DOI: https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2023.e90252

ANALYZING TRANSLATIONS OF CULTURALLY-BOUND EXPRESSIONS IN SPAN OF TIME

Mahmoud Afrouz[1]
[1]University of Isfahan

Abstract: Translation of masterpieces of a nation's classic literature poses great challenges to translators. One of the major challenges is the issue of dealing with culturally-bound expressions (CBEs). In the current study, the researcher aimed at exploring the effect of time-span on rendering Sa'di's *Gulistan*. To this end, two English translations by Ross (1823) and Arnold (1899) were studied based on Davies's (2003) model. She has proposed seven procedures among which 'Preservation', 'Transformation', and 'Omission' were deemed low-productive. These, together with 'Mistranslated' CBEs, were regarded as a criterion for assessing the performance of the two translators on lexical-semantic level. As far as rendering CBEs were concerned, findings of the study showed that time-span has had no positive effect on avoiding low-productive procedures. Since most of the challenging CBEs were categorized in the realm of 'Social life' and 'Religion', the prospective translators, who intend to re-translate a classical Persian masterpiece, are highly recommended to gain adequate knowledge in the two realms. Inaccessibility to other translations of *the Gulistan* was a limitation of the study; therefore, researchers are suggested to find other translations from the 20th or 21st century and also focus on other potential factors affecting the quality of rendering CBEs.

Keywords: Sa'di's *Gulistan*; Davies's (2003) model; Literary Translation; Culturally-bound expressions

Introduction

The term *culture* can be generally defined as the way of life. A nation's culture can find an opportunity to express itself most fully in its language. People with different nationalities can get familiar with each other's cultural values through translated texts. Therefore, translation, as "a journey from source to target language" (Afrouz, 2022b, p. 2), can brilliantly play a pivotal role "in the evolution of cultures" (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998, p. 5).

Translation of literary texts, especially classical ones, poses great challenges to translators. Since such texts are deeply rooted in source language (SL) culture, one of the major difficulties consists of finding adequate equivalents for culturally-bound terms (Oliainia & Afrouz, 2007; Pirnajmuddin & Afrouz, 2007; Parvaz & Afrouz, 2021; Afrouz, 2022d). Such expressions and terms present a concept or an idea which is thoroughly unknown in the culture of the target language (TL). Culturally-bound expressions (CBEs) can "hinder communication of meaning to readers in another language culture" (Leppihalme, 1997, p. viii) and are considered challenging to translators who intend to (re)produce good (i.e., accurate, natural and clear) translations (Afrouz & Mollanazar, 2017a, 2017b; Afrouz, 2022c, 2022e; Hosseinpour & Afrouz, 2022).

When a classical literary text is rendered by a contemporary translator who belongs to a different culture, s/he needs to already possess or attempt to acquire profound cultural knowledge to deal appropriately with the issue. Even modern texts may pose great challenges. While one may think that modernization has leveled-out the differences between various cultures, it is emphasized that it can create more cultural diversity (Tuan, 2008, p. 4).

The language that a writer employs "is inevitably a marker of his or her identity" (Gong, 2014, p. 149). Identity has its roots in the culture of a nation. Literary translators can play a key role as "a cultural intermediary" who can facilitate "communication and exchange between the source and target languages and cultures" (Zhang, 2005, p. 129), and truly present the ST author's identity.

Choice of equivalent is highly affected by the type of procedures a translator selects (Latifi Shirejini & Afrouz, 2021a, 2021b; Afrouz, 2022g). Translators can choose various procedures for dealing with CBEs. Newmark's (1988) procedures included: naturalization, shifts or transpositions, transference, modulation, recognized translation, descriptive equivalent, componential analysis, synonymy, through-translation, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, compensation, couplets, paraphrase, notes. One of the earlier models for translating CBEs is presented by Eirlys E. Davies (2003). She has referred to the following procedures:

1. Localization: is used when CBEs are replaced by ones that are more familiar to the target readership. It occurs when the translator tries "to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience" (Davies, 2003, p. 84).
2. Addition: when translator attempts to "keep the original item but supplement the text with whatever information is judged necessary" (Davies, 2003, p. 77).
3. Creation: It occurs when the translator creates "culture-specific references" that are not found in the ST (Davies, 2003, p. 88).
4. Globalization: it is the process of replacing CBEs "with ones which are more neutral or general, in the sense that they are accessible to audiences from a wider range of cultural backgrounds" (Davies, 2003, p. 83). The use of globalization can cause loss of "effect" in translation (Davies, 2003, p. 83).
5. Preservation: when translator selects to "maintain the source text term in the translation" (Davies, 2003, p. 72). Needless to remind that the use of such a procedure for rendering CBEs is logically considered as an improper one since, while CBEs are absent in the target culture, how can one expect target-text (TT) readers to realize anything from the transliterated CBEs? Therefore, this procedure is potentially a low-productive one.

6. Transformation: It can cause some change in meaning. Davies gives the example of transformation about the sweets when in the SL, sweets are described as "vomit-flavoured" while in the target-language (TL), it is mentioned that sweets taste rubbish (Davies, 2003, p. 87). Naturally, the less number of transformed items in TT can be a criterion for a good translation. It should also be noted that, while normal transformations may be somehow tolerable, the extreme ones or total transformations leading to misunderstandings, are considered as mistranslations. In general, this procedure is considered as a low-productive one.
7. Omission: it occurs when a CBE is omitted and there are no any substitutes for it in the TL (Davies, 2003, p. 79). It is noteworthy to mention that while omissions do not greatly affect the quality of TTs in some rare cases, when it comes to CBEs, because of their special position in literary texts, omissions are required to be avoided as much as possible. Therefore, this procedure is taken into account as a low-productive one.

Literary masterpieces are usually re-translated by translators who come from various nations and different period. TT readership may expect higher quality of the latest versions. But is it always the case that the passage of time would have a positive impact on the quality of translations?

In the current study, the researcher aims at finding answers to the following questions:

1. What are the categories of the CBEs embedded in *the Gulistan*?
2. What are the most problematic areas of rendering *the Gulistan*'s CBEs?
3. To what extent does time-span affect the choice of procedures in rendering *the Gulistan*?

4. To what extent Davies' model covers the procedures used by translators of *the Gulistan*?
5. How does time-span affect the translators' untranslated, mistranslated, transformed and preserved CBEs?

It should be noted that, the factors mentioned in Question 5 can be analyzed through Davies's model, where untranslated and transformed items are product of 'Omission' and 'Transformation'; mistranslated CBEs are the extreme or total transformations, and preserved items are the product of 'Preservation'.

Literature review

Almost all source texts can potentially contain some "concepts" that are "unknown" in the target language (Afrouz, 2019, p. 5). They can be related to a type of "food or drink, a social custom, or a religious belief. Such concepts can be termed as 'culture-specific items' (CSIs), or 'culture-bound terms'" (Afrouz, 2019, p. 5). A number of works, being done on CSIs or CBEs by researchers in the field of translations studies, are reviewed in this section.

Zhao's (2009) study has studied the subtitling procedures of CSIs in the series *Friends*. Aixela's framework was employed by the researcher to analyze the data. Zhao affirms that 'efficacy' and 'frequency' of a strategy do not inevitably correlate.

Concerning "cultural loss in the English translation of Chinese poetry", Yang (2010, p. 170) asserts that "due to the differences between the Chinese culture and the English culture, the translator faces many difficulties in the translation of Chinese poetry". While rendering poems, as Yang (2010, p. 170) writes, "the translator must be sensitive to the cultural connotation of the original poem and well equipped with the necessary cultural background of the original poem, otherwise they cannot convey the beauty and subtlety" of the source text.

Pralas (2012) focused on CBEs in Julian Barnes's *Flaubert's Parrot* and tried to describe the strategies employed in rendering such terms and to check whether or not the translated French CBEs kept their cultural specificity in the target-language text (Pralas, 2012, p. 11). Aixela's taxonomy was used by him foe data analysis. The majority of French CBEs, as Pralas (2012, p. 17) concludes, "preserved their cultural specificity in translation", which signifies that the target audience read a novel bearing "the same cultural specificity" as the original text.

Karshenas & Ordudari's (2016) joint article has focused on translations of 24 metaphorical expressions chosen from the introductory part of *the Gulistan*. Based on their findings, recent translations, compared with the older ones, follow procedures which are more TL-reader-oriented "rather than faithful to SL text" (Karshenas & Ordudari, 2016, p. 96).

Setyawan (2019) discussed CSIs in a work by Henry Ford and its translation in Indonesian based on Davies's model. His finding indicated that 'preservation' had been by far the most frequently used procedure.

Abuisaac *et al*. (2022, p. 1) investigated the "transference of culturally-bound utterances and expressions of the Qur'anic discourse into English". The researchers argued that "selecting accurate TT equivalents ought to depend entirely on the SL accurate diagnostic components that determine the lexicosemantic features of culturally-bound utterances and expressions" (Abuisaac *et al*., 2022, p. 19).

Although time-span is a potential factor affecting the selection of translation strategies (Afrouz, 2020), except for Karshenas & Ordudari's (2016) study, no other work, up to the researcher's knowledge, has recently been conducted on the issue of time-span on literary translations of classical Persian masterpieces. Even Karshenas & Ordudari's study was not on CBEs, but had concentrated only on metaphors extracted from *the Gulistan*.

Corpus

Sa'di's *the Gulistan* is among the top ten masterpieces in the classic literature of Iran (Afrouz, 2021a). *The Gulistan* is also called *the Rose Garden*. It is "translated into English more often than any other language in the world. It was first translated into French by Du Ryer in 1634" (Afrouz, 2022a, p. 193).

The book consists of 8 chapters: "The Manners of Kings"; "On the Morals of Dervishes"; "On the Excellence of Content"; "On the Advantages of Silence"; "On Love and Youth"; "On Weakness and Old Age"; "On the Effects of Education"; "On Rules for Conduct in Life" (Arnold, 1899, p. 11). In the present study, chapters 3, 4, and 5 were selected since they contained almost all CBEs appeared in the whole book. *The Gulistan*'s translations into English by Ross and Arnold are used since they were readily accessible to the researcher.

"Later translations of an original-text into the same target-language are referred to as 'retranslations'" (Afrouz, 2022f, p. 156); therefore, Arnold's (1899) translation can be considered as a retranslation for Ross's (1823) translation. Although a retranslated text might be expected to have higher quality than the earlier translation, this might not always be the case (Afrouz & Mollanazar, 2018). In the present paper, the researcher intends to analyze the quality of the two works in span of time.

Procedure

The article is a corpus-based study with a descriptive approach to the analysis of time-span focusing on CBEs in translation. The following steps were taken to analyze the data and conduct the study:

1. Persian CBEs and their equivalents were extracted.
2. The CBEs were categorized into various cultural categories, including, customs and ideas, religion, foods, ecology, etc.

3. Untranslated CBEs were detected.
4. Mistranslated CBEs were pinpointed.
5. Procedures opted for in rendering CBEs were determined based on Davies's framework.
6. The frequency of each procedure was specified.
7. Low-productive procedures were identified via a survey giving to 10 university professors teaching literary translation in Iran universities. Mistranslated CBEs were also specified.
8. The frequency of low-productive procedures in rendering CBEs in each category was determined to explore the most problematic areas of translating classical Persian literature.
9. Each translator's consistency of resorting to a specific procedure was explored.
10. The potential effect of the time-span on translator's procedures was investigated.
11. The probable effect of time-span on translators' resorting to high- or low-productive procedures was discussed.

Data analysis and results

The article gives a descriptive and theoretical insight into the cultural issues of translation from the perspective of time-span.

Classification of CBEs

In table 1, due to space limitation, only a selected number of CBEs and their English equivalents are presented.

Table 1: Persian CBEs and their equivalents

Translators / Terms	Ross (1823)	Arnold (1899)	Translators / Terms		Ross (1823)	Arnold (1899)
درویش (dærviš)		philosophic man	جو (jo)		grain	a barley corn
علّامه (ællameh)	the wisest man	ullemma	دانگ (dang)		dang	dang
دلق(dælg)	woolen frock	patched robe	عیّار (æyyær)		spy	thief
نسیج (nasij)	embroidery		زاهد (zahed)		hermit	zahid, or holy man
زرّ جعفری (zærr-e jæfæri)	the gold of Jafier	Ja'feri gold	رند (rend)		profligate	wandering minstrel
پرنیان (pærnian)	silk		حبّه (hæbbeh)		grain	grain
نان و نمک خوردن (nan-o næmæk xordæn)	to eat salt	partake of the same bread and salt	درم (deræm)	weight	diram	dirhem
				money		money

Source: The author.

Exploring some CBEs in *the Gulistan*

A brief analysis of the equivalents chosen for some CBEs by the two translators is presented here since examining the practical examples can boost the current models and taxonomies of translation strategies (Afrouz & Mollanazar, 2016). Consider the following two sentences extracted from the second story of the third chapter of *the Gulistan*:

ST: ' عاقبه الامر این یکی علّامه عصر گشت و آن دگر عزیز مصر شد. باری توانگر به چشم حقارت در درویشِ فقیه نظر کرد. '

(Anvari, 2000, p.147)

/agebatælæmr in yeki ællameh-e æsr gæšt væ an degær æziz-e mesr šod. Bari tævangær be češm-e hegaræt dær dærviš-e fægih næzær kærd/

TT: The former became the ullemma of the period and the other the prince of Egypt; whereon the rich man looked with contempt upon the fagih (Arnold, 1899, p. 75).

There are three CBEs in the mentioned extraction: 'درویش' / dærviš/, 'علّامه' /ællameh/ and 'فقیه' /fægih/. In rendering each of them, the translators have chosen different procedure. Arnold (1899) has omitted the word 'درویش' /dærviš/. In Islamic culture, a person who becomes 'فقیه' /fæǥih/ has certain characteristics (e.g. being man, being just and righteous, etc.). Ross, rendering it as 'philosophic man', has referred to one sense component, but 'philosophic' is not an appropriate equivalent for 'فقیه' /fægih/.

Clothes and 'garments' are considered to be among the culturally-bound expressions. In the following couplet extracted from the third story of the third chapter of *the Gulistan*, we can detect such a kind of CBEs:

ST: «به نان خشک قناعت کنیم و جامه ی دلق/ که بار محنت خود به که بار منّت خلق.»
(Anvari, 2000, p. 148)
/be nan-e xošk genaat konim-o jame-e / ke bar-e mehnæt-e xod beh ke bar-e mennæt-e xalg/

TT: We are contented with dry bread and a patched robe / For it is easier to bear the load of one's own trouble than that of thanks to others (Arnold, 1899, p. 75).

It seems noteworthy to mention that this couplet is a proverb in Persian for which we have an English functional equivalent: "It is better poor and free than rich and slave" (Mieder, Kingsbury & Harder, 1992, p. 509). As a supplementary procedure, the translators could have referred to this proverb, in a footnote for instance, to raise the awareness of the target readers.

According to Saidpour (1993, p. 348), 'دلق' /dælg/ "is a kind of animal whose skin is used in making the linen of some kind of clothes. Because of its similarity to the special woolen clothes of

Dervishes, their clothes are called ‘دلق’ /dælg/”. Arnold and Ross, have respectively rendered the term as ‘patched robe’ and ‘woolen frock’—each one referring only to one sense-component. Interestingly, the translators were not even consistent in their choice of equivalent for the same CBE. Somewhere else in the book, they have rendered the same word as ‘frock’ and ‘course frock’.

In the same cultural category, it is interesting to consider the CBEs ‘نسیج’ /nasij/ and ‘پرنیان’ /pærnian/. The term ‘نسیج’ /nasij/, as Saidpour (1993, p. 951) points out, is a kind of “silk cloth within which golden threads is used”. However, according to Oxford dictionary ‘embroidery’ (Ross’s equivalent) means “fabric decorated with threads of various colors”. The term ‘پرنیان’ /pærnian/, being ignored by Arnold, is translated as ‘silk’ by Ross. However, according to Saidpour (1993, p. 98), ‘پرنیان’ /pærnian/ is a kind of “soft painted Chinese silk which was considered to bring luck; hence, it was worn by the kings in the battlefields during wartime”. Furthermore, the term ‘پرنیان’ /pærnian/ is also used in literary texts to refer to the name of Rostam’s[1] shirt which was made of the leopard’s skin (*ibid*.). None of the translators referred to any of the aforementioned allusive points. There can also be found other instances of such allusive references, for instance in the following couplet:

ST:(Anvari, 2000, p. 168) «گر همه زرّ جعفری دارد/ مرد بی توشه بر نگیرد گام»
/gær hæme zærr-e Jæfæri daræd/ mærde bi tuše bær nægiræd gam/

TT: If possessed of all the Ja’feri gold,/ It will avail nothing to a hungry man (Arnold, 1899, p. 84).

The term ‘زرّ جعفری’ /zærr-e jæfæri/ is translated by Arnold as ‘Ja’feri gold’ (= pure gold). Ross has just transferred ‘جعفری’ /jæfæri/ and did not refer to its allusive aspect. According to Anvari (2000, p. 168), “the word ‘جعفری’ /jæfæri/ alludes to ‘جعفر برمکی’ /

[1] Rostam is the greatest legendary hero in the classical Persian literary texts.

jæfær bærmæki/ the vizier of 'هارون الرّشید' /haroun ælræshid/ who had commanded to make pure gold coins. The term 'جعفری' /jafari/ also referred to an alchemist called 'جعفر' /jæfær/" (*ibid*.). Arnold, in a footnote, has provided his readers with such informative notes.

Measurement is another cultural category. The following text is the twenty seventh story of the third chapter of *the Gulistan*, in which Sa'di has referred to two kinds of CBEs:

ST: (Anvari, 2000, p. 148) "به نان خشک قناعت کنیم و جامه ی دلق/ که بار محنت. خود به که بار منّت خلق."
/be nan-e xošk genaat konim-o jame-e / ke bar-e mehnæt-e xod beh ke bar-e mennæt-e xalg/
TT: We are contented with dry bread and a patched robe / For it is easier to bear the load of one's own trouble than that of thanks to others (Arnold, 1899, p. 75).

TT: A thief said to a mendicant: 'Art thou not ashamed to stretch out thy hand for a grain of silver to every sordid fellow?' He replied: 'To hold out the hand for a grain of silver / Is better than to get it cut off for one dane and a half' (Arnold, 1899, p. 89).

The whole ST has an English proverbial equivalent in English: "Better to beg than to steal, but better to work than to beg" (Mieder, Kingsbury & Harder, 1992, p. 43). The translators could have referred to the proverb to let the TT audience get more familiar with the way two similar moral concepts were presented in the source and target cultures. The fist kind of CBE detected in the ST is a 'measurement'. According to Anvari (2000, p. 173), 'جو' /jo/ and 'حبّه' /hæbbeh/ equals about 0.2 gram. However, the word 'grain' (Arnold's equivalent) does not seem to be the same as 'جو' /jo/, since it equals 0.0648 gram. Furthermore, 'دانگ' /dang/, being transferred by the two translators, equals 0.16 gram and does not have an exact equivalent in English. The second CBE can be

categorized under the realm of 'religion'. In Islamic law, in the time of Sa'di, a thief's hand would have been cut off if he had been arrested. The TT readers should not be expected by the translators to possess such 'background cultural knowledge'. The translators could have provided them with a footnote on the matter.

'Social life' is another cultural category. Consider the following sentence extracted from the twenty eighth story of chapter three:

«چه می دانید اگر این هم از جمله دزدان باشد که به عیّاری در میان ما تعبیه شده است تا به وقت فرصت یارا ن را خبر دهد.»**ST:** (Anvari, 2000, p. 175)
/če midanid ægær in hæm æz jomle-e dozdan bašæd ke be æyyari dær mian-e ma tæbieh šode vægte forsæt yaran ra xæbær dehad/

TT: How do you know whether this man is not one of the bands of thieves and has followed us as a spy to inform his comrades on the proper occasion? (Arnold, 1899, p. 96).

The word 'عیّار' /æyyær/, being mistakenly rendered as 'spy' by Arnold, refers to those who stole from the wealthy oppressors and gave it to the poor oppressed people—roughly similar to Robin Hood and his group. Besides, Ross's equivalent (i.e. thief) does not seem to be an exact one.

There are some specific ceremonies which is limited to a particular community. In the following couplet extracted from story twelve in the fifth chapter, Sa'di refers to three culture-specific terms:

«زاهدی در سماع رندان بود/ زان میان گفت شاهد بلخی»**ST:** (Anvari, 2000, p. 213)
/zahedi dær semaae rendan bud/ zan mian goft šahed-e blxi/
TT: A hermit was among profligates / When one of them, a Balkhi beauty, said (Arnold, 1899, p. 116).

The words ‘زاهد’ /zahed/ and ‘رند’ /rend/ are under the ‘social life’ category since they refer to a specific group of people, and they are considered as CBEs since as such groups may not be available in all cultural communities in the world, the translators have not offered a proper equivalent for them. The term ‘سماع’ /semaa’/, according to Anvari (2000, p. 214), is a specific kind of singing that influences the hearer greatly. The term also can refer to the party in which there is such a singing. But the main point is that such a kind of singing is specifically related to the Sufis—the term is actually ‘Sufi-oriented’. The term is left untranslated by Arnold (1899).

Another category of the CBEs is ‘customs and ideas’. One instance of which can be observed in the following extraction of the thirteenth story of chapter five:

ST: «رفیقی داشتم که سالها با هم سفر کرده بودیم و نمک خورده و . . . » (Anvari, 2000, p. 215)
/ræfigi daštæ ke salha ba hæm sæfær kærde budim væ næmæk xorde væ/

TT: I had a companion with whom I had traveled for years and eaten salt (Arnold, 1899, p. 116).

The idiomatic expression ‘نان و نمک خوردن’ /nan-o næmæk xordæn/ (literally: eating bread and salt) is reduced by Arnold as ‘to eat salt’. When a TT audience, not possessing the relevant ST background cultural knowledge, reads the literal translation, s/he is likely to laugh or get shocked since eating ‘salt’ simply does not sound to be a logical behavior. The culturally-rooted idiomatic expression actually means ‘to have a warm relationship with somebody’.

Statistical interpretative data analysis

In Table 2, the CBEs are categorized into different classes, including: Foods, Social life, Religion, Location, Gestures, Garments, Ecology, etc. Moreover, the distribution of the CBEs in various categories is displayed.

Table 2: Categories of CBE

Categories	CBEs	Percentages
Religion	/eftar kærdæn/ افطار کردن، /fægih/ فقیه، /allameh/ علّامه، /eftar kærdæn/ حلال، /mosæla/ مصلّا، /salekan/ سالکان، /tarigæt/ طریقت، /hælal/ ملاحده، /molahedeh/ مؤذّن، /mu'azzen/ قبله، /geble/ حرام، /hæram/	20%
Social life	/rend/ صف بزّازان، رند، /zahed/ زاهد، /ayyar/ عیّار، /dærviš/ درویش، /sufi/ جوانمرد، /æmirzadeh/ صوفی، /sæf-e bæzazan/ میرزاده، /javanmard/ لوریان، /lurian/ مُرید، /morid/ ساقی، /sagi/ قاضی، /gazi/ شحنه، /šæhneh/	24%
Location	/hæræm/ حَرَم، /dehliz/ دهلیز، /gorfeh/ غرفه، /rebat/ رباط	8%
Garments	/gaba/ قبا، /dora'e/ دُرّاعه، /gasab/ قصَب، /dælg/ دلق	7%
Measurements	/mæn/ مَن، /deram/ درم، /dang/ دانگ، /jo/ جُو، /hæbbeh/ حبّه	9%
Materials	/næsij/ نسیج، /pærnian/ پرنیان، /zærr-e jæfæri/ زرّ جعفری، /pašiz/ پَشیز، /dæf/ دَف، /nei/ نی، /na'lein/ نعلین، /senan/ سِنان، /demyati/ دِمیاطی، /lajæværd/ لاجورد	19%
Customs & ideas	/nan-o næmæk xordæn/ نان و نمک خوردن، /samaa'/ سماع	4%
Foods	/nušdaru/ نوش‌دارو، /næbat/ نبات، /golšekar/ گل شکر، /hælva/ حلوا	7%
Ecology	/sæmum/ سَموم	2%

Source: The author.

CBEs related to social life, religion and materials had the highest frequencies in *the Gulistan*—more than 60% of the whole CBEs can be found in these realms. However, ecology, customs and ideas had the lowest frequency—totally 6%. It actually demonstrates the requirement of literary translators (especially translators of classic

Persian literature) to get themselves more familiar with religious lexical items, as well as terms related to social life and materials.

The procedures employed by the two translators in translating the selected CBEs, referred to in table 1, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Procedures of rendering the CBEs

Translators / Terms	Ross (1823)	Arnold (1899)	Translators / Terms		Ross (1823)	Arnold (1899)
درویش (dærviš)	Transformation	Omission	جو (jo)		Transformation	Transformation
فقیه (fægih)	Transformation	Preservation	حبّه (hæbbeh)		Transformation	Transformation
علّامه (ællameh)	Globalization	Preservation	دانگ (dang)		Preservation	Preservation
دلق (dælg)	Addition	Addition	عیّار (æyyær)		Transformation	Transformation
نسیج (nasij)	Transformation	Omission	زاهد (zahed)		Transformation	couplet [Preservation+ Globalization]
پرنیان (pærnian)	Globalization	Omission	رند (rend)		Transformation	Transformation
زرّ جعفری (zærr-e jæfæri)	couplet [Preservation+ Globalization]	couplet [Preservation+ Globalization]	سماع (semaa')		Globalization	Omission
نان و نمک خوردن (nan-o næmæk xordæn)	Globalization	Globalization	درم (deræm)	weight	Preservation	Preservation
				money	Omission	Globalization

Source: The author.

Percentage of each procedure employed by the two translators is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Percentage of the procedures used by the translators

Translators / Procedures	Ross (1823)	Arnold (1899)	Total
Creation	0%	0%	0%
Localization	8%	6%	7%
Addition	11%	5%	8%

Globalization	33%	32%	33%
Preservation	20%	32%	26%
Transformation	13%	7%	10%
Omission	6%	9%	7%
Couplet	9%	9%	9%

Source: The author.

Besides 'Creation' which has never been used by any of the translators, the most and the least favorable translation procedures for them were 'Globalization' (33%) and 'Localization' (7%), respectively. Except for 'Addition', 'Preservation', and 'Transformation', Arnold and Ross had similarly used the rest of procedures. The radical difference has occurred for the use of 'Addition' and 'Transformation' where Ross has employed them twice as much as Arnold. However, Arnold has resorted to 'Preservation' 12% more than Ross.

In Table 5, percentages of CBEs rendered via the specific procedures or mistranslated are presented. The procedures are abbreviated in the following way: Preservation (P); Localization (L); Addition (A); Globalization (G); Transformation (T); Creation (C); Omission (O). the procedure 'Couplet' abbreviated as (CO), denotes the simultaneous use of two procedures in rendering one CBE. Mistranslated items, abbreviated as (MI), were also taken into account.

Table 5: Percentages of CBEs rendered via the specific procedures or mistranslated

Items / Categories	(C)	(L)	(A)	(G)	(P)	(T)	(O)	(CO)	(MI)
Religion			4%	45%	41%	5%			5%
Social life			7%	14%	32%	11%	11%	14%	11%

Location		12%	37%	25%	13%			13%	
Garments		25%	25%	37%				13%	
Measurement				8%	5	34%	8%		
Materials		5%		42%	16%	5%	16%	16%	
Customs				75%			25%		
Foods		37%	13%	25%		25%			
Ecology					5			5	

Source: The author.

The procedure of 'omission' is not a proper one for dealing with CBEs since they are so significant that their omission can usually lead to great losses in translation. The number of mistranslated items can also be considered as a criterion for evaluating the quality of a translation.

Considering the two translations as a whole, the researcher observed that most of the 'untranslated' CBEs have occurred in the realms of customs (25%), social life (11% terms) and materials (16%), while translators has never omitted any CBE related to 'Ecology', 'Foods', 'Garments', 'Location', and 'Religion'. However, it does not indicate that translators have had no challenge rendering such terms. Translators have used generalized and naturalized terms for religious bound terms in 45% of the cases. They have also simply transliterated 41%, or (partially or totally) transformed 10% of such terms, respectively. In other words, translators have had a great challenge in rendering 96% of CBEs categorized under 'Religion'. Therefore, deep familiarity with religious terms is necessary for literary translators of classical literary texts, in general, and close acquaintance with Islamic-specific concepts is quite essential for those attempting to translate classical Persian literature, in particular.

Regarding the two translations as a whole, it was observed that most of the 'mistranslated' CBEs have occurred only in the realms of

'Social life' and 'Religion', which again confirms the great challenge translators have experienced while encountering with them.

Moreover, it was observed that translators either have generalized custom-related CBEs (by 75%) or have simply omitted them (by 25%). The use of such procedures also indicated great challenges such terms have imposed on translators.

In Table 6, the percentages of procedures used for rendering CBEs (in each specific category) and the percentage of mistranslated items occurred in each category are presented. The categories are abbreviated in the following way: Religion (R); Social life (S); Location (L); Garments (G); Measurement (Me); Materials (Ma); Customs (C); Foods (F); Ecology (E).

Table 6: Percentage of the procedures and mistranslated items (MI) occurred in each category

Categories / Procedures	(R)	(S)	(L)	(G)	(Me)	(Ma)	(C)	(F)	(E)
Creation									
Localization			14%	29%		14%		43%	
Addition	11%	22%	34%	22%				11%	
Globalization	31%	12%	6%	9%	3%	24%	9%	6%	
Preservation	31%	31%	4%		21%	10%			3%
Transformation	9%	27%			37%	9%		18	
Omission		37%			12%	38%	13%		
Couplet		40%	10%	10%		30%			10%
Mistranslated items	25%	75%							

Source: The author.

As for finding equivalents, translators have encountered major difficulty in rendering items related to the two categories of 'Social life' (37%) and 'Materials' (38%). Moreover, as far as finding

'accurate' equivalent is concerned, the main challenge translators have faced was CBEs in the category of 'Social life' (75%). This category has also posed great challenges for translators while rendering CBEs since it has made them simply transliterate (31%) or transformed (27%) such items.

Religious bound items are the most preserved (31%), and the second most untranslated items (25%).

In table 7, the overall performance of the translators in rendering CBEs belonging to each category is presented. Here we have focused on the four criteria.

Table 7: Total Percentage of items rendered via (P), (T), (O), or being mistranslated

Categories	(R)	(S)	(L)	(G)	(Me)	(Ma)	(C)	(F)	(E)
Total Percentage	51%	65%	13%	0%	92%	37%	25%	25%	50%

Source: The author.

As is illustrated in Table 7, in 92% and 65% of CBEs belonging to the categories 'Measurement' and 'Social life', respectively, the two translators have not performed adequately. They seemed to have performed ideally in rendering Garments-related CBEs.

Comparing Ross and Arnold

In order to compare the two translators' works, the researcher has taken a number of criteria into consideration: the number of mistranslated, untranslated, preserved and transformed CBEs. These criteria were the result of conducting a survey giving to 10 university professors teaching literary translation in Iran universities and asking them to identify the low-productive procedures in Davies's model.

In Table 8, the higher score (= 2) indicate the superior performance of the translator in dealing with CBEs; the lower score

(= 1), the inferior performance of the translator. Note that 'F' stands for 'frequency'; 'P' for 'percentage', and 'S' for 'Score'.

Table 8: Comparison of the two translator's performance

Translator \ Criteria	Mistranslated			Untranslated			Preserved			Transformed			Total		
	F	P	S	F	P	S	F	P	S	F	P	S	F	P	S
Ross	3	75%	2	3	37%	1	11	38%	1	7	64%	2	24	46%	6
Arnold	1	25%	1	5	63%	2	18	62%	2	4	36%	1	28	54%	6

Source: The author.

As far as the four criteria are concerned, if we presuppose the same weight for each criterion, the comparison of the total frequencies indicates a trivial difference between the performances of the two translators. The scores also confirm the finding.

Conclusion

Except for 'couplet', Davies's model covered all procedures used by translators of *the Gulistan*. Among the procedures proposed by Davies, 'Preservation', 'Transformation', and 'Omission' were deemed low-productive. These procedures, together with 'Mistranslated' CBEs, were regarded as the four criteria for assessing the performance of the two translators on lexical-semantic level.

As far as rendering CBEs was concerned, time-span has seemingly had no positive effect on avoiding low-productive procedures.

Most of the challenging CBEs were categorized in the realm of 'Social life' and 'Religion'. As far as finding 'accurate' equivalent was concerned, the main challenge translators had faced was CBEs in the category of 'Social life'. This category had also posed great challenges for translators while rendering CBEs since it had made them simply transliterate or transformed such items.

Furthermore, translators had seemingly experienced great challenges in rendering 96% of CBEs categorized under the category of 'Religion'. Therefore, deep familiarity with religious terms is deemed quite necessary for literary translators of classical literature, in general, and close acquaintance with Islamic-specific concepts is quite essential for those attempting to translate classical Persian literature, in particular.

Inaccessibility to other translations of *the Gulistan* was a limitation of the study; therefore, researchers are suggested to find other translations from the 20th or 21st century and also focus on other potential factors affecting the quality of rendering CBEs.

References

Abuisaac, Shehda; Albasha, Jamal; Ghaith, Majdi & Bin Sapar, Ahmadb. "Barriers of Intercultural Communication in Transferring Culturally-bound Utterances and Expressions of *the Qur'an* from Arabic into English: Implications and Strategy". *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 52(1), p. 1-24, 2022. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2022.2137559

Afrouz, Mahmoud & Mollanazar, Hussein. "Rendering the Islamic Concepts of *the Holy Qur'an*: Towards a More Comprehensive Model". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(52), p. 61-76, 2016.

Afrouz, Mahmoud & Mollanazar, Hussein. "Strategies Opted for in Translating Twelve Categories of Qur'anic Terms". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(55), p. 7-22, 2017a.

Afrouz, Mahmoud & Mollanazar, Hussein. "Observing both Accuracy and Beauty in Translating Islamic Terms of *the Holy Qur'an*: (Im)possible?!". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(56), p. 89-106, 2017b.

Afrouz, Mahmoud & Mollanazar, Hussein. "A Comparative Study of the Holy Qur'an's English Translations by Muhammad Ali and Shakir: Plagiarism or Revision?" *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 16(61), p. 51-68, 2018.

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "How Different Muslim Translators Render *the Holy Qur'an* into English? The Case Study of Sunni, Shia and 'neither Sunni nor Shia' Translators". *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 12(1), p. 1-14, 2019.

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Exploring the Retranslation Hypothesis in The Holy Qur'an's English Translations". *Linguistic Research in the Holy Quran*, 9(2), p. 115-126, 2020. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22108/NRGS.2022.131661.1727

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Investigating Literary Translator's Style in Span of Time: The Case of Sa'di's Gulistan Translated into English". *Lebende Sprachen*, 66(2), p. 214-230, 2021a. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/les-2021-0016

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Factors Affecting Translation of Realia in Classical Literary Masterpieces: Access to the Previous Translations, the SL Natives, and the SL Experts". *Onomázein*, 56, p. 184–205, 2022a. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.56.10

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Culture and Translation: The Case of English and Persian Languages". *Cadernos de Tradução*, 42(1), p. 1-20, 2022b. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2022.e80896

Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Problems of Onomastics in 26 English Translations of *The Glorious Qur'an*: God's Names in Focus". *Folia Onomastica Croatica*, 31, p. 1-27, 2022c. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21857/yq32ohx6x9

Afrouz, Mahmoud. “Investigating the Readability of Literary Texts Translations: A Step towards Formulating the ‘Nativity Hypothesis’”. *Kervan*, 26(1), p. 365-386, 2022d. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13135/1825-263X/6888

Afrouz, Mahmoud. “Literary-text Research from the Perspective of Literary-translation Research: Criticizing Overtly Erroneous Errors in Literary Translations Based on Text Linguistic Models”. *Literary Text Research*, 26(94), p. 293-322, 2022e. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22054/ltr.2021.45635.2785

Afrouz, Mahmoud. “Testing the Validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis for Classical and Religious Literary Texts: A Meta-Analytical Study”. *trans-kom*, 15(2), p. 156-173, 2022f.

Afrouz, Mahmoud. “Translating Proverbs in The Gulistan of Sa’di: Developing a New Taxonomy Based on Baker’s (2011) Model”. *Hikma*, 21(1), p. 53-83, 2022g. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21071/hikma.v21i1.13250

Arnold, Sir Edwin. “*The Gulistan of Sa’di* by Sheikh Muslih-uddin Sa’di Shirazi (1258)”. 1899. Available at: https://www.sacred-texts.com/. Retrieved: 29 Jan., 2023.

Bassnett, Susan & Lefevere, André. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998.

Davies, Eirlys E. “A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The Treatment of Culture-specific References in Translations of Harry Potter Books”. *The Translator*, 6(2), p. 65-100, 2003.

Gong, Haomin. “Language, Migrancy, and the Literal: Ha Jin’s Translation Literature”. *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 40(1), p. 147-67, 2014. DOI: https://doi.org/10.6240/concentric.lit.2014.40.1.08

Hosseinpour, Maryam & Afrouz, Mahmoud. “Stylistic Issues in Translations of Modern Literary Texts: Enhancing Baker’s (1996) model through Beckett’s Malone Dies”. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 20(79), p. 23-37, 2022.

Karshenas, Hosna & Ordudari, Mahmoud. “Translation Procedures in Span of Time: A Case Study on Newmark’s Translation Procedures in Two English

Translations of Saadi's Gulistan". *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 4(2), p. 96-106, 2016.

Latifi Shirejini, Mehdi & Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Investigating the Representation of Ideological Foregrounding and Journalistic Translators' Agency: Iran-U.S. Relations in Focus". *Language Related Research*, 1(2), p. 629-657, 2021a. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.2.20

Latifi Shirejini, Mehdi & Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Manipulation of Narratives in Translated Political Texts: The Reflection of Iran's Political News in the West-supported Media". *Contemporary Political Studies*, 12(1), p. 1-28, 2021b. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30465/cps.2020.32003.2541

Leppihalme, Ritva. *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

Mieder, Wolfgang; Kingsbury, Stewart A. & Harder, Kelsie B. *A Dictionary of American Proverbs*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Oliainia, Helen & Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Is Pun Translatable? The Case of English Translations of *Sa'di's Gulistan*". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 5(18), p. 90-104, 2007.

Parvaz, Zohreh & Afrouz, Mahmoud. "Methods of Translating Metonymies in *The Masnavi*: Boosting Larson's (1984) Model". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 19(75), p. 6-22, 2021.

Pirnajmuddin, Hossein & Afrouz, Mahmoud. "The Study of Proper Name Allusions in English Translations of Sa'di's Gulistan". *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 5(19), p. 61-75, 2007.

Pralas, Jelena. "Translating French Culture-specific Items in Julian Barnes's Flaubert's Parrot". *Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), p. 11-18, 2012.

Ross, James. *Sadi: Gulistan or Flower Garden*. London: Walter Scott, 1823.

Sa'di, Abū-Muhammad Muslih al-Dīn. *The Gulistan* (collected by Hasan Anvari). Tehran: Qatreh, 1258/2000.

Saidpour, M. *Razi New Persian Dictionary*. Tehran: Fakhr-e Razi Press, 1993.

Setyawan, Riza Aries. "Procedures of Translating Culture-Specific Item in the Book 'The International Jew The World's Foremost Problem'". *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 52, p. 30-39, 2019. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7176/JLLL/52-05

Tuan, Yi-Fu. "Cultural Diversity and the Ideal of Progress". *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 44(2), p. 3-17, 2018. DOI: https://doi.org/10.6240/concentric.lit.201809_44(2).0001

Yang, Liu. "Cultural Loss in the English Translation of Chinese Poetry". *Babel*, 56(2), p. 168-185, 2010. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.56.2.05liu

Zhang, Yingjin. "Cultural Translation between the World and the Chinese: The Problematics in Positioning Nobel Laureate Gao Xingjian". *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 31(2), p. 127-44, 2005.

Zhao, Han. *A Comparative Analysis of Subtitling Strategies: Culture Specific Items in the Series Friends*. 2009. Thesis (Master of Arts in Applied Language Studies) – Faculty of Applied Humanities, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, 2009.

Recebido em: 25/07/2022
Aprovado em: 19/01/2023
Publicado em março de 2023

Mahmoud Afrouz. Isfahan, Isfahan Province, Iran. E-mail: m.afrouz@fgn.ui.ac.ir. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3051-4769.