case. This also lends support to Mauranen's assertion (2004) that transfer might come to the text without having any stimulus.

According to Toury, "the more the make-up of a text is taken as a factor in the formulation of its translation, the more the target text can be expected to show traces of interference" (2012, p. 312). The translational semblance in case of the pseudotranslations here was accomplished by resorting to expressions and sentences indicating signs of anomaly in the lexicogrammatical realization of the text. To Parks (2007), lexical, syntactic, and cultural interferences are distinguishing elements of translated literature as they inevitably slow down the reader, attract attention, or invite to explore meaning (see also Thorovský, 2009). Along the same line, Veisbergs (2016) posits that syntactic interference, including clumsy structures, does not give rise to misunderstanding yet frequently exposes the 'translationality' of the text. In the translated texts in this study, syntactic interferences exhibited a significant—and in fact the strongest—contribution to translationese. Likewise, syntactic anomaly proved the most frequent type of interference within the pseudotranslated works, which initially suggests a conscious attempt at producing similitude to translated literature.

Mirabedini (1380/2001) and Khazaei and Ashrafi (1391/2012) assert that in 1953–1979, Persian gave telltale signs of being significantly affected by translation through preponderance of unnatural phrases and structures in Persian authored works. Further, Mirabedini (1396/2017) notes that Persian authorial language during this period was replete with 'interference', specifically due to the influence of indirect translation of Western fiction through intermediary languages such as Arabic. In the same line, Najafi (1361/1982) contends that as the result of encountering unnatural authorial language ensuing from frequent 'unacceptable translations', Persian writers embellished their products by 'purposive' application of interference to the brim, as a sign of modern style of writing. However, our data for interference at different levels fail to support such claims for authored crime fiction in Persian in the period examined. Notwithstanding, that the authored texts did not exhibit interference but pseudotranslations were significantly different from authored texts in this respect and indeed similar to translated works tentatively implies that there was a purposive manifestation of this tendency in pseudotranslations to maintain a translational façade—a feature also noted by Maher (2013) in her analysis of English detective stories set in Italy by the use of various English phrases seeming to have been calqued from Italian. In other words, full absence of this inclination in original works coupled with the fact that pseudotranslations had no source text to copy these elements from suggest a deliberate use of (pseudo)transfer as a translation strategy and as a disguise mechanism in the pseudotranslations.

Overall, with respect to the hypothesis put forward regarding the textual-linguistic features of the pseudotranslations and their similarities to those of the translated texts, the findings here are consistent with Du Pont (2005), Gürçağlar (2014, 2017), Kupsch-Losereit (2014), Logie (2017), Lombez (2017), Méndez-Oliver (2017), Raleigh (2017), and Toury (2005, 2012), supporting the claim that pseudotranslations integrate elements typically associated with translated literature in the target culture. The first null hypothesis here is then not supported by the results of the study. However, with respect to the second hypothesis, the findings do not bolster the claim by Gürçağlar (2014), Toury (1995, 2005, 2012), and Maher (2013), who posited that pseudotranslations 'exaggerate' translational features or 'over-do in

imitation' of translations. Thus, the findings confirm the second null hypothesis holding that pseudotranslations do not exaggerate translational features.

Although the first hypothesis was confirmed, it should be noted that regarding the typical translational features studied here, the translations were at odds with the general reports on explicitness since the translations in our corpus were not significantly more explicit than authored texts regarding cultural information made available to the reader and explicitness of conjunctions. More surprisingly, in the only kind of explicitness that translated and authored corpora did prove to be significantly different, i.e., explicitness of complementizer *THAT*, it was the authored corpus that was significantly more explicit. Pseudotranslations in our study exhibited behavior similar to translated text for all kinds of explicitness examined. Regarding simplification, no significant difference was observed between pseudotranslated, authored, and translated works. Last but not least, interference proved to be significantly higher in both pseudotranslated and translated texts when compared to the authored ones. Hence, inconsistent as some of the findings are with the reports in the literature about the translation universals investigated, pseudotranslated and translated works were in great harmony in all the measures examined.

As concerns the exaggeration hypothesis, an interesting element in pseudotranslations was interference, which seems to have been exercised rather deliberately as no source text ever existed to have served as the provenance of transfer. Yet, this was just more than half the interference found in translations although pseudotranslations were significantly different from authored books as were translations. Both pseudotranslated and translated books exhibited very strong effect sizes when compared to authored books in this respect. With regard to the complementizer *THAT*, translations and pseudotranslations behaved almost similarly and were significantly different from the authored texts, yet the effect sizes were respectively very strong and medium for translations and pseudotranslations, demonstrating a much stronger effect on the part of the translations. The three corpora did not show any significant differences in any other feature examined.

According to Toury (2012, p. 64), when norms are active and operative, regularities could be observed in recurrent situations, which is an indication of "order and predictability". Once such regularities are recognized through their recurrence, even in cases which persons-in-the-culture may be unable to explicitly explain the norm, they can at the minimum determine when sanctioned practices are not adopted. In fact, regularities are the outcome of norms, and by the same token, proof of their activity, i.e., they are the external clues through which "instances of behavior" could be recovered (p. 63). That being the case, receivers "may have expectations about text-type and discourse conventions, about style and register, about the appropriate degree of grammaticality, about the statistical distribution of text features of all kinds, about collocations, lexical choice, and so on" (Chesterman, 2016, p. 62). The affinity of the pseudotranslations with translations rather than original works in the current study most potentially demonstrates a fair degree of compliance of pseudotranslations with the 'norm-model' governing Persian translations and observation of the expectancy norms for the translated literature in the pseudotranslations in this genre in the period and for the aspects discussed. Nonetheless, more data and larger corpora are required to be able to generalize the findings with respect to the measures explored. A stumbling block avoiding such generalization in this genre in the case of Persian is accessing more pseudotranslated works by different authors and at the same time trying to limit the time period in focus in order to achieve more consistent results. Abundant in production of pseudotranslations as the period selected is, the majority of these works were published by a handful of prolific pseudotranslators, which further limits the corpus size if to minimize the crucial issue of author's style and its effect on

the regularities studied. Yet, these findings might pose challenge to the universality of the translational tendencies studied and support the argument that they may be time- and genre-bound as the findings here are inconsistent with other studies on Persian texts in other genres and time periods.

Other studies have already shown pseudotranslations, including crime fiction (e.g., Gürçağlar, 2010; Maher, 2013; Sohár, 2000), in various literatures benefit from diverse features mostly found in translated works. The pseudotranslated crime fictional works in our corpus exhibited translational lexicogrammatical features regarding the putative universal features of translation, thus, indicating that the *pseudotranslated* crime fictions are in harmony across various literatures in their maintenance of certain translational façade to give the readers the impression of reading a translated text.

5. Conclusion

This study addressed the translational behavior of pseudotranslated texts. It tested hypotheses concerning similitude of pseudotranslations to translations rather than original texts and whether the pseudotranslations exaggerated translational features. Expressed in terms of effect sizes of Cohen's *d* value for 'interference', the translations and pseudotranslations yielded very large and medium effects, respectively, in comparison to the original texts; and for explicitness of 'complementizer THAT', pseudotranslations and translations both exhibited large effects compared to authored texts. As the findings demonstrated, pseudotranslations showed great affinity to translations in the elements measured, with the data indicating that the textual-linguistic makeup of the pseudotranslations in the corpus were in full agreement with those in the translated works. This is consistent with other studies in other literary traditions examining pseudotranslated crime fiction for translational characteristics. Notwithstanding, the findings in this study were counter-intuitive regarding a vast majority of reports on explicitness, which may be attributed to the norms governing translation of the genre and during the time in focus, verification of which requires larger corpora.

6. References

- Alibabaei, A., & Salehi, Z. (2012). A comparative study of Persian translated and non-translated political texts: Focus on simplification hypothesis. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation (LCT)*, 1(3), 1-12.
- Anthony, L. (2022). *AntConc (Version 4.1.0) [Computer Software]*. Tokyo: Waseda University. Retrieved from <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus linguistics and translation studies – Implications and applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 233-250). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Sharifi, A. (2010). Explicitation of implicit logical links in Persian-English translation. *Translation & Interpreting*, 2(2), 57-65.
- Beebe, T. O., & Amano, I. (2010). Pseudotranslation in the fiction of Akutagawa Ryūnosuke. *Translation Studies*, 3(1), 17-32.
- Beikian, A., Yarahmadzahi, N., & Karimpour Natanzi, M. (2013). Explicitation of conjunctive relations in Ghabraei's Persian translation of 'The Kite Runner'. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 3(2), 81-89.
- Bernardini, S., & Kenny, D. (2020). Corpora. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (3rd ed., pp. 110-115). London and New York: Routledge.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986/2000). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 298-313). London and New York: Routledge.
- Chen, J. W. (2006). *Explication through the use of connectives in translated Chinese: A corpus-based study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
- Chen, Y.-W. (2020). Automatic Detection of Different Types of Translation Based on Translationese Features. Master's thesis, Universität des Saarlandes, Germany.
- Chesterman, A. (2011). Translation Universals. In Y. Gambier, & L. v. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 175-179). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Revised ed.). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Du Pont, O. (2005). Robert Graves's Claudian novels: A case of pseudotranslation. *Target*, 17(2), 327–347.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005). *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Esfandiari, M. R., Mahadi, T. S., Jamshid, M., & Rahimi, F. (2012). Explicitation and simplification in translation of poetic and prosaic genre from Persian into English: The case of Sadi's Gulistan. *Elixir Ling. & Trans.*, 44C, 7130-7133.
- Farahzad, F. (2013). Editing (Virayesh) as a Movement of Resistance During the Iran-Iraq War. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 132-141.
- Fokin, S. (2013). TTR changes in different directions of translation. *Translation Journal*, 17(1). Retrieved January 12, 2018, from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/63ttr.htm>
- Franco Aixelá, J. (2009). An overview of interference in scientific and technical translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 11, 75-88.
- Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (2010). Scouting the borders of translation, pseudotranslation, concealed translations and authorship in 20th-century Turkey. *Translation Studies*, 3(2), 172-187.
- Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (2017). Pseudotranslation as passage into history: Murat Gülsoy's Gölgele ve Hayaller Şehrinde as transmesis. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 44(4), 637-654.
- Gürçağlar, Ş.-T. (2014). Pseudotranslation on the margin of fact and fiction. In S. Bermann, & C. Porter (Eds.), *A companion to translation studies* (pp. 516-527). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Halverson, S. L. (2017). Gravitational pull in translation: Testing a revised model. In G. De Sutter, M.-A. Lefer, & I. Delaere (Eds.), *Empirical translation studies: New methodological and theoretical traditions* (pp. 9-46). Germany: CPI books GmbH.
- Hopkinson, C. (2007). Factors in linguistic interference: A case study in translation. *SKASE: Journal of translation and interpretation*, 2(1), 13-23.
- Jafari, S. J. (2009). *Explicitation in sacred texts*. Unpublished master's thesis, Science and Research Campus, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
- Jalali, N. (2011). *Tasrih dar tarjome-ye Ghoran: Moredpazhouhi-ye Soure-ye Yousef [Explicitation in translation of Quran: A case study of Surah Yusuf]*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
- Kajzer-Wietrzny, M. (2012). *Interpreting universals and interpreting style*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland.
- Kajzer-Wietrzny, M. (2018). Interpretese vs. non-native language use: The case of optional that. In M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, & B. Defrancq (Eds.), *Making way in corpus-based interpreting studies: New frontiers in translation studies* (pp. 97-114). Singapore: Springer.
- Kenny, D. (2005). Parallel corpora and translation studies: old questions, new perspectives? Reporting that in Gepcolt: a case study. . In *Meaningful texts: The extraction of semantic information from monolingual and multilingual corpora* (pp. 154-165). London: Continuum.
- Khazaee, A., & Ashrafi, N. (1391/2012). Negahi tosifi be vaziat-e tarjome va ta'lif-e adabi dar nezam-e chandgane-ye adabi-e Iran dar dahe-ye 1380 [A descriptive account of literary translation and authorship in Iranian literary polysystem in 2002-2011]. *Motale'at Tarjomeh va Zaban*, 8, 19-41.
- Khorshidi Mehr, B. (2010). *The impact of explicitation of stream of consciousness style on Persian translations of James Joyce's A Portrait of the Artist as A Young Man*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Kaludy, K. (1998). Explicitation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (1st ed., pp. 80–84). London and New York: Routledge.
- Kupsch-Losereit, S. (2014). Pseudotranslations in 18th century France. In K. Kaindl, & K. Spitzl (Eds.), *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction* (pp. 189-201). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Laviosa, S. (1998). Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable corpus of English narrative prose. *Meta*, 43(4), 557–570.
- Laviosa, S. (2002). *Corpus-based translation studies: Theory, findings, applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Laviosa, S. (2021). *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Logie, I. (2017). The stripped fish: Translation and culture in Mario Bellatin's Japanese novellas. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 44(4), 666-679.
- Lombes, C. (2017). Political (mis)use of translation: Poetry pseudotranslations in Occupied France (1940-44). *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 44(4), 655-665.

- Magalhães, M. C., & Batista, M. d. (2002). Features in translated Brazilian-Portuguese texts: A corpus-based research. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1(9), 81-129.
- Maher, B. (2013). A Crook's tour: Translation, pseudotranslation and foreignness in Anglo-Italian crime fiction. In B. Nelson, & B. Maher (Eds.), *Perspectives on literature and translation: Creation, circulation, reception* (pp. 145-158). New York and London: Routledge.
- Mansour, A., Al-Sowaidi, B., & Mohammed, T. A. (2014). Investigating explicitation in literary translation from English into Arabic. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(3), 97-125.
- Masoumi Tadayyon, S. (2012). *Textual strategy of (optional) explicitation in translated literary texts (Gone with the Wind)*. Unpublished master's thesis, Tarbiat Moallem University, Tehran, Iran.
- Mauranen, A. (2004). Corpora, universals and interference. In A. Mauranen, & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 65-82). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mauranen, A. (2007). Universal tendencies in translation. In G. Anderman, & M. Rogers (Eds.), *Incorporating corpora: The linguist and the translator* (pp. 32-48). Great Britain: MPG Books Ltd.
- Méndez-Oliver, A. (2017). "Translating" the origins of the Spanish nation in Miguel de Luna's Verdadera historia del Rey don Rodrigo. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 44(4), 735-754.
- Mirabedini, H. (1380/2001). Seir-e tarikhi-e tarjome-ye dastan va ta'sir-e an bar adabiat-e melli [Historical course of fiction translation and its influence on national literature]. In A. Khazaefarid (Ed.), *Majmou'e maghalate nakhostin hamayesh-e tarjome-ye adabi dar Iran [A collection of the articles presented in the first conference of literary translation in Iran]* (pp. 259-268). Mashhad: Banafsheh.
- Mirabedini, H. (1396/2017). *Sad sal dastannevisi-e Iran [One hundred years of fiction-writing in Iran]* (Vol. 2). Tehran: Cheshmeh.
- Mirzaee, M., & Manafi Anari, S. (2017). Translationese in Novels Translated from English into Persian. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 15(57), 39-54.
- Mollanazar, H. (1990). *The Role of Collocation in Translationese*. Unpublished master's thesis, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
- Monshi Toussi, M. T., & Jangi, M. (2013). Cohesion shifts in English medical texts and their Persian translation. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(12), 327-334.
- Moradi, N., Rahbar, M., & Olfat, M. (2015). Explicitation in translation: Culture-specific items from Persian into English. *Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Science Science Journal (CSJ)*, 36(3), 2311-2316.
- Mousavi, S. O. (2011). *Explicitation of cohesive devices in translation*. Unpublished master's thesis, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
- Najafi, A. (1361/1982). Mas'ale-ye amanat dar tarjomeh [Loyalty in translation]. *Nashr-e Danesh*, 13, 5-11.
- Olohan, M. (2001). Spelling out the optionals in translation: A corpus study. *UCREL Technical Papers*, 13, 423-432.
- Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Olohan, M., & Baker, M. (2000). Reporting that in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures*, 1(2), 141-158.
- Olk, H. M. (2013). Cultural references in translation: A framework for quantitative translation analysis. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 21(3), 344-357.
- O'Sullivan, C. (2005). Translation, pseudotranslation and paratext: The presentation of contemporary crime fiction set in Italy. *EnterText Supplement*, 4(3), 62-76.
- Øverås, L. (1998). In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta*, 43(3), 557-570.
- Pápai, V. (2004). Explicitation: A universal of translated texts? In *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 143-164). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Parks, T. (2007). *Translating style: A literary approach to translation, a translation approach to literature* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Plonsky, L., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How Big Is "Big"? Interpreting Effect Sizes in L2 Research. *Language Learning*, 64(4), 878-912.
- Popovič, A. (1976). *Dictionary for the analysis of literary translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Qian, Z. (2016). *The explicitation phenomenon in Yuanqu's translation into English*. Retrieved December 18, 2017, from <http://translationjournal.net/April-2016/the-explicitation-phenomenon-in-yuanqu-s-translation-into-english.html>
- Rahbar, M. (2014). Explicitation in English-Persian parallel texts. *Translation Studies*, 12(46), 27-39.
- Raleigh, T. (2017). The thousand and first author: Thomas-Simon Gueullette's repeating fictions. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 44(4), 701-717.
- Rambelli, P. (2009). Pseudotranslation. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2nd ed., pp. 208-212). London and New York: Routledge.

- Reazi, S. M. (2011). *Translation universals: A case study of explicitation in Persian-English-Persian translations*. Unpublished master's thesis, Shahid Bahonar University, Kerman, Iran.
- Roos, D. (2009). Translation features in a comparable corpus of Afrikaans newspaper articles. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS*, 39, 73-83.
- Safari, S. (2012). Deforming tendencies in the transfer of proper nouns in Fantastic literature: A case study. *Translation Studies*, 9(36), 79-96.
- Sandrelli, A., & Bendazzoli, C. (2005). *Lexical patterns in simultaneous interpreting: A preliminary investigation of EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus)*. Retrieved May 17, 2023 from <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/corpus/conference-archives/2005-journal/ContrastiveCorpusLinguistics/lexicalpatternsinsimultaneousinterpreting.doc>
- Séguinot, C. (1998). Pragmatics and the explicitation hypothesis. *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 1(2), 106-113.
- Sipayung, K. T., Lubis, S., Setia, E., & Silalahi, R. (2017). Explicitation and implicitation of conjunctive relation in target text of Principle Language Learning and Teaching (PLLT). *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 2(1), 83-93.
- Sohár, A. (1998). 'Genuine' and 'fictitious' translations of science fiction and fantasy in Hungary. In L. Bowker, M. Cronin, D. Kenny, & J. Pearson (Eds.), *Unity in diversity? Current trends in translation studies* (pp. 38-46). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sohár, A. (2000). Thy speech bewrayeth thee: Thou shalt not steal the prestige of foreign literatures: Pseudo-translations in Hungary after 1989. *Hungarian Studies*, 10(1), 54-83.
- Steiner, E. (2005). Explicitation, its lexicogrammatical realization, and its determining (independent) variables – towards an empirical and corpus-based methodology. *SPIRK*, 1-42.
- Taghavi, M., & Hashemi, M. (2021). Are Translation Universals Really Universal? A Corpus-based Study of Translational Expository Persian. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 25, 81-107.
- Taki, S., Mirmiran Varzaneh, P. S., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Patterns of repetition in Persian and English: A cross-linguistic study of the two translations of *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(1), 111-119.
- Teich, E. (2012). *Cross-Linguistic Variation in System and Text: A Methodology for the Investigation of Translations and Comparable Texts*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Thorovský, M. (2009). Lexical linguistic interference in translations of science-fiction literature from English into Czech. *Ostrava Journal of English Philology*, 1, 86-99.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (2005). Enhancing cultural changes by means of fictitious translations. In E. Hung (Ed.), *Translation and cultural change: Studies in history, norms and image-projection* (pp. 3-18). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vahedikia, M. (2018). *Features of Pseudotranslations in Comparison with Those of Translated and Authentic Literary Texts in Pahlavi Era (1941–1978)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
- Vahedikia, M., & Oliaeinia, H. (2016). Explicitation across literary genres: Evidence of a strategic device? *Translation and Interpreting*, 8(2), 82-95.
- Vahedikia, M., & Pirnajmuddin, H. (2011). Explicitation in literary translations, English syntactic optionals in translations of Persian literary genres. *Research In Contemporary Word Literature*, 62, 113-128.
- Veisbergs, A. (2016). Translationese, translatorese, interference. In L. Ilynska, & M. Platonova (Eds.), *Meaning in translation: Illusion of precision* (pp. 25-52). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Xiao, R., & Yue, M. (2009). Using corpora in translation studies: The state of the art. In P. Baker (Ed.), *Contemporary Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 237-262). London: Continuum.
- Yalsharzeh, R. (2011). Ellipses, conjunctions, and substitutions: Which one becomes explicit in the process of translation? *Journal of Translation Studies*, 14(1&2), 37-52.
- Yarmohammadi, L., Sharif, M., & Amalsaleh, E. (2008). A constrastive analysis of thematic organization. *Quarterly Journal of Humanities*, 70, 2-24.
- Yuan, Y., & Gao, F. (2008). Universals of translation: A corpus-based investigation of Chinese translated fiction. In R. Xiao, L. He, & M. Yue (Ed.), *Proceedings of The International Symposium on Using Corpora in Contrastive and Translation Studies (UCCTS 2008), 25–27 September 2008. Zhejiang University, Hangzhou*, (pp. 1-25).
- Yue, M., & Sun, B. (2021). Translationese and interlanguage in inverse translation: A case study. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 22(1), 45-63.



 Mehdi Vahedikia

Arak University

Shariati Square

Postal Code: 3815688138

Arak, Iran

m-vahedikia@araku.ac.ir

Biography: Mehdi Vahedikia is a faculty member at the English Language and Literature Department at Arak University. He received his PhD in Translation Studies from Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. He is interested in descriptive translation studies, corpus-based translation studies, literary translation, and post-colonial studies.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.